The Effect of Ottoman Rule on *Fin de Siècle* Beirut;
the Province of Beirut, 1888-1914

Jens-P. Hanssen
St. Antony’s College, University of Oxford

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of D.Phil.
in Modern History at the Faculty of Modern History at the University of Oxford
(Trinity Term, 2001)
To

Both my parents,

my brother

and

Melanie
The proposed thesis deals with Beirut’s urban development from a maritime town to a provincial capital in the 19. and early 20. centuries. It does so in the context of physical, politico-administrative and socio-cultural inscriptions on the city by a centralizing Ottoman state. The center-periphery relations in the Ottoman Empire are examined in terms of the forces of political integration and social cohesion as well as challenges to them. The empire-city nexus that is maintained throughout this thesis posits Beirut both as the site of Ottoman imperial discourses and practices and as the site of local appropriation of - and resistance to - them. Local power was articulated in arenas of negotiation between Istanbul and Beirut (e.g. municipal councils, bureaucratic and personal networks, production of space, practices of urban management). At the same time, the quality of the city’s growth and wealth created discontent and resistance among these sectors of society that were excluded from, or threatened by, Beirut’s development as a port city and provincial capital (e.g. strikes, boycotts, demonstrations, riots). The condition of Beirut at the turn of the century was commented and reflected upon in contemporary Arabic journal editorials, newspaper articles, poems and speeches whose transformative power, it will be argued, affected the very physical form of Beirut’s urban fabric.
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Introduction

A city, that is to say a geographical concentration of a large population, can only subsist or develop within a system of coherent relations between its society and the space in which it expands.

Andre Raymond

The city and the urban sphere are thus the setting of struggle; they are also, however, the stakes of that struggle.

Henri Lefebvre

Beirut how you have changed; Beirut how we have changed

Nizar Kabbani

Beirut through Lefebvre-tinted spectacles

“Bayrut” – Beirut

In the fifth volume of his Arabic Encyclopaedia, Da’irat al-Ma’arif (1881), Butrus al-Bustani dedicated ten pages to the long history of Beirut.\(^1\) After a few columns on Beirut’s Phoenician origins, Bustani’s urban biography strung together a narrative of an ever-accumulating urban past, covering Greek and Roman rule, Harun al-Rashid’s epoch, Salah ad-Din’s struggle against the crusaders and the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt in 1517. This was by no means a natural choice and Bustani’s particular weighting of historical epochs differed from contemporary Ottoman and English histories of Beirut.\(^2\) On the one hand, philologico-archaeological discoveries of the time tended to favour an inverted interest in ancient history over a recent past deemed unworthy of study. On the other hand, military and then capitalist mappings viewed Beirut purely in terms of its strategic location and as an

---


2 Bustani’s account differs in weighting specific epochs from the ten page, illustrated history of Beirut printed in the Ottoman Salname of 1908/1326 for Beirut (p. 224-230). The Ottoman text, taken from Şemseddin Sami Fraşeri’s Qamus ul-a’lam, focuses on the pre-Islamic grandeur of Alexander the Great while purposefully accompanying the narrative with photos of the Ottoman clocktower, Grand Serail, Petit Serail, a police station, and two panoramas of Beirut. Likewise, Harvey Porter’s 1912 “History of Beirut” in al-Kulliyya, Beirut, focuses half his 100-page essay on Beirut’s Greek and Roman history. On page 70, Porter was still on the crusaders. Porter saw Fakhr al-Din’s rule as the golden age of the city. After page 87 and into the eighteenth century “Beirut was evidently in decline”.

1
investment site respectively. Bustani did not subordinate Beirut to its natural environment of Mount Lebanon or Syria. Instead, Bustani presented regional and global events and epochal transformations through the prism of Beirut’s own histories of adaptations, changes and resistances under local potentates such as Imam Uza’i (707-774), the Tanukhi and Arslan period during and after the crusades (12th – 16th centuries). Beirut after the Ottoman invasion of 1517 through the governorships of Mansur al-Assaf and Fakhr al-Din (r. 1588-1633).

Beirut was not only represented as one amongst equals, but had become its own centre stage in the 1870s. Pride of place was given not only to antiquity per se, but to Beirut’s extant architecture and to what it always has been, despite partisan historiographies, a mixed society enriched by urban diversity. Butrus’ son, Salim al-Bustani, based his Markazuna (“our centre”) – a foundational 1872 essay on Beirut’s “central rôle” in the modern world – on this same characteristic strength few years earlier. In both essays, centrality meant hybridity. Beirut’s first scientific urban biography in Da’irat al-Ma’arif, which culminates in lists of its architectural landmarks and demographic details, not only informs the reader of Beirut’s coordinates in the global grid of latitudes and longitudes, in Arabic alphabetical order “Bayrut” also ranges between the entries for “Peru” and “Perugia”. In a world of words, the city of Beirut had entered the academic stage of urban representations of which this thesis is only temporarily the latest reading.

Butrus al-Bustani’s particular reading-production of Beirut raises a number of important historiographical and methodological questions that this thesis intends to address:

1. How did Beirut’s literary elite relate to – and identify with – the growth of the city? How did urban perception intervene in, and change the quality of the experience of everyday life?
2. What was the relation between Ottoman state and provincial city? What were the particular and general effects of late Ottoman rule on urban politics and the urban fabric of Beirut? How did the local population manipulate Ottoman rule and how did that rule structure everyday life in Beirut?
3. What were the institutions, networks and human agencies that linked the imperial centre to the province and city of Beirut?
4. What role did European and local capitalism play in the transformation of urban space? In what ways was the Ottoman state implicated in the capitalist expansion – the process of urbanisation of capital?

---

1 Salim al-Bustani, “Markazuna,” al-Jinan 3 (1872), 135-137.
5. How did representations of space (mappings, photography) and the state (landmarks and government buildings) impact the spaces of representation, 'the self of the city'? "How did buildings mean"? 

6. What were the dominant orders and patterns of deviance? How was marginality produced? Who produced it and what was the role of the literary elite in this process?

7. To what extent did these productions of social space lead to an urban production of class distinctions?

This thesis contends that for the inhabitants of Beirut the social space of the city provided the overriding referent of the experience of everyday life. This is not to say the city of Beirut stood in a vacuum, isolated from wider political, economic and intellectual inscriptions onto its urban fabric. On the contrary, this thesis will demonstrate the multiple ways in which the production of space acted upon and shaped Beirut. The relation between city and mountain, particularly after the traumatic experience of the civil war of 1860, gave rise to particular norms and forms of the social environment that affected the social space of late Ottoman Beirut. The interventions of a centralising Ottoman state apparatus and of European capitalist investment particularly after 1888 fundamentally affected the urban consciousness, the physical and the social space of Beirut’s inhabitants.

In recent Middle East scholarship, works on Arab historical consciousness and temporal awareness abound. Significantly, such studies persist in measuring consciousness of time in parameters of nationalism. In effect, the earnest attempts to liberate historical subjectivity and human agency from the structural constraints of world-economist and Orientalist frameworks ends up, paradoxically, inserting subjectivity and agency into a new homogenising, systemic construct – that of nationalism – and thereby producing a new kind of intellectual disenfranchisement of the historical subject. This study, therefore, answers Sheehi’s implicit call for a radical subjectivity based on the lived experience of its Arab articulators. The flipside of this subjectivity is a radical accountability of nineteenth-century Beiruti intellectuals. Al-Bustani’s encyclopedic entry integrates his “Bayrut” into his four revolving cultural circles of belonging – Eastern, Ottoman, Arab, Syrian (no mention of European ‘influence’). But contrary to what studies on the intellectual origins of nationalism

---

make believe. Bustani does not prioritise any one element over the other. Bustani’s circles are free of an oft-asserted proto-nationalist agenda. On the contrary, as we shall see in the course of this study, al-Bustani persistently advocated a social space that was shaped by multiple notions of belonging and relates to being in space (spatiality) as much as to being in time (historicality).

At root, therefore, this study sets out to restore the heterogeneous spatial dimension of history in and of Beirut. History has treated time as the dynamic field of societal development, with all its coherent contradictions and crises that carried human beings along the rhythmic paths of an ‘ever-accumulating past’. But while “History was socially produced … Geography was naively given.” Michel Foucault’s critique of historicism is pertinent in this context, as he asks why it was that ‘time’ has been treated as “richness, fecundity, life, dialectic” while in contrast space has been typically seen as “the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile.”

A whole history remains to be written of spaces – which would at the same time be the history of powers – from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat.

But for Foucault, to whom “space is fundamental in any exercise of power,” the analysis of space stops there. One is inclined to shrug one’s shoulders since, if with Foucault power resides everywhere, why not also in space. Not only is the specificity of (urban) space left unexplored, also, in Foucault’s (early) institutional and structuralist approaches, social change appears in ‘systems’ that become more and more constricting and disciplinarian culminating in a modern “society of surveillance”. Although “one of Foucault’s most imaginative contributions has been his critique of the repressive hypothesis,

---

5 Lefebvre criticised that “Foucault never explained what space it is that he is referring to, nor how it bridges the gap between the theoretical (epistemological) realm and the practical one, between mental and social, between the space of the philosophers and the space of the people who deal with material things.” In Production, 4.
and his (contrary) claim that power is productive.” 12 human subjectivity always and fundamentally carries with it human subjection.

There is no way out of this double “subjectification”. With a Foucauldian analysis, the inhabitants of Beirut had no agency to exercise their peripheral power in shaping their own social space within the overbearing structures of the Ottoman state and European colonial/capitalist intervention. Such a perspective would merely reify the abstract power of the Ottoman state (legal, cartographical, etc.), a perspective that Timothy Mitchell has applied rigorously to nineteenth-century Egypt. 13

The State, Capitalism and the City

Henri Lefebvre stood at the centre of most debates in social and urban theory and he has influenced many of today’s intellectual currents directly or indirectly. But his work has only recently begun to be integrated into the academic canon. Critical postmodernists, and black feminists see in him a precursor to their conception of marginality as the strategic location of radical difference. 14 Urban planners, architects, critical geographers and new urban sociologists, too, ascribe to him new ways of thinking about the relationships between space, time and society. 15 Anthony Giddens acknowledged the influence of Henri Lefebvre’s Production of Space (1974) on the development of his theory of social structuration and concurs with him that “the importance of space itself has rarely been sufficiently emphasised in social theory.” 16

The academic discipline of history in general and Middle East urban history in particular, has been less prone to reappraisals. André Raymond’s personal life has been closely connected to Lefebvre’s while his early intellectual formation as “militant communist” coincided with Lefebvre’s prominence in the French communist party in the

14 In Third Space, Edward Soja discusses the influence of Lefebvre on critical postmodernists such as bell hooks, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Gayatri C. Spivak, and Paul Gilroy.
forties and early fifties. Although in his student years Raymond was a dedicated reader of Lefebvre’s work, Raymond insists that academically Lefebvre’s influence only came indirectly through his older brother Henri (a prominent urban sociologist in Lefebvre’s inner circle at the University of Nanterre in the 60s and 70s). But he does – when pushed – acknowledge that he was more comfortable with being associated with Henri Lefebvre’s *Critique of Everyday Life* (1947) than Braudel’s *longue-durée* history with which critics frequently associate Raymond. In the course of this introduction, we will argue that, albeit latently, his *Grandes villes arabes à l’époque ottomane* echoes many of Lefebvre’s spatial approaches to the city, and less of Braudel’s temporal focus. It is time to open the urban history of the Middle East to the work of Henri Lefebvre not least because his concern with space has attempted to “displace the problematic of industrialization.” In Lefebvre’s writings we thus find a timely alternative to evolutionary approaches inherent in temporally-based typologies such as “the pre-industrial city”, which have regularly been used to ‘explain the city’ in the Middle East.

In Lefebvre’s writing, the city as the social space of “encounter, assembly and simultaneity” is the place of the unexpected, and by virtue of this characteristic contains in and of itself transformative (“revolutionary”) powers. Although the works of Henri Lefebvre on everyday life, the production of space and the city echo many of Foucault’s concerns, Lefebvre’s analysis arrives at socio-spatial change from a different analytical angle and pace – an analytical difference which he himself sees between an inductive and a productive approach. Whereas

*an induced difference remains within a set or system generated according to a particular law [and] is in fact constitutive of that set or system ... a produced difference presupposes the shattering of a system; ... it emerges from the chasm opened up when a closed universe ruptures.*

---

17 See Nancy Gallagher’s interview with André Raymond in *Approaches to the History of the Middle East: Interviews with Leading Middle East Historians*, (Reading, 1994), 69.
18 Personal conversation with André Raymond, Aix-en-Provence, March 3, 2001. During World War II, Lefebvre sought refuge in the family house of the young Henri and André Raymond in Montargis where he fled from the Nazis.
19 Lefebvre, *Production*, 89.
20 Gideon Sjöberg, *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present*, (Illinois, 1960) has informed a number of urban studies in the Middle East. Most recently Tal Shuval’s *Algier* engages in Sjöberg’s work.
The Production of Space (1974) is in many ways the culmination of his writings on cities and urban space that inspired, and was inspired by, what he considered the “urban revolution” of Parisian students in May 1968. In it, Lefebvre concludes with his earlier calls of Le Droit à la Ville (1968) for a city of “counter-spaces”: “A space not fragmented but differential in character”, one of harmony without homogeneity, of difference without segregation “that allowed a certain pluralism.”

The [modern] state’s tendency to establish centres of decision armed with all the tools of power and subordinated to a single main centre, the capital, thus encounters stiff resistance. Local powers (municipalities, [or] regions) do not readily allow themselves to be absorbed. ... This is why conflicts between local powers and central powers are of the greatest possible interest. Such conflicts – occasionally – allow something other to break the barriers of the forbidden.

State reforms in the middle of the nineteenth century turned the Ottoman imperial government into a powerful organiser of the heterogeneous space of empire. This power was not repressive in the sense of Oriental Despotism, but – with Foucault – it was highly productive. Yet, at the same time, the modern Ottoman state was neither omniscient nor omnipotent, and local power continued to appropriate its own spheres of influence. More, it will be argued that as Ottoman state power infiltrated – colonised – urban everyday life in the provincial peripheries, the power of local elites also grew. As Grémion puts it, “local power cannot be understood if one reduces it to a system of relations within a given community replicated onto itself.” Indeed, as shall be argued further on in the introduction, ‘Ottomanisation’ simultaneously generated ‘localisation’ of social space.

In particular the institution of the municipality, subject of chapter three, formalised and perpetuated the dominance of a stratum of urban society that had emerged co-terminously with - and crucially maintained – the regional ascendancy of Beirut. The same individuals and often family clusters who struggled in petitions or in editorials for the creation of a provincial capital in Beirut reappear on the municipal council. This is neither natural nor a coincidence. From the point of view of the Ottoman government, the

22 Lefebvre, Production, 303.

23 In Production of Space, 379, Lefebvre wisely cautioned that “not all hope should be placed, after the fashion of American liberals, in pluralism per se, but it is not unreasonable to place some hope in things that pluralism lets by.” Emphasis added.

24 Lefebvre, Production, 379.

25 Pierre Grémion, Le pouvoir périphérique. Bureaucrates et Notables dans le Système politique français,
municipality and other local and provincial forms of participation incorporated a pre-existing socio-economic elite into the political and cultural orbits of the state. From the point of view of the local and provincial notables, participation in the Ottoman institutions and the reform project solidified their informal social ascendancy in the formalised political realm.

The Production of Space and Everyday Life

Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* presents layer after layer of revolving spatial thought whose main argument for the purpose of this thesis will be distilled into the question of how various levels of the production of space impacted everyday life in late Ottoman Beirut. As a socio-spatial archaeology ("spectral analysis") of modern, urban life, his 'exploration of why space matters' examines the impact of planning technologies and ideologies of the centralising state and capitalist intervention (often, but not automatically, working hand in hand) on the spaces and places of everyday life.

Developed in contentiously titled *Le Droit à Ville*, the method-metaphor of "spectral analysis" is also central to understanding the contradictory nature of the production of space. Lefebvre uses spectral analysis as an 'archaeology' of city forms and urban knowledges in order to "decompose" space, "just like white light, though uniform in appearance, may be broken down into a spectrum." His aim is not to reintroduce essential divisions in space but to show how the different dimensions of space conjure a unity of the productive process. Translated to the late Ottoman context, we shall argue that, like elsewhere, the reform project of the modernising state gave the space of empire the appearance of a rational, homogenous order, hierarchized into different levels of geography and administration. At the same time, this abstract space of the Ottoman state also generated and contained internal conflicts and sources of social domination that were hidden behind the very appearance of order.

Prior to the *Tanzimat*, the "historical space" of socio-economic centre-periphery relations in the Ottoman Empire, as described by Raymond, Antoine Abdel Nour and Beshara Doumani, had been the space of human struggles and social structures, of
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27 Lefebvre, *Production*, 353.
continuous political adjustment and open boundaries of local, territorial and social particularities across the empire. Before the mid-nineteenth century, the abstract space of the modernising Ottoman state derived imperial legitimacy and local obedience from coercive forces of often repressive violence or from the fiscal authority of its representatives—whether tax farmer or tax collector, multazim or mutasallim. In contrast, after the provincial reorganisation of 1864, the imperial state initiated a politics that aimed at generating conformity of local, heterogeneous reality to abstract projections of homogeneity. It did so on the authoritative bases of new imperial statistics, new provincial boundaries, new institutional hierarchies or new confessional representations. An underlying effect of the centralising Ottoman state in the nineteenth century was the transformation from the ‘historical’ to the ‘abstract’ space which began to hold structuring powers over the social space of everyday life in the far-flung provinces. As an (unwitting) consequence this transformation also paved the way for—and found its antithetical continuation in—new homogeneous counter-abstractions of national and sectarian spaces in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Balkans and the Middle East.

Equally applicable to popular experiences of fin de siècle Beirut is Lefebvre’s critique of the ways in which capitalism produced the city as the object and the project of its logic of expansion. Since the 1880s, particularly in Beirut, European capitalism mobilised space and distance through infrastructural investment in urban transport, communication and ‘public services’. Of the estimated 205 million francs of major European investment in Syria between 1860 and 1914, over 72 million went into the city of Beirut. Considering that the 4.2-million-franc construction of the Beirut-Damascus Road was the only major investment in pre-provincial capital Beirut, the years between 1888 and 1914 clearly brought about the most profound changes to the social and urban space which Beirut had experienced up to that time.

---


29 As such this mode of capitalism distinguishes itself from the historical space of Mediterranean commerce that Braudel, Raymond and, more recently, Doumani describe. This space was synonymous with diversity, communication and openness “and the exchange of goods went hand in hand with the exchange of ideas and pleasures.” Lefebvre, Production, 217.

Henri Lefebvre’s spectral analysis of space helps to understand the spatial relations between the Ottoman state, European capitalism and the city, and to understand the depth of the socio-spatial transformation that Beirut underwent as a provincial capital of the late Ottoman Empire. Lefebvre differentiates three interconnecting modes of spatial production: the perceived, the conceived and the lived.31 The first space contains the “particular locations characteristic of each social formation.”32 Perceived space is a product of the conscious spatial practices of a population and involves the city’s human geography; urban functions, material and physical forms of social relations, spatial organisation, the urban sites, residential patterns, and the built environment.

In contrast, the conceived space contains the mental and epistemological sphere, the signs and codes of the city. This second space is where the struggle over visions and orders of the city and over the mobilisation of space is fought out. This is the abstract space of visuality and future. It is dominated by rulers, planners, urban institutions and literary elites. Significantly, spatial representations are both abstract and concrete. Although the concept of “Bayrut”-as-text is not the same as Beirut-as-reality, in the course of the study, it will be demonstrated how the recurrent literary representations of the city (“Bayrut”) produced a particular urban reality (Beirut) as a simultaneously real and imagined city.

Lefebvre argues that urban, social space cannot be reduced to either a mere product or a figment of the imagination at the mercy of (modern) technologies of production as this binary structure of opposition would imply and he reinstates the ontological dimensions of space by introducing a third spatial element. This third space denotes the directly lived, representational spaces of the inhabitants, the way they create their city as ‘users’ through practices, images and symbols: lived space “overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects [and forms].”33 To Lefebvre, this is at once the space of everyday life dominated by the political stakes of state- and capitalist intervention, and the space of resistance to that intervention. This “trialectics of space” provides him not with a theory of the city, much less an urban science — two modes of savoir that are connected to power and implicated in the process of abstraction and alienation — but with an unmediated spatial/urban connaissance that is critical, potential and subversive. Despite his method of “decomposing the urban”, the

31 Lefebvre, Production, 33.
32 Ibid., 38.
33 Ibid., 39
differences between the perceived, conceived and lived spaces are not systemic but are in practice always fluid and open elements of the production of social space.

According to Lefebvre, whatever their developmentalist pretensions, neither the state, nor the urban planner who serves the (apparent) logic of capitalism can “truly” reach the lived space without colonising it. He does not deem localist self-management the panacea to all urban problems but it could recover and strengthen its capacities of integration and participation of the city which are almost entirely lost, and which cannot be stimulated either by authoritarian means or by administrative prescription, or by the intervention of (spatial) scientists and specialists.34

Henri Lefebvre’s sphere of “everyday life” is where his own critical humanism resides and where the space of human agency and lived experience interacts with the physical and the mental dimensions of the production of space.35 He acknowledged the Annales’ call “to go farther and say that it is in the most familiar things, that the unknown – not the mysterious – is at its richest, and that this rich content of life is still beyond our empty, darkling conscious.”36 Translated into the urban problematic of *The Production of Space*, everyday life became the space of the user, differential space, both ‘real’ and ‘possible’ which also contains the sources of collective memory (family- or community networks and geographical or genealogical origins) that lie outside the conceptual powers of the state.37

The writings of Michel de Certeau complete our spectrum of approaches to everyday life that will guide the way into Beirut’s social history of the nineteenth century. In significant contrast to Lefebvre, de Certeau’s treatment of urban everyday life comes across as a sort of ‘habitual jaywalking’ (after all, how many pedestrians ‘go Luddite’ on traffic lights?). He acknowledges the potential of resistance in Lefebvre’s work but takes the subversive voluntarism of everyday life a step further. The practices of everyday life – “les opérations des usagers” – contain ordinary, but artistic creativity (“manière de faire”), daily manipulations of space and a myriad of indomitable strategies and tactics of consumption.38

34 Lefebvre, *Writings on Cities*, 146.
37 Lefebvre, *Production*, 385.
De Certeau does not reassert the possibility of resistance in a Foucauldian society of surveillance. Instead he “exhumes those surreptitious forms of dispersed creativity” that lie beyond the reach of the assumed domination-resistance fundamentals of everyday life. Thus De Certeau provides urban historians with a path to understand popular culture as that which lies outside the conventional grand narratives and ‘histories-of-becoming’: becoming modern, secular, civil, national, etc. He, like Lefebvre, allows us to look beyond the seemingly boundless scope of the state and capitalism without abandoning the project of critical history for the sake of harmonious or nostalgic history.

‘Trialetics’ of Being: Spatiality-Historicality-Sociality

Urban space is socially produced. Everyday life habitually contains the social spaces of lived experiences, of subjectivity and subversion. To Lefebvre only in the city as a whole, with its all its contradictions and shifting centralities, is the human being fully realised. Lefebvre’s particular identification of the urban dimension as level of analysis (as opposed to the sub-urban levels of ‘the House’ or ‘the Community’) made him deeply suspicious of the nostalgic romanticism in Heidegger’s ‘ontology of the House’ as the most essential container and as the authentic unit of existence: “dwelling is the basic character of Being in keeping with which mortals exist.” Lefebvre accused Heidegger’s ontology of “philosophical trivialisation” of everyday life as it espoused “mistrust of the city and its encounters and chatter” and defied the city’s revolutionary potential vis à vis state- and capitalist intervention. Likewise, Bachelard’s phenomenological work on The Poetics of Space is dismissed on the grounds of a psychological over-equation of ‘Home’ and ‘Ego’.

The focus on urban society and the city do not preclude entirely the study of the private and public architecture. Rather, a Lefebvrian approach incorporates buildings into the analytical level of the city. The bourgeois house as much as the gecekondu (makeshift shelters) of fin de siècle Beirut, constituted the practico-material spaces of (self-)
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39 Ibid., “Introduction,” XL.
42 Lefebvre, Production, 121.
representation that marked Beirut’s urbanity. Thus Lefebvre’s approach differs from that of architectural historians such as Lewis Mumford and – in the Ottoman context – Zeynep Çelik who hold that the ‘urban fabric’ represents the dominant (and singular) architectural language and the ‘gist’ of an age. Nor is the urban form simply the embodiment of social values through architectural styles and forms. Lefebvre brings back into the picture individual experience and the multiple levels of architectural meaning and interpretation, urban contestation and subversion of artistic and symbolic representations as well as the myriad usages of urban space.

In a study of the urban effect of the revolution of 1870 in Paris that has greatly influenced this thesis’s approach, the Lefebvrian, Marxist geographer David Harvey has excavated the intense social struggle behind the construction of the basilica of Sacre Coeur. Harvey shows that rather than connoting the essence of a general Parisian worldview, the basilica was the product of different social groups struggling for cultural hegemony and political power.

So, how do buildings mean within the social, urban context? Walter Benjamin has pointed out that “buildings are appropriated in a two-fold manner: by use and by perception – or rather, by touch and sight.” Most buildings have a functional and a representational aspect. At base, domestic architecture therefore provides lived and perceived space. Public architecture, too, is a product and a frame of urban life. It encodes the dominant as the natural social order. But whether the purely representational space of an uninhabited Ottoman monument, military barracks or clocktowers, the ostentatious design of the inhabited bourgeois villas and palaces in fin de siècle Beirut or the makeshift dwellings of Armenian refugees in north-eastern Beirut, all these spaces contain a perceived, a conceived and a lived level of representations that structured urban everyday life.

How do its builders ensure that what is visible is also read in the intended way? The Ottoman imperial architecture imposed itself through monumentality, repetition and linearity by use and by perception – or rather, by touch and sight.”

45 Sacre Coeur was built to expiate the ‘sins’ that had brought the war with Prussia and the Commune in its aftermath. See David Harvey, “Monument and Myth: The building of the Basilica of the Sacred Heart,” in his Consciousness and The Urban Experience; Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization, Vol. 1. (Oxford, 1985), 221-49.
46 Walter Benjamin [1968], “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in Illuminations;
first through pencil minarets and mosques under Sulayman the Lawgiver and in the late
nineteenth century through its civil and military buildings.47 Monuments and statues
gradually gained currency during the Tanzimat.48 After the opening of the School of Fine
Arts and the School of Civil Engineering in Istanbul by sultan Abdülhamid II (1876-1909) in
the 1880s, Ottoman public architecture was ‘exported’ to the provinces and systematically
staged by rituals of commemoration. Railway stations, telegraph masts, public squares,
fountains and clocktowers became ‘immortal’ memorials to Ottoman modernity and imperial
might.49 Ottoman flags, military bands and opening ceremonies posed for the local population
and the imperial photographer alike.

This study examines how architectural codes were read by the population. Did they
turn provincial populations into modern Ottomans or did something ‘other’ break through in
the process? Were these codes challenged by subversive decoding or by breaking the script
of the code altogether?

The bourgeois house in Beirut distinguished itself from the popular habitat by a
different kind of monumentality than that of Ottoman imperial architecture. Playful forms
and ornamentation on its seaward façades were effectively incorporated into the city’s
amphitheatrical topography once the outer city area had become safe enough to be inhabited.
Whether the façades concealed a ‘traditional’ internal courtyard, or the spatial organisation of
the Ottoman konak, the often highly eclectic and diverse appearance signified above all an
embrace of modernity’s seemingly boundless potential. The more spacious the houses grew,
the more the rooms became functionally differentiated. The habitat of the Beirut
bourgeoisie’s hybrid tastes contained more simulation than outright, so-called Westernisation
of tastes in the late nineteenth century. French furniture fashions blended with Anatolian
carpets. Wooden, Cairene-style mashrabiyyas and finely embroidered Damascene seating
arrangements around interior fountains replaced more modest home furnishings in the
smaller, multi-purpose habitats of the life-styles of previous family generations. The ornate
staircases and luxuriant galleries of the grand mansions that exemplified Beirut’s fin de siècle
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47 On pre-nineteenth-century Ottoman architecture, see The Ottoman City and its Parts: Urban Structure
49 On the relationship between modern architecture, memory and power in fin de siècle Europe, see Matt
architecture, were both bourgeois spaces of representation and celebrated representations of space. In contrast, popular spaces of representation, the theatre and the coffeehouses – those traditional places of encounter and assembly discussed in chapter seven – became signifiers of the political elites’ concepts of danger and vice.

Despite the claims of semiotics that cities and buildings can be read as texts, as social constructs they cannot be reduced to mere signs and messages floating in the mental sphere of the state, the builders and the articulate elites. Architectural styles, spatial organisation and public construction are indeed artistic expressions of urbanity and a particular self-consciousness. But they acquire their multiple, immediate meanings through their particular relations to the reality of everyday life, and not merely in communication with other styles and systems of signs. The urban fabric is a social expression that is situated at the interface between personal experiences and communal- or family memories on the one hand, and the historical construction of dominant meanings and values on the other. 50

Urban life is shaped by different rhythms of being in space, being in history and being in society. In his last writings before his death, Lefebvre explored the rhythms and rituals “which punctuate daily life” in Mediterranean cities. He asks the pertinent question “[d]oes the characteristic ambiguity of Mediterranean cities in relation to the State manifest itself in the rhythms of social life?” 51 For Lefebvre,

[to think about the city is to hold and maintain its conflictual aspects: constraints and possibilities, peacefulness and violence, meetings and solitude, gatherings and separation, the trivial and the poetic, brutal functionalism and surprising improvisation. The dialectic of the urban cannot be limited to the opposition centre-periphery, although it contains it … Thinking the city moves towards thinking the world (thought as a relationship to the world) …the universe, space-time, energies, information, but without valuing one rather than another … One can hope that this will turn out well but the urban can become a place of barbarity, domination, dependence and exploitation … In thinking about these perspectives, let us leave a place for events, initiatives, decisions. 52

51 Henri Lefebvre [1986], “Rhythmanalysis of Mediterranean Cities,” in Writings on Cities, 234.
52 Henri Lefebvre, Qu’est ce que penser? (Paris, 1985), 110. Quoted from Writings on Cities, 53.
Mediterranean, Ottoman and Urban Historiographies

“[Y]ears ago Beirut was a place of compromises and alliances which now seem miraculous; the place of a polyrhythm realised in an (apparent) harmony.”  

A Space of Socio-Economic Integration: the Eastern Mediterranean under Review

Cities in the Eastern Mediterranean region look back on a rich history of several thousand years. During the long duration of Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Venetian, Caliphal and Ottoman rule, cities grew prosperous or were abandoned as economic cycles, the establishment of new settlements, trade- and pilgrimage routes affected patterns of human transience and demographic change. These historical layers constitute the coherence and vitality of an economic, social and cultural space that marks - as Fernand Braudel insists - the Mediterranean Sea until at least the seventeenth century. As we move into the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries we are presented with a Mediterranean economy that was fundamentally restructured by the forces of an accelerating world-economy. Indeed, from the middle of the nineteenth century until today these cities were caught in an intense process of profound changes, ruptures and new developments. This period is generally characterized by capital flow of world-wide dimensions, by an evolving modernization of administrative and economic patterns and political institutions, by enormous demographic and cultural changes as well as urban growth.

Braudel’s notion that a Mediterranean space-time continuum exerts its own rhythm and, indeed, structural limits to individual and state agency was taken up enthusiastically, first by historians of demographic changes in the Ottoman Empire, and more recently by world-systems historians with an urban-centred perspective at the Fernand Braudel Center in Binghampton. In their in-house journal Review, the latter expound the idea that these cities began to share cultural similarities in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries based mainly on their trade-based economies and related cultural exchanges. They demonstrate how port-cities were linked to each other on a number of levels through a network of new urban-based, Levantine merchant classes.

53 Lefebvre, “Rhythmanalysis,” 240.
55 Donald Quataert, Reşit Kasaba, Elena Frangakis-Syrett, B. Gounaris, Ç. Keyder,., Eyüp Özveren, “Port
These authors tacitly assume at the same time, that these cities were therefore fundamentally different from inland cities in the Ottoman Empire. We are offered the 'Mediterranean City' as a regional variation of the hitherto dominant 'colonial city' paradigm and as an alternative urban typology to the previously dominant paradigm of the 'Islamic City'. But Braudel's critique of the conventional historical view that "we historians of the west ... glimpse the Turkish world from the outside only" still remains. The geographic boundaries of analysis are merely pushed to the Eastern Mediterranean shores while the 'West' uncomfortably remains the sole referent of social change. The recipients of the structural transformations of the world-economy are left, somewhat mechanically, to benefit (primarily 'minorities' – Jews, Greeks, Armenians, and other Christians) or suffer (members of a 'religio-traditional' economic order – qadi, guilds, feudal lords, etc.) from the consequences. In this view, the historical subject could never quite step out of the objective and deterministic historical processes and acted merely in response to external influences.

In the influential 1993 volume of the Review, the editors concluded that "[p]ort cities in the periphery emerge as the privileged locales of contact in the world capitalist economy". The Eastern Mediterranean of the nineteenth century now emerges as "a subsystem of the world-economy" which was marked by liberal exchange ('liberal' because it was largely outside Ottoman state intervention and took place - as Reşit Kasaba put it - in the "nonstate arena"). Thus this sub-system was also marked by a high degree of autonomy of the Levantine commercial bourgeoisie which - significantly – reinvested its income at home, in the ports, trading companies and land in and around its cities of origin.

But criticism from within thus school soon argued that the work on port-cities remained a reworked world-economy approach which denies the historical agency of the Ottoman state. Moreover, the approach is methodologically unable – and indeed unwilling...
to incorporate the modes of 'internal urbanisation'\textsuperscript{61} – the multiple levels of discursive, semiotic or hermeneutic dimensions of social transformation and the production of space.\textsuperscript{62} In particular, the histories of human perception and experiences of modernity in everyday life: the constant production and reproduction of meanings; the strategic utilization of modern concepts through new political vocabularies and architectural vernaculars; the self-reflective and self-representing modes of identification with - and appropriation of - the modern world; and alternative – regionalizing as opposed to westernizing – dynamics.

Robert Ilbert’s recent landmark study on Alexandria between 1830-1930 can be understood as an attempt to rectify the shortcomings of the approach of the 1993 \textit{Review} issue. The state and colonialism are acknowledged as destructive forces. But Ilbert threads different times, autonomous spaces and referents into the British colonial attempts to create the abstract space of a homogeneous modern state. For Alexandria, “the colonial city [paradigm] is not sufficient … to explain that the port-city has clearly become a city [cité] composed of Alexandrians and not of expatriates and deracinated”\textsuperscript{63} inhabitants. Thus Ilbert sets out to test whether imperialism and capitalism have really absorbed every part of Alexandrian society into its abstract space or whether this city was inhabited by (non-economic) autonomous formations of social space (which is “above all a question of power”). Ilbert echoes de Certeau, when he examines whether there were social practices in Alexandria that defied historical processes of domination-resistance\textsuperscript{64}

After a lively, Lefebvrian “rhythmanalysis” of the many facets of \textit{fin de siècle} Alexandria, some of Ilbert’s conclusions contradict his initial plan. Methodologically the attributes a Mediterranean city populated by an “autonomous” Levantine society are superimposed by the synthesizing historian who seeks to identify the specificity of Alexandria’s ‘\textit{fin de siècle}’ period. Ilbert steers the argument away from his initial aim to trace “the production of space [in] a city disputed by contradictory forces and the everyday practice of men” and towards identifying the emergence of a ‘public sphere’, or a ‘civil society’ in Alexandria which is elevated in the process to the rank of capital of the

\textsuperscript{61} The term is borrowed from Joachim Schlör, \textit{Nights in the Big City: Paris, London, Berlin}, (London, 1998), 16 and denotes the role of acting, thinking and feeling in the process of urbanization.


\textsuperscript{63} Ilbert, \textit{Alexandrie}, “Introduction,” xxvi.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., xxix.
Mediterranean sea. Drawing on Marie Claire Bergère’s study on the golden age of Shanghai’s bourgeoisie and applying it to the case of Alexandria. Ilbert defines “the basis of any civil society” – quoting from Bergère – as “one section of urban society [that] now proved itself capable of organising the representative associations and of setting up the procedures of deliberation and cooperation, and the institutions of self-government.”

Apart from the general, latent nostalgia for a prenationalist and therefore liberal era, in the search for a “civil society” or “the public sphere” the omniscient historian tends to place him/herself outside the historical process whose agents always aspire to, but never quite achieve, the a posteriori ideal-type of a civil society. Nevertheless, if we integrate attempts at modelling a civil society into the historical process itself as subjective and conscious strategies of contemporary agents acting upon the social structures they inhabited, normative ideal-types form part of the production of social space and as such emerge as central but highly ambiguous discursive practices of power. The production of an urban society as “civilised” is in and of itself a civilising discourse which produced its discontented ‘others’. Chapters five and seven will demonstrate the ways in which Beirut’s literary elite, in particular the writings of Butrus and Salim al-Bustani, identified Beirut as the noble place of civilisation and modernity constantly under threat from ignorant people, thieves, bedouins and vagrants. In these chapters we encounter Bustrus al-Bustani, one of this study’s ‘tragic’ intellectual heroes of Beirut’s post-1860 era, as the bourgeois who was trying “to put his world in order.”

As we shall see, Khaldunian dynastic conceptions of ‘urban civilisation’ versus ‘tribal barbarianism’ reverberate in the Bustanis writings. But as a critical bourgeois commentary, the notion of urbanity as possessing redemptive or emancipatory qualities produced a civilising discourse of the Arab enlightenment movement which – as we shall argue in the course of this thesis – was intricately linked to the confinary practices in fin de siècle Beirut.

In our analysis the attribute fin de siècle to late Ottoman Beirut is does not ‘pay homage’ to an a posteriori defined ‘golden age’. On the contrary, as a historical epoch, fin de siècle was marked by a perceived discrepancy between unprecedented material progress and
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the perception of spiritual dejection by those who experienced it.\textsuperscript{68} The term \textit{fin de siècle} first entered the literary domain in metropolitan France in 1888 and thus conveniently coincides with the creation of the province of Beirut. That year a play called “Fin de Siècle” about “shady deals, adultery, and murder” hit the theatres in Paris while Victorian London was tormented by Jack the Ripper. The editor of a new financial weekly \textit{Le Fin de Siècle} proclaimed in 1890 that the \textit{fin de siècle} character at its most acute was “struggle for life”.\textsuperscript{69} Also, in the words of its contemporary Stefan Zweig, “this generation was inhibited in free expression by the pressures of the spirit of the age.”\textsuperscript{70}

As a social and cultural experience the \textit{fin de siècle} was not limited to metropolitan centres like London, Paris or Vienna. Eugen Weber’s recent explorations of French provincial towns during the \textit{fin de siècle} have opened up the inquiry of the cultural history of the period to non-metropolitan localities. Borrowing from Eugen Weber, the term ‘\textit{fin de siècle} Beirut’ is meant here to recreate the awareness of Ottoman politicians and the local bourgeoisie of belonging (and aspiring to belong) to a distinctly modern epoch. It also fundamentally involves the struggle of those considered obstacles to this civilising project to find a place for themselves.

One of the recurring and underlying themes of the literary movement in Beirut (\textit{al-Nadha}) was the notion of \textit{al-‘asr al-jadid} (“new age”) which was carried by a particular \textit{ruh al-‘asr} (“Zeitgeist”).\textsuperscript{71} On one level, contemporary writers and journalists in Beirut celebrated modernity (new technologies, scientific inventions and discoveries but also leisure and conspicuous consumption) as the force of the future that purged their society from an allegedly ignorant, backward and violent past. On another level, this kind of ‘epochalism’ was also a powerful social tool in the hands of the public moralists and bourgeois intellectuals who identified the practices of other, non-conforming classes as unmodern while establishing themselves as the vanguard of modernity. At the end of the nineteenth century


\textsuperscript{69} Weber, \textit{Fin de Siècle}, 10.

\textsuperscript{70} Stefan Zweig, \textit{[1944]}, \textit{Die Welt von Gestern, Erinnerungen eines Europäers}, (Frankfurt, 1998), 90.

‘progressive time’ became a marker of social difference not only by the state but also by the local bourgeoisie. 72

The scale and frame of our historical inquiry is provided by the historical subjects themselves in their struggle for the coastal province of Beirut and therefore entertains their perspective of a provincial capital. But before we introduce more thoroughly the paradigm of the Ottoman provincial capital, we need to bring the Ottoman state “as a conceptual variable” back into the historical framework. 73

Bringing the Ottoman State Back In

To consider nineteenth-century Mediterranean history as operating in the “nonstate arena” is highly problematic (let alone Reşit Kasaba’s assumed nexus of ‘the liberal’ 74), because it leaves out a whole empire - metaphorically as well as literally - of signs, cultural expressions and social articulations that gave meaning to the unfolding transformations. Did the “benevolent” Tanzimat reforms (Tanzimat-i hayriye) turn the Ottoman Empire into a colonial empire? Is it time to ‘mainstream’ the Ottoman Empire and integrate it into academic debates on imperialism and colonialism elsewhere in the world, or would we then abandon the specificities of the historical Ottoman context?

The origins of the Tanzimat reforms were firmly situated in the practices of integration within the revolving centre-periphery relations in the Ottoman Empire. Whereas in pre-Tanzimat times, Ottoman populations referred to tax-farmers and mutasallims often resident in urban centers, under the new provincial organisation, urban centers themselves became the reference points of provincial societies and the imperial government alike. After 1864, imperial legislation penetrated and shaped with heretofore unknown intensity all aspects of (urban) life of provincial societies, through building codes, regulations and laws concerning registration, health and education. Although clearly European economic and cultural influence continued unabated, all administrative and legislative integration came to have its source and focus in Istanbul.

During four centuries of Ottoman rule over its Arab provinces, center and periphery

72 Donald Lowe, History of Bourgeois Perception, (Brighton, 1982).
74 Kasaba, “A time and a place for the nonstate.”
had been intricately intertwined historically and culturally through career paths, pilgrimage, marriage and religious networks to name but a few examples.\textsuperscript{75} In the nineteenth century, the image of the Muslim ruler governing the community of believers dealing with more or less obedient provinces receded into the background. Instead the idea developed of a center that was ‘modern’ and ‘progressive’ and which made it its mission to communicate and transfer this new condition to its provinces which had become by the same token ‘traditional’ and ‘reactionary’.

This view is still reproduced by Turkish historians. Apparently, Ottoman center-periphery relations were marked by constant “unidimensional” confrontation, and subversion (“rebellion” and “bribing”) by the periphery.\textsuperscript{76} Where compromises between the “benevolent” government and the local elites were achieved and where “localism [was] tolerated by the center” these only contributed to an entrenchment of the ‘primordial Oriental’ structures that the enlightened program of reform attempted - in vain - to eradicate. “The provinces thus became centers of ‘reaction’,”\textsuperscript{77} and by implication were to be blamed for Turkey’s development failures in the twentieth century. As Heper argued:

Two types of relationships existed between the center and the periphery: power politics and a degenerated form of patron-client relationship. The change that took place has been no more than a segregative change. Change in the periphery itself was not evolutionary, let alone revolutionary. At times it showed signs of involution; any weakening of the central control led to maximum legal irresponsibility.\textsuperscript{78}

Ottoman center-periphery relations cannot be explained by a zero-sum game logic. There exists almost a knee-jerk assumption that – here in Heper’s language – “[local] authority increased to the same proportion that the authority of the state in the localities became weakened. They [local notables?] filled a vacuum; they did not actively overcome authority.”\textsuperscript{79} Instead, this study contends that Ottomanization and localization coincided and mutually complemented each other in “confluence and continuum.”\textsuperscript{80} First, localization did

\textsuperscript{76} Sherif Mardin, “Centre-Periphery Relations: a Key to Turkish Politics?,” \textit{Daedalus} 102 (Winter 1973), 170-1.
\textsuperscript{77} Mardin, “Centre-Periphery Relations,” 179.
\textsuperscript{78} Metin Heper, “Center and Periphery in the Ottoman Empire, with special Reference to the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century,” \textit{International Political Science Review} 1/1 (1980), 81.
\textsuperscript{79} Heper, “Center and Periphery,” 87.
not occur against – much less outside – the Ottoman state context but depended on political and infra-structural centralization. Second, in the search for a solution to the crises of provincial rule in the first part of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman state referred neither to 'time-honoured' principles nor to outright adoptions of ‘western’ models of governance. The imperial reforms were future-oriented and found inspiration in the Ottoman provinces.

Following the near total eclipse of state authority at the center of power in Istanbul at the beginning of the nineteenth century, subsequent developments during the Tanzimat were neither declining moments in Ottoman history nor marked by déjà vu banality. However, the newness of the relations between imperial center and provincial periphery during the Tanzimat lay not so much in the long process that substituted new for old institutions. Rather, this thesis suggests the need to refocus the analysis and to prioritize the spatial dimension of the Tanzimat over the conventional temporal dimension. As such this study is an attempt to cut the cord of temporally arranged, evolutionary causality of the Tanzimat era and identify the transformative powers of geography and space.

An embattled imperial government was forced to examine what had changed in the Arab provinces during the Egyptian occupation of Syria (1831-40) and during the early phases of Ottoman centralization in order to find blue-prints for the adoption of future reforms at the imperial centre in Istanbul. Faced with paramount crises in the provinces, the central government resorted to four strategies in order to reorganize fundamentally the structure of Ottoman provincial rule: dispatching fact finding missions and inspection tours; encouraging local petitions and delegations to Istanbul, setting up local councils to channel the center-periphery relations into in situ institutions; and setting up model provinces whose characteristics were then fine-tuned and applied to other provinces.

The production of imperial knowledge about the provinces involved classifications along territorial and communal categories that emerged out of the practices of integration. Inspection tours and local petitions formed the stock of experience and information upon which a major part of official knowledge about provincial society in Istanbul depended. The inspectors' provincial reports effectively provided authorized knowledge about Ottoman
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provincial societies, on the basis of which model provinces were created in order to test the efficacy of its application. Richard Smith's discussion of British imperialism in India also holds for Ottoman imperialism in the Arab provinces: "to 'know' was to know what was good for [a provincial society] ... Here, one should not assume that the reports were merely a natural product of administration, without a beginning or a dynamic of its own.”82 It is in this sense that the "beneficent regulations" of the Ottoman reform era should be understood as an epistemological leap of faith through acts of abstraction from provincial situations to imperial policy. At the same time, the abstraction of social facts and the representations of provincial realities had already been pre-molded at the point of gathering. More often than not, they had emerged out of particular power struggles whose local origins were lost to the departments in the capital.83

"Commissions of improvement" investigated the administration of taxes, the operation of local councils and their relationship with the governors. They drew maps, attempted cadastral surveys, assessed roads and the potentials for public works. As strategies of spatial representation the activities combined to produce a new quality of social transformation that was based on establishing an order of geographical homogeneity.

Shortly after the imperial decree of 1839, representatives of the provincial councils were invited to Istanbul to report on the needs and desires of their provinces.84 Following these recommendations the Porte decided in 1845 to designate certain provinces as models to overcome the burdensome task of reform. The best-qualified administrators were dispatched to Bursa, Sayda, Salonika and other capitals of maritime model provinces, in order to apply the new imperial policy. With the breakout of new social and sectarian conflicts in the Ottoman provinces in the 1850s, culminating in the civil wars of Damascus and Mount Lebanon in 1860, new efforts to revise provincial administration were undertaken. Charged with an emergency mission to resolve the atrocities committed against the Christians the foreign minister Fuad Pasha successfully averted the imminent European military intervention in Mount Lebanon. Basing his judgment and verdicts as much on the extensive

trials as on the body of previous reports available in government archives. Fuad Pasha’s new order in Mount Lebanon was to be adopted in other provinces and together with Midhat Pasha’s province of the Danube, served as a blueprint for the provincial law of the entire empire in 1864.

Through the creation of model provinces, the *Tanzimat* created its own system of administrative and territorial references. Local petitions and imperial inspection tours combined to produce the vision of an ideally bounded and administered province. The self-referential nature of the evolving reforms represented one of the most important carriers of historical rupture during the Ottoman reform period. This rupture was disseminated in a number of ways. Ottoman state education and employment in the imperial bureaucracy became a very effective way of inculcating loyalty to the Ottoman state amongst provincial elites.

Based on their education, cultural orientation, and career choices, most Syrian Mülkiye graduates could be considered Ottomans: they were educated in Istanbul, spoke Ottoman Turkish fluently, were well versed in Ottoman culture, had developed good central government connections, and held positions in Ottoman government.

The first Ottoman Parliament (1876-8) was in many ways the culmination of the *Tanzimat* process of incorporating the provincial periphery. In parliamentary sessions, provincial notables were quick to set their own agendas. As the British ambassador pointed out, “if such deputies were mere nominees of the Porte, they showed independence and intelligence.” The population of Istanbul witnessed the “amazing spectacle of seeing ministers consent to appear before the Chamber to undergo the most vigorous cross-examination concerning their action.” The extent of provincial self-confidence is captured in the almost arrogant exclamation of Nigula Nawfal, the deputy of Tripoli, Syria, during a parliament session:

---

85 Ussama Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism; Community, History and Violence in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Lebanon*, (Los Angeles, 2000), 121ff.
We are from the provinces, we have been voting since the beginning of the Tanzimat. Istanbul, however, has encountered elections only this year.90

Ottoman Imperialism and Discourses of Modernity

Recently, modernisation theory has largely given way to a theoretsation of modernity. Modernity as a particularly urban phenomenon, as “a vital mode of experiences”, encompasses the dimensions of space and time, of self and others in new ways.91 In particular, the city in the nineteenth century as a place of ostentatious display of modern life is seen in terms of its modern forms of experience and the new perceptions of space and time it ushered in.92 The provincial, urban experience of Ottoman modernity encompassed a variety of human sensibilities that reflected the specific and changing meanings of space, time and being. Ottoman modernization, then, constituted a process of social restructuring that accelerated during the nineteenth century to produce a significant geographical recomposition of being in time and space through the concrete forms of state centralization. Time acquired a distinct quality of political use in modern European and Ottoman imperial discourses alike.

Abdülhâmid’s post-Tanzimat version of Ottomanism re-interpreted imperial power in order to regain personal control over Ottoman cities and provinces and reach directly the empire’s urban population. Late Ottoman imperialism emerged as a dialectic and discursive process between competing imperial self-perceptions: on the one hand, the empire’s own past and its provinces as backward, and of contemporary European states as models of progress and modernity to be aspired to on the other. Under Abdülhamid II, the Ottoman state a process of ‘fine-tuning’ through “meticulous inculcation, indoctrination, enticing, frightening, flattering, forbidding, permitting, punishing or rewarding.”93 In his book The
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Well-Protected Domains. Deringil traces Ottomanism as a state ideology which at once tried to “minimize the exotic” within the empire, while ‘othering’ unincorporated groups of Ottoman provincial societies as ‘traditional’ and ‘primitive’ at world exhibitions, in the imperial museum, photo albums and travel literature.

Ottoman centralisation coincided with the general tendencies during ‘age of empire’ to create regularity, uniformity and efficiency in urban space and time in rapidly growing cities. Threatened by European intervention in economic, political and cultural spheres, the new concept of Ottomanism meant to unite all peoples of the empire, regardless of their confessional, ethnic or geographical origin under the leadership of the Sultan. Redefining the raison d’état was by no means confined to the nineteenth-century Ottomans. As in the cases of the Russian and Austrian empires, Ottoman “‘official nationalism’ meant that the person of the monarch, Abdülhamid II, came to be directly identified with state power, but this also had risks because now the monarch became directly responsible for the failures of the system.”

The reinvented, late nineteenth century concept of the Sultanate had a lot of the trappings of a nineteenth-century European monarchy: the invention of an Ottoman ‘throne’, the reinvention of official music, like the ‘Ottoman march’, the ‘Hamidiye March’ or the ‘Oriental Overture’; the discovery of an Ottoman national flag; or the invention of commemorative iconography, in other words, the lavishing of Ottoman citizens with medals for their service. All these tokens served as “symbols of the renewed emphasis on royal power and ceremonial”. The joint impact of these symbols created a new public image and a new legitimacy of the modern Ottoman state based on the reinvention of a specifically Ottoman history and tradition. In doing so Abdülhamid II took recourse to the ages of Sultan Suleyman ‘the Magnificent’ (r. 1520-1566), and Ahmet III (r. 1703-1730) as an idealised past which was epitomised by the architectural masterpieces of the classical era under the architect Sinan in the sixteenth century and by the Tulip era of the early seventeenth century. The architecture of these periods distinguished Istanbul’s urban fabric as a constant reminder of past Ottoman splendour. In a way then, public construction in late nineteenth century
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Ottoman cities was also an attempt to match - or recreate - these by-gone ages in a modern context.

The material culture of the expanding cities of the Ottoman Empire was a very suitable platform on which the Ottoman imperial government probed its 'new public image'. The management of urban space and time became an important vehicle to demonstrate convincingly this image of a modern Ottoman state. Throughout the Ottoman Empire commemorative rituals were rehearsed at opening ceremonies of public constructions. Within this rhythm of commemorative rituals two dates recurred almost religiously: January 9, the Sultan’s birthday, and September 1, the anniversary of his accession to the “Ottoman throne”. As in other cities of the empire, the numerous public buildings, the barracks, the hospitals, the schools and the serails in Beirut were not only responding to practical necessity. Through the magnificence of the buildings’ dimensions, the amplitude of their lines, the uniformity of their design, the effect of their decorative elements, they confirmed the power of the state and provided visual and physical evidence of Ottoman claims to modernity. As such the management of urban space engendered not just physical changes of the built environment but also filled urban space and time with new socio-political meaning.

The sectarian violence in Mount Lebanon provoked a deep crisis in the imperial self-representation of Ottoman modernity. The uprisings between 1840 and 1860 threatened not only the established social order between different communities but also the social hierarchy within them. What was particularly unnerving to the imperial government and local elites alike was that the ignorant insurgents (al-juhhal) should legitimize their rebellions with reference to the Tanzimat reforms. Attempts by elites – notables and clergymen alike – to prevent the entrance of the ahali (the commoners) into politics and “to close the door on such subaltern mobilisation” resulted in imperial collusion through the legal consecration of elite representation along fixed sectarian lines after 1860.

Makdisi’s extraordinary account of the “ambiguities of the Tanzimat” and the contradictions in the “reinvented landscape” of mid-century Mount Lebanon is pertinent to Beirut. After the civil war, the city absorbed thousands of refugees from its embattled hinterland. The city was spared the ever-spiraling violence of the mountain, but it inherited
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the resulting fears and insecurities. In Beirut, the reinscription of political and social boundaries of the Ottoman “socially conservative project of secular modernisation” affected the intricate interplay of social hierarchy and communal identity Makdisi observed for Mount Lebanon. Indeed, urban density and social proximity amplified the urban elite’s angst that vagrancy would lead to transgressions of inner-city social and geographical boundaries.

Jirji Zaydan’s autobiography, written at the end of his life in 1909, provides a contemporary definition of Beirut’s post-war social hierarchy. He divided Beirut’s society into three distinct classes. “Although the social norms were basically the same,” his was far from a neutral distinction. *Al-khassa* – the distinguished elite – were “the people of the government and the rich.” *Al-‘amma* – the undistinguished general public – Zaydan considered “the riff raff, the artisans, all the other people with menial occupations, and the small merchant.” To Zaydan, they were “immoral crooks” and “idle vagrants” who got drunk and “were uneducated because of the few school available.” But Zaydan insisted there emerged an independent “third class after the unrest [of 1860].” Cultural and intellectual capital allowed Beirut’s literary elite – or the *Bildungsbürgertum* – to climb the social ladder while their humble background distinguished them from the people who inherited wealth or status. At the same time, Zaydan realized that this group of educated individuals maintained ideas and dress codes which “the common people considered a sinful breach with tradition.”

In the eyes of this early Arab literati, intellectuals were a class in and of themselves, distinguished by common habits and tastes and by world views that were elicited distancing by other social groups.

In the final chapter we trace how – on the basis of this widely accepted, tripartite division of class – Beirut’s *Bildungsbürgertum* was befallen by a ‘moral panic’ and went to great lengths to identify the sources and locations of immorality and vice that ‘infested’ the city otherwise so full of potential. Together, Beirut’s literary and political elites converged with a bourgeois outlook. Both the Ottoman governors and the local socio-political elites had a certain privileged position for defining and forming social space. This is neither to essentialise nor to conflate ‘the state’ and ‘the bourgeoisie’. Rather the term ‘bourgeois’ designates certain shared life styles, values, practices and pedagogy tangible attempts to master the perceived volatility of their urban experience. In *fin de siècle* Beirut, perceptions
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of social norms and conformity to morals structured social relations as much as access to means of (urban) production.

**The Provincial Capital: A Frame and a Scale for an Alternative Approach to Urban History in the Middle East**

The present study is premised on Raymond’s definition that “a city, that is to say a geographical concentration of a large population, can only subsist or develop within a system of coherent relations between its society and the space in which it expands.”

André Raymond’s 1985 work on *Great Arab Cities* between the fifteenth- and early nineteenth centuries was as much a critique as a synthesis of existing literature. Significantly, in the place of essentialising paradigms he chose a relational framework between the Ottoman state and the provincial urban centres. Economic decline between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, he argued, was in fact a figment of latter-day, French colonial imagination. Rather, in the age of the “Ottoman Commonwealth” an unprecedented degree of security, prosperity and urban expansion as well as “moral and material unity” developed within the Ottoman lands to which Raymond attributes a specific imperial-local interplay of power that varied from place to place. Significantly for our alternative urban approach, he argues that the transformation of historic Arab capital cities like Damascus, Aleppo, Mosul, Baghdad, Tunis, Cairo and Madina into Ottoman provincial capitals subordinate to Istanbul actually led to urban growth in these cities.

Raymond’s analysis of historically produced, material processes of urban culture replaced what he considered the dominant, essentialising epistemologies of the Islamic city with his own brand of ‘historico-geographical materialism’. Whether Sauvaget’s paradigms of Ottoman decline, Grünebaum’s urban anarchy or Cahen’s Islamic egalitarianism, scholars had treated the city as an absolute space entirely governed by the application of (metaphysical) rules of ‘Islam’. In contrast, Raymond argues for a distinctly historical
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space of Arab cities. It was not divine Islamic law (or absence of it) that determined urban processes but material contradictions manifested in coherent spatial differentiation.

The Ottoman provincial hierarchy was replicated inside the cities where class differentiation was reflected and expressed in inner-city centralities. “radio-concentric residential patterns” as well as in the types of houses and neighborhoods. Not only fixed communal or confessional segregation but more importantly, class boundaries and the integration/separation of workplace and residence spatialised social hierarchy in the cities.105 Although the fixed locations of great mosques and markets became more accentuated under the Ottomans, spatial organisation around them was marked by shifting political centralities and social mobility.106

Raymond’s analysis of the form, function and structure of Arab provincial capitals in the pre-nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire bears parallels with Beirut in the nineteenth century. The fundamental difference of the Tanzimat period is that Raymond deals with historical space while this study is obliged to account for European capitalism and the imperial undertaking to establish the abstract space of the state. Raymond himself alludes to this Lefebvrian distinction: In comparison to the age imperialism, central state power and “Qadi urbanism” in the pre-nineteenth century was constantly negotiated and exercised on an ad hoc basis. Drawing on Baber Johansen, Raymond demonstrates how Hanafi law was applied to urban society rather than society to the law.107 In his words, what distinguished the age of the “Ottoman Commonwealth” was that “the actions of the authorities made themselves felt more in a corrective than in a normative framework of development.”108

The recent study by Eldem, Goffman and Masters on The Ottoman City between East and West emphatically criticizes the false normativity that informs essentialist urban categories. Clearly drawing on Raymond’s study, the authors deliberately chose Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul as “borderland sites” related to each other through the geographies of commerce and religious networks on the one hand and to other civilizations (“east-west”), ethnicities (“Turkish and Arab worlds”), and historical periods (“Byzantine to Ottoman epochs”) on the other. Though the authors insist that a typical Ottoman, Arab, or Islamic city
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does not exist, they continue by inadvertently adopting the evolutionary language of the
Turko-Ottoman state-in-becoming and argue:

If the fifteenth and sixteenth were formative centuries for the Ottoman state and society
and the nineteenth was the century of decline, then the seventeenth and eighteenth
centuries feature a mature stability. Surely we should turn to this middle period in order
to explore the nature and character of the Ottoman city.\(^{109}\)

Why should we “turn to this middle period”, unless the aim is not, as declared, to
reconstruct the processes of change, but to eke out the putative essence of an ‘Ottoman city’?
Did the Ottoman Empire stop (or was it stopped) being its own self after the eighteenth
century? What really distinguished this ‘golden age’ was a foreign-led cosmopolitan, civic
order of co-habitation.\(^{110}\) This order is the kind that Goffman nostalgically bemoans - in the
case of Izmir - as having been wiped away by disease, natural disasters, rural immigration
from the hinterland, and the ugly effects of industrialization and “singularly western (and
ultimately fatal) notions such as nationalism, ethnicity and racism.”\(^{111}\) But are these
processes not precisely the issues whose validity and historical conjecture urban history
should critically engage with?

It has generally been recognised that “the colonial city was an instrument in the
expansion of the capitalist world-economy.”\(^{112}\) But the most challenging approaches to
nineteenth-century urban history have been inspired by Frantz Fanon’s description of
colonial Algiers.\(^{113}\) Drawing on literature on French colonialism in the Maghreb, Timothy
Mitchell eloquently argues that the colonial city is more than just a capitalist construction.\(^{114}\)
In contrast to Abu Lughod, however, Mitchell is primarily concerned with showing the
‘indigenous’ dimensions of colonialism that pre-dated the British occupation of Egypt in
1882. The writings of the Egyptian reformer Ali Mubarak shared the British discourse on
colonial Egypt. Both were equally powerful, deliberate and constant representation of
colonial truths on ‘Oriental backwardness’ and the cultural superiority of Western
rationalism, progress and modernity:


\(^{110}\) An order that lived on in Robert Ilbert’s \textit{Alexandrie} until the 1930s.

\(^{111}\) Goffmann, \textit{The Ottoman City}, 130-133.


\(^{113}\) Frantz Fanon, [1961], \textit{The Wretched of the Earth}, (London, 1990), in particular pages 29-30.

The identity of the modern city is created by what is kept out. Its modernity is something contingent upon the exclusion of its own opposite. In order to determine itself as the place of order, reason, propriety, cleanliness, civilization and power, it must represent outside itself what is irrational, disordered, dirty, libidinous, barbarian and crowded. The city requires this “outside” in order to present itself, in order to constitute its singular, uncorrupted identity.\textsuperscript{115}

So compelling were these colonial representations that, according to Mitchell, they convinced the colonized themselves of their own deviation from that constructed truth. But here the usefulness of this urban approach becomes problematic. There exists a paradoxical continuity between certain assumptions of false consciousness about the local internalization of this colonial construct and the inescapable passivity of the inhabitants of both the ‘Oriental’ and the ‘Colonial City’. Despite the important contributions of the ‘Colonial City’ paradigm in deconstructing the ‘Oriental City’ as a colonial invention, there are similarities between the two approaches that tend to obfuscate local dynamics in any given city in the Middle East. Powerful European armies, steamships, companies and banks nipped all nascent local initiative in the bud. By extension, then, there prevails a sense that both models share Max Weber’s underlying assumption that cities in the Middle East are locales of illegitimate authority.\textsuperscript{116} It then follows that without colonial exploitation there would have been a more “authentic” and autonomous development towards modernization.

As Lefebvre has shown, the city and its rhythms defy by definition scientific and theoretical typologies. The present thesis has therefore chosen as a frame and a scale of its urban inquiry the object of an urban elite’s struggle: the Ottoman provincial capital. In doing so, the study concentrates thematically on a city in the Arab provinces, its simultaneous role as port-city and later as provincial capital and its functions as center for the regional, territorial integration of the Ottoman Empire. As a provincial capital Beirut became a site of new and enforced manifestations of state presence. The introduction of administrative changes resulted in geographical and material manifestations, be they in the form of new provincial boundaries, secular state institutions, imperial architecture or decorative design and urban planning. All these were expressions of a changing society and spoke a powerful language. It was in these material domains that the Ottoman state inscribed its imperial
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project most visibly, tangibly and effectively. Free-standing administrative buildings, monuments, wide boulevards and sumptuous squares created a vocabulary of a specifically Ottoman symmetry, regularity and order which appeared to “enframe” (to use Mitchell’s term) everyday conduct around markets, guilds, families and local, regional and international networks. At the same time, these provincial capitals functioned as bridgeheads for foreign interests in the region. Missions, schools, consulates, hotels, banks and insurance agencies, tourist- and development companies established head offices in provincial capitals, branches in secondary cities and local agencies in smaller towns.117

The specific locations of Ottoman and European institutions affected the regional, inter-urban structuration and city hierarchies in the Ottoman Empire. In the Ottoman Empire, provincial capitals in the nineteenth-century functioned as nodal points and relay stations of imperial state power that emanated from Istanbul to its provinces. The Ottoman capital was the first city to undergo a veritable urban revolution in the nineteenth century in which urban spaces became increasingly differentiated economically and symbolically. The grand plans for Istanbul, the ostentatious architecture of new Sultanic palaces, government buildings, huge apartment blocks and private villas along the shores of the Bosphorus gave the Ottoman capital a powerful appearance of political reinvigoration. Like the capitals of European state-empires Istanbul underwent a state-led, architectural, development boom that reinforced its perception of metropolitan superiority vis à vis its provinces.118

The provincial capital of the late nineteenth century became in many ways a ‘dominant city’. While not strictly possessing a character of its own (because it was functionally part of a much greater spatial realm), it nevertheless imparted certain characteristics to its spheres of influence, or reflected in a distinctive manner the societal structures and the mentalities of the regions which it served.119 The provincial capital was a lieu of delegation and expression of imperial power while it used this power centripetally to draw into its own orbit its administrative hinterland. Some cities had been provincial capitals throughout Ottoman rule (Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad), others were granted this status as a

117 The urban nomenclature under the post 1864 provincial administrative system was as follows: ‘asimat Istanbul –vilayet merkezi (e.g. Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Mersin after 1864, and Beirut after 1888) – sancaq merkezi (e.g. al-Salt, Nablus, Tripoli, Homs).
119 Fernand Braudel, Afterthoughts on Material Civilisation (Baltimore, 1977), 78.
consequence of recent economic booms (Beirut, Mersin). In all cases, the Ottoman provincial capital was first and foremost linked to its natural and administrative hinterland and in that capacity interacted with the wider world.

In sum, four qualities of the Ottoman provincial capital emerge: it was invested with a function and a political size. It was marked by relational capacities, both towards Istanbul and the province between which it mediated power, dominant meaning and culture. It was both contextual because of its own historical space and the long-standing relations with its natural environment, and conjectural because of the dependence on the abstract space of the Ottoman politico-administrative system of which it was part. Finally, it was maintained by a population conscious of its urbanity.

Reading Beirut: Geographies of Class and Community

Three main perspectives have preceded this one. They have paved the way to build on themes explored here and allow us to focus on our particular Ottoman reading which they themselves have largely tended to omit. In the context of post-1860 Beirut, urban order and social hierarchy hinged on Ottoman state institutions, European consular protection and cross-confessional, pacifying collusion by the city’s notables. The notables drew their socio-political status from the ‘vertical’ ties to the religious community they represented and from their ‘horizontal’ ties of class with members of other communities with whom they shared a general economic, political and cultural outlook. Together, both ties vested them with socio-political authority.

First Reading: Merchants and Migrants of Nineteenth-Century Beirut

Leila Fawaz’s Merchants and Migrants of Nineteenth-Century Beirut became a highly influential monograph of Eastern Mediterranean urban history as soon as it appeared in 1983. Fawaz argues that Beirut enjoyed sectarian stability during the nineteenth and early twentieth century thanks to a horizontal collusion of notables of different religious
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backgrounds. But her narrative very much echoes the contemporary elite self-perception of Jirji Zaydan, for example in that she takes the dominant as the natural order. Sectarian violence was merely the practice of the deviant lower classes. In terms of human geography, she is concerned with the relationship between mountain and city and the demographic transformations that led to the rapid urbanisation of Beirut in the second half of the nineteenth century. In her narrative, this open port-city managed to absorb the multiple identities and parochial animosities of its immigrants through its cosmopolitan atmosphere.

In spite of its inclusive title the study largely covers – and therefore applies to – Beirut between 1830 and 1870. Her study is important, because she shows how local merchants and elite families appropriated the forces of change without constituting or becoming a ‘comprador bourgeoisie’ alien to its natural and social environment. But her assumption that European missionaries, merchants and consuls became the prime (and, indeed, sole) agents of economic, social and cultural change during this period is problematic. In Fawaz’s work, Beirut was the product of a cluster of intermediaries, of notable families, merchants, migrants and dragomans, social groups who are usually noted for their transience and placelessness. Indeed, no real connection between Beirut’s society and the urban space in which it expanded is drawn.

Drawing on Fawaz’s study, Özveren’s *The Making and unmaking of an Ottoman Port-City* puts the city-mountain dynamics into a more systematic world-economy approach. He shows that port-cities are creations of historical conjectures particular to British-led global free trade after the Napoleonic Wars, but restricts his analysis to the structures of urban networks in the Levant to the exclusion of the role of the Ottoman state and intra-urban dynamics. Urban inhabitants and institutions remain driftwood in the rough sea of Mediterranean trade and come to the surface only as local agents of Westernisation and, at the beginning of the twentieth century - somewhat spuriously - as sectarian and nationalist agents of Beirut’s unmaking. Even then, “[h]ad it not been for the interstate role of France, the aspirations for ‘Greater Lebanon’ may not have materialized.”

Second Reading: Class and Clientelism in Sunni Beirut between 1840 and 1985

Michael Johnson’s *Class and Clientelism* picks up on Fawaz’s assertion that notables managed to contain ‘inherent’ sectarian identities. But, Johnson turns Fawaz’s analysis on its head and challenges the picture as too rosy and too elite. Focussing on the emergence of ‘vertical’ patron-client relations in what he considers “the transition from feudalism to capitalism” during the late nineteenth century, he shows the ways in which a non-industrial mode of class domination structured and perpetuated communal modes of social organisation and service-sector capitalism. Taking his argument to its logical, though not explicitly stated conclusion, in Beirut there emerged a double contradiction. The actual class domination of political patrons, or *za’ims*, was dependent on, yet concealed by, vertical structures of clientelism. Thus the dominant urban class that emerged in the nineteenth century fundamentally relied on sectarianism that in turn contributed to the perpetuation of this class’s hegemony.

Third Reading: Beirut and its Suburbs between 1840 and 1940

What Johnson considers a “failed bourgeois revolution” is an “unachieved” urbanist integration to May Davie. Her *Beyrouth et ses Faubourgs* is a thorough analysis of the geographical transformation and urban expansion of Beirut in the nineteenth century. Davie’s study is preceded by a host of articles on what Lefebvre would consider the “suburban level of analysis”: the Beirut house as authentic habitat, and the Greek Orthodox community of Beirut as closed (and therefore coherent) social space. Although the Ottoman provincial administration is brought into the historical equation, local elites remain the focus. Although more names and families (mainly Greek Orthodox) are introduced, social relations remain reduced to inter-confessional, elite co-operation.

Her study traces the “harmonious” relations between the city centre and the suburbs from the “golden age” of the late Ottoman Empire whose political organisation, she argues, left a significant margin of autonomy in which local elites could shape their growing city, to the colonialism of the French Mandate period. The study of the Ottoman period is fed by a distinct dose of organicism. In contrast, after the rupture of World War I, the Lebanese state
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as much as French colonialism conspired to cage in this autonomous space and deprived the city of its “auto-regulatory mechanisms.” If the suburbs had been a force of social integration in the pre-mandate period, under the French Mandate, they were the spaces where opposing identities clashed.\textsuperscript{125}

**Microstorias of Beirut**

A number of unpublished academic works on nineteenth-century Beirut have taken a micro-historical, everyday-life approach.\textsuperscript{126} Under the supervision of André’s brother, Henri Raymond, Nada Sehnaoui has traced the cultural transformation from “traditional” to “Western” habits by focusing on the material life of Beirut’s inhabitants in the domains of the house, the municipality, health, dress and leisure. Malek Sharif has recently begun to refocus on the Ottoman role in some of these domains – most notably the municipality and health regulations.\textsuperscript{127} Ralph Bodenstein has written the biography of one of the earliest mansions in the quarter of Zuqaq al-Blatt. *Qasr Hunayna* is examined as a micro-historical case study to show the ways in which the “little tactics of the habitat” and architectural hybridity provided unexpected architectural and sociological clues that defied convenient categories of style and their assumed signification.\textsuperscript{128}

Today, a host of local histories lurk in the many libraries and bookshops of Beirut. Some of them are either merely anecdotal or highly partisan to this or that community’s claim to the city. Nevertheless, they wield unexpected and contradictory results in the story of Beirut. Particularly Fuad Debbas and Taha al-Wali provide detailed and complementary inventories of local events.\textsuperscript{129} The usefulness of other local histories of Beirut is limited to

\textsuperscript{125} Davie, *Beyrouth et ses Faubourgs*, 70.
\textsuperscript{128} Ralph Bodenstein, *Qasr Heneine; Memories and History of a Late Ottoman House in Beirut*, (Bonn, M.A. thesis, 1999). The Italian school of microstoria and especially Carlo Ginzburg’s “Clues: Roots of an Evidentiary Paradigm,” in his *Clues, Myths and the Historical Method*, (Baltimore, 1992, 2. ed.) spring to mind in Bodenstein’s work.
\textsuperscript{129} Fuad Debbas, [1986], *Beirut our Memory; a Guided Tour illustrated with picture postcards*, (London: Folios, 1994, 2nd revised edition).
familiarizing the foreign historian with valuable insight into local bones of historical contention.\textsuperscript{130}

\textbf{Sources of Urban Knowledge}

The city of Beirut as the locale of ‘the unexpected’ requires a diverse body of sources. State documents in the Ottoman, French, British and German archives trace what British historians used to call “the official mind of imperialism.”\textsuperscript{131} But this is clearly not sufficient for the purpose of this study. The Ottoman Imperial Bank in Istanbul, the “Westfälische Archivamt” in my native town of Münster, Germany, the university libraries of AUB and Oxford, the British Library and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris as well as the private collections of Fuad Debbas in Paris and Wolf-Dieter Lemke in Beirut all revealed the unexpected. The local newspapers, public and private architecture and maps contained literary and material representations of social relations they simultaneously shaped. Sources accessible to contemporaries have been the most revealing. Published texts, maps and buildings provide historical evidence and are treated as sources because of their intervention in the historical process.

\textbf{European Archives: the View from ‘Outside’}

Although the study deals primarily with the effect of Ottoman policies, administrative structure and urban imprints (while not denying the relevance of European influence on Beirut’s urban life), European archival material also provides a vital source of information. However, the bias and self-serving agendas of French and British imperial interests in the region and the city are duly acknowledged. Throughout the consular reports and correspondence to the respective foreign offices there transpires a generally negative approach to Ottoman policies for centralising the empire and inscribing its imperial rule onto the urban fabric and landscape. This approach was particularly manifest in Beirut as it was deemed culturally the most westernised, economically the most linked to European commercial interests in the Eastern Mediterranean, and politically its Christian minorities


were deemed in need of protection. However, European skepticism towards Beirut’s transformation and the Ottoman centralising project has the benefit, fortuitous for the historian, of relatively detailed recordings of Ottoman rule in Beirut. A ‘subaltern’ approach to European diplomatic sources, given paradigmatic status by Spivak, Guha and others, enables us to contextualise local agency by reading colonial documents ‘from within but against the grain’. 132

This thesis is not concerned with European colonialism per se. Local reaction (opportunism and insurgence) was directed at the effects of the dual ‘capitalisation’ of Beirut (politic-co-administrative in 1888 and financial thereafter). There is therefore scope to filter reports on Ottoman-local politics and turn these marginal aspects of the consular dispatches into the central focus of this study, while neglecting their more central concerns towards the expatriate community, ably dealt with by Leila Fawaz and others.

Moreover, unlike Indian subaltern studies, it is not the European archives that have structured or set the agenda for this study but Ottoman and local sources. 133 Historians of Ottoman imperialism in the Arab towns and provinces are blessed with two additional categories of sources: Haymidian state documents and Arab journalistic and literary documents. The historian is thus not limited to the technique of reading European diplomatic sources ‘against the grain’ alone but can cross-check information and counter-weigh arguments.

The Imperial Ottoman Archive in Istanbul: The View from Above

To the extent that the late Ottoman Empire qualifies as a “bureaucratic empire”, its legacy is its vast state archive which contains in-depth records of Ottoman provincial rule. The Prime Minister’s archive stores local petitions as well as the correspondence between the central government ministries and the provincial administration. In particular during the long reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909) which constitutes the core of this thesis’ periodisation, the Ottoman state built a vast archival repository. Ottoman archival research has concentrated on Yildiz palace series of documents which have recently been incorporated into the

133 In this context it is instructive that Foucault has raised the issue of archival politics calling the archive “a repressive instrument that confines the dimensions of thought and articulation.” In Archaeology of Knowledge, (London: Routledge, 1997, 6. ed.), 128f.
Baybakanlik Arşivi. The principal papers collection (Esas Evraki), the classified special rulings (Sadarat Hususi) and the classification of miscellaneous entries (Mutenevvi Tasnifi) provided the main body of Hamidian knowledge of the provinces. They were complemented by summary entries of incoming and outgoing telegraph messages in the Giden-Gelen files. The correspondence between provincial and central administration were kept in these registers by a growing army of Ottoman book-keepers and archivists. Abdülhamid II also introduced personal registers of provincial notables and Ottoman bureaucrats (Sicill-i Ahval) which listed in minute detail the careers and social positions of an entire generation of Ottoman elites (born between c. 1840 and 1890).

Internal government correspondence provides the historian with a privileged knowledge of Ottoman involvement in every nook and cranny of provincial affairs. It also offers the possibility of a “spectral analysis” of actual internal conflict in imperial decision-making, where the state gave the appearance of order and homogeneity. Correspondence yields evidence about rivaling competences of the various levels of the bureaucratic and institutional hierarchy and the pressures and constraints to which local, provincial and imperial levels of government were exposed.

Imperial and provincial yearbooks (annuaires and salnames), sanitary reports, maps, plans and legal texts constitute an entirely different, official set of sources. They represent the discursive and spatial practices of imperial politics to the provincial public as authoritative and logical. Significantly, since the 1880s, these published technologies of Ottoman state power have been set in print and produced an imperial “savoir” of lived space. With James Scott, they provided “categories used by state agents [which] are not merely means to make their environment legible; they are an authoritative tune to which most of the population must dance.”

---

134 Owing to time constraints, only about one third of the entries for individuals born in what became the province of Beirut has been computed here.
Local literary production - the Nahda as a source for urban history

The third category blows intellectual life into fin de siècle Beirut. It is the contention of this study that, as sources, the writings of the Arab Nahda (Revival, ‘Renaissance’) reflected the experiences of a certain literate and literary élite under the conditions of urbanization. Arabic newspapers and journals not only commented on but also demanded progress and thereby shaped a modern Zeitgeist, public morality as well as discourses on hygiene and welfare.

The writings of the Beiruti Nahda, in as far as they relate to the city constituted an vital layer in the production of space.136 As readily-available urban commentaries of the time, they had a profound impact on the physical shape of the city - they produced Beirut as a simultaneously real and imagined city. As early as the 1840s, Beiruti literati came together in literary clubs to discuss matters of the day and of philosophical, geographical, social and historical import. In particular the local and Ottoman members of the Syrian Society of Arts and Sciences (al-Jam‘iyya al-Suriyya lil-Ulum wal-Funun, or Majma‘ al-Tahdhib between 1838 and 1852), al-‘Umda al-‘Arabiyya in 1860, the Syrian Scientific Society of the late 1860s (al-jam‘iyyat al-‘ilmiiyya al-suriyya) the Society of Islamic Benevolence (al-jam‘iyya al-maqasid al khayriyya) had enormous influence on cultural production and urban self-consciousness in Beirut.

At the centre of this intellectual movement stood Butrus and Salim al-Bustani between the 1840s and their deaths in 1883 and 1884. Their vast literary output has been examined here for writings on Beirut’s physical transformation and social conditions in the city. Moreover, as newspaper editors, Khalil al-Khuri (b. Shuwayfat, 1836, d. Beirut, 1907), ’Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani (b. Beirut, 1847, d. Beirut, 1935) and Khalil Sarkis (b. ’Abaya, 1842, d. Beirut, 1915) championed Beirut’s cause weekly and as such their writings – city news and editorials – are treated as particular voices of the city throughout the study. By the early twentieth century, this network of intellectuals spanned almost the entire globe with emigrés like Jirji Zaydan (1861-1915), Amin al-Rihani (1876-1940) and Khalil Jibran (1883-1931) projecting their visions of Beirut from Cairo and New York.

136 For general biographies of the men of the Nahda, see Philippe deTarazi, Tarikh al-sahafa al-‘arabiyya, Vols. 1-4, (Beirut, 1913-33).
Buildings, Maps and Photography: Material Culture and Visual Representations as Sources for Social History

Domestic and public architecture are inventories of the social space of everyday life. During the Tanzimat period and particularly under Abdülhamid II monumental state architecture, government buildings, towers or memorial statues and columns emerged as omnipresent vehicles to inscribe imperial presence into the existing and changing urban fabric of the provincial towns, cities and capitals. In doing so, state architecture contributed to the larger imperial project of reforms of both homogenizing and hierarchizing the space of empire. Similarly, ostentatious, domestic architecture formed a distinct representation of bourgeois urbanity in fin de siècle Beirut – a certain self-confidence and class consciousness. The intricate design of bourgeois villas distinguished itself both from the linear monumentality of Ottoman provincial architecture and from more popular, local forms of dwelling – the hawsh or collective habitat, and the makeshift habitats of Armenian refugees in Beirut’s industrial area at the beginning of the twentieth century. In their diverse functions and degrees of self-representations all three categories of buildings structured and configured the social space of the city. Thus they hold both ontological and semiotic clues to social relations. In this respect, the archive of the Lebanese Association pour la Protection des Sites et Anciens Demeures (APSAD) has been consulted for its vast documentation on nineteenth-century houses in Beirut. Moreover Hassan Hallaq’s editions of Beirut’s law court registers (sijillat al-mahkama al-shar’iya) for the 1840s and 50s has permitted insights into the spatial organisation of the city at mid-century.

In a recent Ph.D. thesis, Benjamin Forma has examined the “Hamidian attitude” towards atlases and wall maps in schools. While Ottoman cartography had a long legacy, the Hamidian maps of the Ottoman Empire represented a break in technique, application and dissemination. Although often copied or retouched from European originals, these appropriated maps were integrated into Ottoman education and – by extension – into the Islamic-Ottomanist reform project of the Hamidian regime.

---

139 Benjamin Forma, Education for the Empire: Ottoman State Secondary Schools During the Reign of 43
This study, however, is concerned with urban cartography. City maps, whether in travel guides or planning offices, are not merely representations of reality. They also shape that reality by virtue of their claims to scientific authority. As such they hold discursive power, i.e. they form a system of possibility for knowledge that is both productive and limiting.\textsuperscript{140} Particularly in the nineteenth century, cartography underwent a veritable revolution that affected the ways in which the world was represented. As European interests in the Middle East diversified, artistic and historic ‘Holy Land-scapes’ gave way to scientific military topographies in the 1840s. Since the inception of large-scale tourism to the region in the 1860s and 70s, yearly travel guides produced reproducible images of present, civil landmarks of the ever-changing cities (hotels, consulates and bars). During the 1880s and 90s, when infrastructural investment companies moved in on cities, the urban fabric began to be represented with an eye to the future. If Baedecker maps tended to be chronically outdated, infrastructural maps began to project a future city as reality. All kinds of maps are therefore deceptive sources for the historian, particularly those that claim technological and scientific accuracy.

Like maps, photography says as much about the seer as the seen. Under Abdülhamid II, photography was used by the provincial authorities to convince the imperial government of its modernization drive. \textit{Salnames} were replete with photos of opening ceremonies of public buildings (bridges, schools, prisons and hospitals). The thesis treats all these representations as both historical sources and contemporary fact-producing interventions.

This study cannot aim to tackle the (albeit important) issue of political transition from the Ottoman to the French periods. But a study that treats the Ottoman period in its own right, with the strategic choice of the framework of a province, holds valuable advantages. For one, it allows for a detailed analysis of the evolving social relations over time within the space of the late Ottoman Empire. It also frees this study from an inevitable teleological gaze of national emergence that tends to posit in opposing blocks ‘the Ottoman era’ against ‘the Mandate period’.


\textsuperscript{140} Only recently, has the self-confidence of the discipline of cartography been shattered by Brian Harley’s \textit{“Deconstructing the Map,”} \textit{Cartographica} 26/2 (1989), 1-20.
PART I: ‘Capitalisations’ of Beirut

Introduction

In early 1865, a milestone petition reached the Ottoman government from Beirut. The group agency of the two hundred urban notables who signed a carefully but unmistakably phrased request that the sultan grant Beirut the status of an Ottoman provincial capital emerged as the driving force behind Beirut’s political and economic ascendancy. Over the next two and a half decades, the struggle for a provincial capital set the tone for the rapport of Beirut’s urban notables with their government in Istanbul. When in February 1888, Abdülhamid II finally agreed to the request, Beirut’s urban fabric and urban politics were to experience profound transformations. On the one hand the decision catapulted the city into the orbit of Ottoman imperial representations and international capitalist urbanisation and on the other it authorised the provincial capital to incorporate its new administrative periphery.

Urban rivalry evolved around a process of towns and cities vying not only for markets but also to be designated the seat of a court or imperial administration. As in France after the revolution where “new networks emerged and winning a law court, a tax office, or a prefecture lifted a town’s status and provided economic benefit,” in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Bilad as-Sham, urban rivalry instilled a sense of local, urban patriotism – or, with Abdel Nour, “le chauvinisme des villes.” This urban patriotism provided the ideological underpinning for a will to urban government and public spirit. Urban rivalry intensified in the nineteenth century, as the stakes increased and the towns and cities in Bilad as-Sham underwent a dual integration, economically with Europe and politically within the

---

1 BBA, Dahiliye Iradeleri, 37280.
centralising rule of the Ottoman Empire. Both processes were facilitated by technological innovations in communication, transportation and printing.4

Since at least the sixteenth century a tight economic network evolved around the pivotal cities of Aleppo, Damascus, Tripoli and Acre. Successful towns attracted regular Friday markets, while second tiers towns held bi-monthly markets.5 As food and merchandise was moved from the countryside to the towns and cities, the urban centres determined the regional distribution of wealth and the production of commodities. Trade regions also constituted a social space integrated by production lines, cultural capital, communal charity, family status, marriage ties and wedding ceremonies.6 With time, the regional commodity chain began to follow world-economic forces that encouraged export production and led to certain, capital-intensive sectors of the economy to concentrate around urban centres linked to Mediterranean trade.

Part one consists of two chapters. They argue that a causal link existed between the creation of Beirut as a provincial capital (Vilayet merkezi) – or ‘politico-administrative capitalisation’ – and the influx of international investment capital – or ‘financial capitalisation’ – which produced the fin de siècle Beirut that is the subject of all subsequent chapters. The choice of the term ‘capitalisation’ is not intended to contribute to the unsettled debate over when capitalism arrived in the Middle East. As vague definitions of what constitutes capitalism have mushroomed, so have its periodisations.7 Rather than pinpointing origins, this part intends to show the qualitative effect of trade on urban transformation at a time when international economy and European imperialism entered into a new phase that
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4 See especially the contributions in Thomas Philipp and B. Schaebler, The Syrian Land in the 18th and 19th Century: Integration and Fragmentation, (Stuttgart, 1998).
5 Abdel Nour, Introduction à l'Histoire Urbaine, 356.
6 For this process, see Beshara Doumani’s case study Rediscovering Palestine, Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, (Los Angeles, 1996).
7 The works of Braudel, Frank and Wallerstein have been paradigmatic. They ascribe foundational importance to the monetary revolution in the 15th century. Historians of the economy of the Ottoman Empire, such as Owen, Islamoglu and Kasaba have applied their approach to the Ottoman regions. They concurred that the Middle East was incorporated into the capitalist world economy in the second half of the 18th century when the volume of trade suddenly increased and there was a steady shift from manufactured or partially-treated goods to raw materials. Since Janet Abu Lughod’s ground-breaking study on Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350, (Oxford: OUP, 1989), the origins of the capitalist system have been push further and further back in time. For our purposes, we make a qualitative and quantitative distinction between Braudel’s Mediterranean merchant capitalism and financial capitalism since the late nineteenth century.
restructured urban environments world-wide. Economic forces had a formative impact on Beirut, but their effect on the physical and material composition as well as on urban society cannot be measured in trade balances alone. This part also shows the ways in which local elites utilized, appropriated and redirected the effects of imperial and capitalist interventions in Beirut's urban fabric and built environment at a time Lenin famously declared as the highest phase of capitalism. As Lefebvre and Harvey have argued, the production of space under the condition of capitalist urbanisation critically sustained capitalism both as a mode of production and as a structure of social relations.

---


Chapter I: The Struggle for an Ottoman Provincial Capital

“We don’t see in the world a city whose population aspires to work hard like Beirut.”

While Beirut’s development was grounded in a regional rivalry of coastal cities, its ascendancy evolved less as the predetermined effect of *forces majeurs* of an advantageous geographical location and the unfolding world-economy than as the outcome of two diametrically opposed strategies of the city’s notables. Beirut owed its initial boost to its merchants’ subversive activities to undercut the monopoly system imposed from Acre on the Levant. In contrast to this strategy, the second half of the century was marked by a local approach that invited the political power of the Ottoman state to Beirut. Petitions to Istanbul since 1865 urged the sultan to sever Beirut from the province of Damascus and grant the city its own administrative hinterland. The notables leading the struggle for Beirut argued that this would generate sustainable growth and secure a continuous structural advantage over other Syrian cities, both along the coast and in the interior.

1.1. From Acre to Beirut

The échelle of Acre has for long been regarded only as a fortified town whose governor takes umbrage at any foreigner who settles in it because he wants to be the only monopolist of the products of his territory . . . . Beirut has always been a port with great commercial potential; but for a very long time it was held as a fief, by the princes of the Mountain . . . . Before and even after 1814 there was only one European merchant in this port, yet Beirut was already considered to be the most active trading port of the coast; from this one can infer that it was not precisely the establishment of European trading houses that gave Beirut its importance.11

1.1.1. The Moment of the “Merchant Republic”

At the end of the eighteenth century, Acre was the uncontested port city of the Levant serving as the entrepôt of grain, cotton and olive oil from the valleys of the Galilee, Nablus and the plains south of Damascus. It became the administrative centre of the Ottoman province of Sayda when Ahmad al-Jazzar Pasha moved the seat of government from Sayda
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10 Lisan al-Hal, February 6, 1888.
to Acre in 1788. Until the Egyptian invasion of Bilad al-Sham in 1831, political power was to emanate from Acre which frequently incorporated Tripoli and Damascus into its rule. Al-Jazzar Pasha was made governor of Damascus on numerous occasions and for considerable time periods, while his successors also ruled over the province of Tripoli. Between 1783, the year of the death of the last powerful `Azm ruler in Damascus, and the fall of Acre to the besieging Egyptian troops of Mehmet Ali Pasha on May 27, 1832, the city of Acre was the urban hegemon in all of southern Bilad al-Sham and Palestine. Nevertheless, al-Jazzar Pasha acted as representative of the Ottoman sultan. At a time when the imperial capital Istanbul was in the throes of urban unrest, he effectively pledged allegiance to the Ottoman dynasty by constructing a commanding imperial mosque with the characteristic Ottoman pencil minarets in the centre of Acre.

So long as al-Jazzar paid his dues to the Porte, he had a free hand over the political economy of his realm. Acre’s economic boom was entirely based on an effective implementation of a system of monopoly over regional exports. This system was politically and militarily administered by consecutive rulers of the well-fortified port-city of Acre, Zahir al-‘Umar (d. 1775), Ahmad al-Jazzar (d. 1804), Suleyman al-‘Adil (r. 1804-1818) and Abdallah (r. 1818-1831) who controlled the vast coastal strip from Tripoli to Gaza. Between the 1740s and the 1800s, these rulers – in Thomas Philipp’s words - became not only the biggest local merchants but the only ones. They were able, often with brutal force, to establish themselves as sole middlemen between the French merchants and peasant production by guaranteeing supply of produce in return for fixed prices. French and Italian merchants in turn had the monopoly over purchase, transportation and distribution of grain and cotton from the warehouses of Sayda and Acre and silk from those in Tripoli. Challenges to Acre’s regional authority were not tolerated. In 1777, for example, a few years after a
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13 From 1785 to 1786, 1790 to 1795, 1803-04. Pending the Napoleonic attack, he was “commander of all troops, Pasha of Tripoli, Syria, Gaza, Ramla, Jaffa and all their dependencies and Commander of the Pilgrimage” in 1798. De Testa quoted in Thomas Philipp, *Acre: The Rise and Fall of a Palestinian City – World-Economy and Local Politics*, (New York, forthcoming).
16 Philipp, *Acre*. 49
Russian fleet briefly conquered Beirut. Ahmad al-Jazzar had expropriated Beirut from Emir Yusuf al-Shihab and expelled the Druze of the Gharb from their urban fiefdom.17

Acre’s system of trade monopoly was premised on political stability, continuous supply and demand, and tight military control over the other coastal towns and over the peasants was maintained. Other threats to Acre’s precarious economic system, such as peasant upheaval, rural flight and starvation posed more serious problems to the monopolist rulers in Acre and could only be abated by brute force. After the Napoleonic Wars, French merchants were gradually supplanted by British-Maltese and Greek-Ottoman merchants. As British demand for grain rose, Acre’s rulers profited handsomely by raising prices. The city was set for a prosperous future.

But the straw that broke Acre’s back ultimately, was the growing commercial assertion of a small community of mainly Damascene merchants in Beirut at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The growing trading activity of this community with British merchants – first clandestinely and then more openly in defiance of Acre’s commercial monopoly – broke the tight control over the entire region. And it was made possible precisely because at that particular moment in history Beirut was outside the military reach of the rulers in Acre. Although considerable efforts went into reinforcing Beirut’s fortifications and water supply after ousting the Russian expedition of 1772, Beirut’s trade had generally dwindled under Ahmad al-Jazzar who in 1775 had replaced Zahir al-‘Umar, the discredited ally of Egyptian and Russian designs in Ottoman Palestine. There had been efforts of little consequence by Italian and Danish merchants to promote Beirut’s harbour in the eighteenth century. But in 1808, a French consular representative in Acre first mentioned that Beirut had replaced Sayda as the port of Damascus.18 Because of monopoly control in Sayda and Acre, captains of the British merchant fleet soon began to realise that better deals could be struck in Beirut. Under these circumstances, Beirut prices were more competitive than Acre prices.

Sulayman Pasha, then the ruler of Acre, grew disturbed by these activities in 1811. He was furious and imposed a heavy fine on the merchants of Beirut. The ruler of Acre considered military intervention when Beirut refused to comply. Significantly, resistance to the authorities in Acre was led by ‘ulama and merchant houses of mainly Damascene origins

18 September 30 1808, in Philipp, Acre, 22.
with branches in Ras Shamiyya at the head of Beirut’s harbour. The leading insurgent’s background is a case in point: Beirut’s mufti. Shaykh Ahmad al-Barbir (1747-1811) who held the position of chief judge – or qadi – of Beirut from 1774 until his death, was the first of his family to reside in Beirut having arrived from Damascus where he had received religious education in the Ummayyad mosque.

With the memory of their eviction from Beirut by Ahmad al-Jazzar still fresh, Druze leaders south of Beirut also teamed up with the merchants and ‘ulama in Beirut to protect the city against Sulayman Pasha’s punitive strike. A weak military expedition was easily defeated by the Druzes, and the Beirut merchants could continue to undermine the prices set in Acre. Sulayman Pasha’s erosion of control over Beirut turned out to be the weak spot in Acre’s monopoly system. Between 1808 and 1811, Beirut became a viable rival to Acre as British trade through Beirut began to challenge the French position in Acre. When the prolific British travel writer James Buckingham visited Syria and Palestine in the mid-1810s, Beirut was already considered a flourishing commercial city with an estimated 8,000 inhabitants. At this time of successful subversion an impressed French consul of Acre, Pillavoine, visited Beirut and commented

the Pasha of Acre is without authority. His customs official who is one of his slaves, is taunted if he causes the least irritation. The representative of the Pasha is nothing, the Mufti [al-Barbir] is everything.

Pillavoine suggested to Paris that the consulate be moved from Acre to Beirut and emphatically summed up his report with the phrase that Beirut was “a Republic of Merchants with their own powers and laws,” a byword that has stuck until today.

Beirut’s merchants and notables joined forces to improve public utilities. Around 1813 they had an aqueduct constructed outside the town walls while several new warehouses were raised in Ras Shamiyya. In the decades to come, these warehouses stored merchandise from Nablus and other towns in the interior. Its owners, the Quraytims, Ayyas and Ghandurs,
advanced loans to inland merchants and arranged packing and shipping.26 These warehouses — or jarridat — were the foundation for Beirut’s growing capacity to conduct large-scale commodity exchange.

Migration shaped the first phase of Beirut’s regional ascendancy as a mercantile enclave in a region of monopoly rule. As a ‘merchant republic’, Beirut thrived against the odds of the regional urban hierarchy and — as we shall see presently — against the structure of its own urban layout. So far, Beirut’s ascendancy was not the outcome of a deliberate government planning effort. On the contrary, the city distinguished itself as an urban asylum for refugees from embattled regions in Bilad al-Sham. It attracted throngs of people from Tripoli who fled the simmering conflict between the local potentate Mustafa Agha Barbar and the ‘Azms of Hama,27 from the struggles between local ashraf families and imperial janissaries in Aleppo,28 from the ’ammiyya uprising in Mount Lebanon and subsequent Shihhabi retribution and from the rulers in Acre themselves.29 For all these migrants, Beirut’s walls provided protection while the town’s notables acquired something of a reputation for defying the regional authorities.

The growing prosperity of Beirut made it an attractive but expensive city to hold and control. Since his capture of Beirut in 1777, Jazzar Pasha was required to pay the sultan in Istanbul an annual tithe of 60,000 piastres for his urban iltizam — tax farm.30 By 1809, tenancy of the Beirut iltizam had risen exponentially and cost Sulayman Pasha of Acre some 60 bourses (or 300,000 piastres) per year.31 The city continued to defy attempts at political integration even after the changing regional power constellation between the governing Pashas of Damascus and Acre and the emirs in Mount Lebanon. When the peasant uprising of 1821 swept Mount Lebanon, Emir Bashir II was forced to flee from his palace in Bayt al-Din to Beirut. However, the Beiruti notables had little sympathy for their embattled Emir. Barbir’s successor, the Damascus-born mufti of Beirut, Şaykh Abd al-Latif Fathallah (1766-1844) and his onetime pupil, the qadi of Beirut, Ahmad al-Aghar, confronted him outside

26 Doumani, Rediscovering Palestine, 75.
29 For details on the ’ammiyya movement, see Havemann, Rurale Bewegungen.
30 Ismail, Documents Diplomatiques, Vol. 4, December 1, 1788, 50.
31 Ismail, Documents Diplomatiques, Vol. 4, July 2, 1809, 223.
Beirut and refused him entry into the city. Such enmity forced Bashir II to seek shelter with Abdallah Pasha in Acre - the very governor whose tax demands had precipitated the peasant uprising against him in the first place. Beirut had become not only a cherished prize but also an uncomfortably autonomous entity in the struggle for regional hegemony.

1.1.2. The Egyptian Invasion and the Making of a Port-City

Of all the échelles of the Levant at the turn of the eighteenth century, Beirut was the maritime town with least imperial authority within its walls. Ottoman governors resided elsewhere and military barracks were still absent. The Serail that Fakhr al-Din (1588-1633?) had built on the eastern wall had long been relegated to a temporary residence of the Emirs of the Mountain. Its commercial assertion notwithstanding, Beirut’s formal politico-administrative recognition was still denied by the regional powers that resided elsewhere. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Beirut did not yet have a customs office while Tripoli was considered “a small-scale Marseille” as the endpoint of the Mediterranean silk trade. Although the customs authorities in Tripoli already expressed worries about the increasing trade going through the port of Beirut, it was only under Egyptian rule in the 1830s that Beirut was transformed into port-city.

Although Ibrahim Pasha, the Egyptian general and son of Mehmet Ali Pasha, expended considerable effort in repairing Acre after his 1831 invasion, the Egyptian decade in Bilad al-Sham first and foremost reinstated Damascus as the region’s political centre between Adana and Gaza. But with public security (temporarily) restored in Mount Lebanon and coastal trade revived, Beirut matured into the uncontested port of Damascus. Under Egyptian centralising rule, the power of the emir of the Mountain, Bashir II, was circumscribed by Ibrahim Pasha’s overall authority. In contradistinction to the joint jurisdiction of mountain and plain under al-Jazzar, Ibrahim soon placed the coastal cities under loyal administrators – mutasallims – who were independent of the Shihabi emirs of the
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33 The first military barracks intramuros were built by Mahmud Nami Bey under the Egyptian rule in the 1830s. Between 1853 and 1861, the first extramural military complex was built on the Qantari hillside.
35 Ismail, Documents Diplomatiques, Vol. 4, December 13, 1811, 327.
36 Dominique Chevallier, “Western Development and Eastern Crisis in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: Syria Confronted with the European Economy,” in Beginnings of Modernisation in the Middle East, edited by W.
mountain. In 1833, Beirut was placed under the command of Sulayman Pasha, a French officer in Mehmet Ali’s service, who continued Bashir II’s previous drive to expropriate the property of Beirut’s Druze tax farmers.

The Egyptian government heeded a recommendation of the Damascus Advisory Council to furnish Beirut with a local council. Under the French trained, Egyptian officer-engineer, Mahmud Nami Bey, the council members Abd al-Fattah agha Hamada, `Umar Bayhum efendi, the shaykhs Ahmad al-`Ariss, Hassan al-Barbir, Amin Ramadhan, Ahmad Jallas, the khawajas Jibra’il Humsi, Bishara Nasrallah, Elias Manassa, Nasif Matar, Yusuf `Ayrut and Musa Bustrus enthusiastically set about improving the social and commercial conditions of their town. The council was a precursor to the municipal council of the 1860s where many of the sons and nephews of these members grappled with similar issues of urban development.

At the same time Ibrahim Pasha also paved the way for a rapid increase in European consular, commercial and missionary intervention in Syria through Beirut. During Greek corsairs’ attacks on Beirut in 1827 the entire foreign community had fled the city. In the 1830s, European commercial expansion – especially the silk trade with Mount Lebanon – propelled Beirut into the orbit of the Europe-centred world-economy. Inland merchants continued to use Tripoli as a convenient outlet for their exports, but British steam liners arriving from Izmir began to favour Beirut as entrepôt. Merchants and manpower had been migrating from all parts of the region to Beirut for at least two decades. In the early 1830s, foreigners also began to settle permanently. In 1833 there had been “no town on the sea-coast

41 Much has been written on the effect of European trade on Beirut, Mount Lebanon and the Syrian geographical entity at large and the reaction of the local populations. See for example, Roger Owen, The Middle East in the World Economy, 1800-1914, (London, New York, 1981), and Butrus Labaki, Introduction à l’Histoire Economique du Liban, (Beyrouth, 1984).
where edibles are cheaper than in Beirut”. By the end of the decade fish and meat as well as house-rent rose by up to 300 percent under the conditions of growing population density, the presence of Egyptian and Albanian soldiers and the establishment of a host of European consulates and businesses. These changes in structure and human agency led to a process that facilitated the unprecedented accumulation of wealth which was only magnified during and after the Crimean War (1853-1856) before it came to a temporary halt during the civil war of 1860.

The way the Egyptian officers - Ibrahim Pasha, his mutasallim Sulayman Pasha and the president of the Beirut advisory council, Mahmud Nami Bey - conceived of the city of Beirut differed fundamentally from how al-Jazzar Pasha had done at the end of the eighteenth century. Where the Egyptian rulers of the 1830s focussed on creating a commercial city, under the rulers of Acre by contrast, military considerations had been paramount to urban development schemes. The Maritime threat from the Russian fleet in the 1770 and Greek corsairs in the 1820s had forced Acre’s rulers to consolidate Beirut’s town walls, and fortify the seven gates and eight towers around the town centre. At the same time, the port of Beirut remained deliberately neglected as Acre’s rulers discouraged trade from Beirut as a means to sustain their monopoly trade system with Europe.

At the beginning of Mahmud Nami Bey’s term of office, the new council of Beirut was probably busy clearing up the rubble from the 1821 earthquake. The port basin was still exposed to violent storms and clogged up by what the contemporary traveler Eduard Blondel believed to be Roman columns. Lacking sufficient funding for any large-scale port construction, the council was limited to building a single jetty from the debris in the basin to improve at least landing and loading facilities. Moreover, traffic communication between the city centre and the port was non-existent and in urgent need of development if Beirut was to attract the new steam-line trade in the Eastern Mediterranean.
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42 Michel Poujoulat and M. Micaud, Correspondance d’Orient, 1830-1833, (Paris, 1833), Vol. 6, 125.
45 Much of the debris was still witnessed by an early local hotelier in 1840. See Habeeb Rizk Allah, The Thistle and the Cedar of Lebanon, (London: James Madden, 1854), 52-53. Lortet mentions another earthquake in 1837, in La Syrie d’aujourd’hui, (Paris, 1884), 74.
46 Edouard Blondel, Deux Ans en Syrie et en Palestine, 1838-1839, (Paris, 1840), 57.
British consular complaints about "various local inconveniences to which commerce is exposed from the want of a sufficient number of warehouses – the State of the Customs House – the want of a mole" probably rang in Nami Bey’s ears. He put his training as a mathematician and naval engineer into action and applied himself to Beirut’s urban development. Streets and bazaars were to be regularly sprinkled, swept and paved. He ordered street names to be posted on the main throughways, formed a police force, created commercial and health councils and supervised the construction of the quarantine. Under his leadership, the main intramural khans were renovated and large warehouses with pillared vaults erected near the port in order to improve handling of import and export.

The port gained a new importance in the urban development of Beirut. The facilitation of maritime trade overruled all other planning considerations during the Egyptian decade. One of the most instrumental elements of urban restructuring under Mahmud Nami Bey was the reconstruction of the throughway from the port to the city centre which had been a lively and picturesque boulevard in the seventeenth century. The measure proved crucial to sustain Beirut’s position as commercial entrepôt as it provided easier access and transfer of incoming and outgoing merchandise. Had the outcome of the urban rivalry in the Levant been uncertain until the 1830s, Mahmud Bey Nami’s urban restructuring of Beirut towards the port put an end to on-going diplomatic speculations.

Nami Bey transformed Beirut from a fortified, maritime tax farm into an open port-city servicing Mediterranean trade. Urban restructuring occurred just in time for the Ottoman-European Free Trade Agreements to take effect in the Eastern Mediterranean. As a newly-shaped port-city, Beirut was able to benefit from the commercial opportunities of the emerging Mediterranean subsystem of the world-economy. Port-cities in the periphery of the world-economy were transformed into deterritorialised, colonial bridgeheads that distinctly favoured European states’ economy. Beirut’s dominant position owed as much to internal
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50 On the khans in Beirut, see Dominique Chevallier, “Signes de Beyrouth en 1834,” in *Villes et Travail en Syrie du XIX au XX Siecle*, (Beirut, 1982), 9-28; on the warehouses on the port, see Seeden, “Beirut from Ottoman Sea Walls.”
52 See chapter four.
53 For a critique of the colonial city paradigm, see Introduction.
urban planning processes aimed at facilitating trade as to the transformative power of trade itself.

The “opening of South Lebanon” under Ibrahim Pasha came at the expense of the Druze community, especially their notables. The Bowring report of 1840 and consular observers of the Egyptian occupation noted the dramatic impoverishment of Druze feudal lords. Harsh Egyptian conscription — including some 2,000 men from Beirut, Sayda and Tyre — and new taxation demands added to Bashir II’s long-standing policy of eviction, expropriation and assassination of the Druze leadership and led to the anti-Ibrahim/Bashir rebellion of Druze commoners in 1835-38.

After the Egyptian occupation Druze tax farmers in and around Beirut, like the Talhuqs and Arslans sold their land to Christian and Sunni urban merchants. While the population of other communities increased exponentially, the demise of Druze inhabitants of Beirut was dramatic. In the first half of the nineteenth century, Guys counted some 800 Druze men and women compared to 7,000 Sunnis, 4,000 Greek Orthodox, 1,500 Maronites, 1,200 Greek Catholics, 400 Armenian Catholics and 200 Jews out of a total of 15,000 in the district of Beirut. While the population increased drastically to 50,000 in 1858, 80,000 in 1865, and 100,000 in 1885 and 120,000 in 1896, the Druze community shrank to under 500 male inhabitants during this period. No one in this community appears to have held positions in the Ottoman bureaucracy or the local councils of Beirut. Instead, many mountain Druzes were conscripted into the Ottoman army for campaigns in Yemen (1895) and Libya (1911).

The longest-standing urban members of Beirut’s Druze community had settled on the plains south-west of Beirut after the battle of ‘Ayn Dara in 1711. Druze families, such as al-Darub, ’Assaf, Ribbah, Khaddaj, Radwan, Abd al-Haleq, al-Dik and Sirri al-Din, lived in the quarters west of the old city walls from their fishing port in ‘Ain al-Mreisse to Zaytuneh and Qantari and Saqiyyet Janzir. The wealthier among them acquired considerable plots of fertile land on the plains in Ras Beirut, lower Musaitbeh, Mazra’at al-Arab, Bir Hassan and

55 Fahmy, All the Pasha’s Men, especially 76-112.
56 See comparative table of Beirut’s population in May Davie, Beyrouth et ses Faubourgs (1840-1940); une Intégration Inachevée, (Beirut, 1996), 141.
57 Salim Hishshi, Duruz Bayrut wa tarikhiihum, (Beirut, 1985), 91.
Khaldeh. Some entered business partnerships with Sunni merchants such as the Ghandurs, the Ayyas and the Tabbaras, or became political allies of Abd al-Fattah Hamada, the Barbirs and the muftis Ahmad al-Aghar and Mustafa Najja. But most Beiruti Druzes worked as small-scale vegetable and olive oil farmers, mulberry gardeners, wood suppliers, water wheel operators, pearl fishers, fishermen and fishmongers. Towards the end of the nineteenth century many of them found employment as coachmen, port and construction workers or coastal guards.\textsuperscript{58}

1.3. Incorporating a Port-City: the Application of the Ottoman Tanzimat in Urban Bilad al-Sham

The administrative geography of Beirut within the Ottoman context had shifted according to the tides of regional politics for centuries. The town reported to the immediate administrative superiors in Damascus, Sayda or Acre. For Druze emirs or Ottoman pashas ruling from provincial capitals, Beirut was a lucrative tax farm. The Egyptians then turned Beirut into a port-city. Their eviction coincided with the proclamation of the Ottoman Hatt-i Hümâyûn of 1839 which abolished urban tax-farming and ushered in the incorporation of provincial towns into the new geo-administrative hierarchy of centralised Ottoman rule.\textsuperscript{59}

The Ottoman return to power in Syria coincided with the provincial reform programmes in Istanbul in the 1840s. The ‘men of the Tanzimat’ devised schemes of crisis management which they focused on a handful of model provinces. Based on these provincial experiments the administrative reforms were then applied to the rest of the empire’s provinces. The province of Sayda was chosen as such a model province in part because of a sense of urgency to deal with European interventionism and local unrest in adjacent Mount Lebanon. The province of Tripoli, on the other hand, was abolished altogether and incorporated into the enlarged province of Sayda.\textsuperscript{60} Although temporarily under the authority of the governor in Acre, Tripoli had been the capital of its own province (the towns and districts of Tartus, Safita, Akkar, Dinniyya, Kura, Alexandretta and at times also Jubayl).

\textsuperscript{58} Hishshi, \textit{Duruz Bayrut}. See also Mas'ud Dahir, “Namuzaj al-hijra ila Bayrut fil-qarn al-tasi‘ ashar“, \textit{Al-Tariq} 45 (1986), 77-92.

\textsuperscript{59} Muhammad 'Abd al-'Aziz 'Awad, \textit{Al-idara al-‘uthmaniyya fi Wilaya Suriyya, 1864-1914}, (Cairo, 1969), 64-65.

\textsuperscript{60} Faruq Hoblos, “Ilgha’ Wilaya Tarabulus,” conference paper given in Erlangen, July 2000.
Batrun and Bisharre) for centuries. After the redrawing of administrative boundaries in *Bilad al-Sham* following the Provincial Laws of 1864 and 1867. Tripoli never recovered its status and remained a sub-province.

The relationship between Mount Lebanon and Beirut became an issue of international concern by 1840. British consuls in Beirut were keen to see the jurisdiction of the emir of Mount Lebanon extend to the coastal cities arguing “that the influence in Syria of a Maritime Power like that of Great Britain would be much increased and fortified.”

The Maronite Shihabi factions for their part, too, pressed their French allies to support the incorporation of Beirut’s coastal plain into the jurisdiction of their Christian mountain district, although the territory belonged to the long-standing *muqata‘a* estates of the Druze Arslan notables. In contrast to Dayr al-Qamar, ‘the city of the mountain’ – *madinat al-jabal* – an almost exclusively Christian city after the native Druze were cleansed by Maronite factions, Beirut as ‘the city of the plain’ – *madinat al-sahil* – remained unchallenged by Franco-Shihabi Christianisation attempts.

With the renewed outbreak of violence in the Mountain in 1841, the Ottoman government insisted on the presence of an imperial governor in Beirut. Along with the Ottoman cities of Bursa and Adrianople, Beirut was chosen as a model city for local government reforms. The move from Acre to Beirut meant more direct rule and involvement of the imperial government in order to contain sectarian developments and the growing influence of European consuls in Mount Lebanon. While the provincial treasury remained in distant Acre, the governor’s residency in Beirut brought about extensive Ottoman construction efforts of government buildings. A provincial council manned by 16 members, consisting of imperial bureaucrats, local *`ulama* and dignitaries, convened regular sessions. They effectively checked the imperial authority of both the governor and the treasurer. “The Megilis had complete authority over every branch of law, criminal, civil and commercial” and full competence over fiscal and public works planning where “the Pasha is only one of its members, and its President his rival.... Here is a small Parliament, in which

---

63 See Introduction.
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every member attends in his place during transaction of business, with a virtue and a patriotism."

For the majority of years between 1841 and 1860, the position of the president of the urban advisory council in Beirut was held by one Abd al-Fattah Agha Hamada whose son Muhi al-Din dominated the municipality in the 1870s and 80s. Replacing his predecessor Mahmud Nami Bey,

'[t]he former Divan Effendi of this Ayalet...Feti Aga [Hamada] had filled the office under successive Pashas from the times of the Egyptians. He managed them all, and made himself necessary to each, by knowing how to pull strings of the various Marionettes of plain, city and mountain; turning knowledge into power and power into money.'

1.2. “Emasculating Damascus”? The ‘Capitalisation’ of Beirut

What has so far emerged from the urban trajectories in Bilad al-Sham confirms the arguments of those historians who emphasize the region’s incorporation into the world-economy around the end of the eighteenth century. The economic centre of gravity shifted from post-al-'Azm Damascus to the Acre of Zahir al-`Umar and Ahmad al-Jazzar. As Thomas Philipp has consistently argued, Bilad al-Sham was incorporated into the world-economy through the gates of Acre. Under Egyptian rule the commercial pivot remained in the Levant - now Beirut - while Damascus recovered its political clout from Acre. But there was nothing about this process that guaranteed Beirut’s economic primacy. And the Beirutis were critically aware of the volatile position of their city. Mahmud Nami Bey had already realised that in order to sustain Beirut’s privileged trading position, urban planning and fundamental urban restructuring towards the port was vital. After the civil war of 1860, the passionate battle of petitions between Damascenes and Beirutis was driven by the general perception that prosperity was elusive. In order to allay constant fear of economic decline, the Beirutis reasoned that their city required political weight through administrative upgrading. As a provincial capital Beirut could better sustain its prosperity.
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Before examining the trope of ever-looming decline, however, the very real urban transformation of Beirut requires attention. European residents of Beirut in mid-nineteenth century enthused about Beirut’s recent growth. Thompson, a member of the growing community of Protestant missionaries, wrote about Beirut in 1850:

Thirty years ago, the population was 5,000, and the shops and markets were dependent for supplies on Sidon. Now there are not less than 40,000 inhabitants, and Sidon is wholly dependent on Beirut. Thirty years ago, there was scarcely a decent house outside the walls; now two-thirds of the population reside in the gardens, and hundreds of convenient dwellings and not a few large and noble mansions, adorn the charming suburbs.\(^70\)

Another British long-term resident of Beirut, F. Neale, was equally impressed by the growing assertion of Beirut as a regional centre of diplomacy, commerce, industry, architecture and leisure:

Beyrouth may be said to be the capital of all Syria. It is already so in a commercial point of view… and nowhere are so many public edifices and steam factories to be met with. Beyrout is also the seat of diplomacy for here the Consul-Generals of the different European nations reside, and at Beyrout are discussed and quelled those oft-arising disputes between the Druses and the Maronites inhabiting the Lebanon. It has risen in the last 15 years. Now it contains nearly 100 European families. Stupendous new mansions, the property of opulent merchants, were daily built; beautiful summer residences of the wealthy; hotels and billiard rooms and cafés, elegantly fitted up; and splendid steam factories, for reeling silk on European machinery, were springing up in every direction.\(^71\)

Other Europeans residents of Beirut in the 1840s and 50s shared Thompson’s and Neale’s observations regarding the effect of supply chain patterns on Beirut’s regional centrality. They noticed that “grain, vegetables, and oil came to Beirut from Palestine,” how villages around the coastal town of Jaffa sent their watermelons all the way north to Beirut and that “the fishermen of Sayda supplied the town with fish.”\(^72\) Sales of merchandise were generally conducted on a credit basis of two to three months usually at a rate of 16 per cent. In an economy increasingly determined by mass export production and monetarisation under chronic instability of currencies, money lending under the ‘seraff system’ provided the vital

---

link in the supply and commodity chains between peasant production and Mediterranean trade. Under these conditions, local moneylenders grew wealthy on currency speculation and credit interest as they could and did ask for as much as 24-36 percent in interest from their debtors.

In 1848, a British consular report listed the “most respectable” merchant houses of Beirut. A host of newcomer families, mainly Christians who had migrated to Beirut from Damascus, Tripoli, Acre, Sayda and Mount Lebanon a generation earlier, had joined the seven leading Damascene merchant families mentioned in the French report of November 13, 1812. As a group with common goals and fears, they formed the nucleus of Beirut’s political economy in the latter parts of the nineteenth century. Many of these notable families were to champion the struggle for the province of Beirut and were to dominate its political economy. Some of those ‘most respectable’ notables were already influential under the Egyptians, such as the ulama-cum-merchant Barbir brothers and Ahmad al-‘Ariss, and the councillor in the Egyptian divan, ‘Umar Bayhum. Among the Christian merchant and money-lending houses were the Greek Orthodox Dabbas and Fayyad, the Fi’ani brothers, Bustrus and Nephews, Niqula Sursuq and brothers, Sursuq and Jammal, Rizqallah and Ibrahim Trad, Ni’matallah Khury, Yusuf Sayyur and Yusuf Daghir. Others were mainly Maronite merchants, the Naqqash brothers, Tubiyya and Asfar, the Farajallahs, Thabit and Co., Butrus Kabbaba, Niqula Jahil and son, Habib Dahhan, Abdallah Hanna and ‘Awda, ‘Abdallah Khury and Antun Nasrallah. The Nawfal brothers had recently arrived from Tripoli and one of them, Na’matallah, was to become head of Beirut’s customs office after 1860. Francis and Antun Misk were Roman Catholics originally from Aleppo. Francis had become an influential
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British protegé in the service of Bashir III in the powerful position of a divan efendisi who was “to the Pasha what the grand vizier was to the sultan.”

Despite the growing number of very wealthy local merchants and moneylenders, however, one frustrated chief accountant of the Beirut office of the Imperial Ottoman Bank (BIO) – the first branch to open in the Arab provinces in 1856 – discerned a distinct lack of capitalist spirit among the wealthy Beirutis:

There is a large amount of wealth accumulated in the towns; but it must be borne in mind that wealth is not capital, and although we may be, like Midas, surrounded with gold, yet if that gold be unproductive, it is valueless. The essence of wealth consists in the capacity of supplying the wants and ministering to the desires of men, and not in the capacity of being accumulated; and it is, therefore, only when wealth is made use of for the purpose of reproduction that it becomes really useful, and takes the name of capital. In Syria there is a great deal of wealth, but very little capital.

The insecurity of property, which existed for so many years under the Ottoman rule, and the total absence of any establishments in which money could be safely deposited, compelled the Syrians to invest their gains in the most valuable and, at the same time, the most portable articles [like] jewels, and it is startling, when visiting at the private houses of the native population, to see the quantity of diamonds and other precious stones worn by the females of the family.

Such common conceptions of the Oriental mode of production lacking investment spirit and consisting of hoarding mentalities have been vociferously deconstructed by recent critiques of Euro-centric studies on the formation of capitalism. Whether capitalist processes in Asia pre-dated European colonialism or not, the point here is that this lonely accountant was very much a precursor of a new dimension of an international political economy that fundamentally restructured existing economic practices and dynamics, urban planning and state-city relations - processes in which “[c]apital accumulation and the production of urbanization [went] hand in hand.” In fin de siècle Beirut these processes were driven by political and financial capitalisation. The Beirutis actively sought the former by at the Sublime Porte in Istanbul in order to facilitate the latter.
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1.2.1. The Struggle for the Creation of an Ottoman Provincial Capital and the Changing Political Geographies of Bilad al-Sham

The art of geography is of immense benefit for mankind to the extent that some people give it priority over the art of history because man is concerned with the divisions of his existence, of where he resides and what it constitutes. Therefore he requires first to look at his house [bayt - also family] then to his clan and his people. The reason why I give this speech is [my belief] that the geography of the province of Syria is more important than world geography.83

When the Sublime Porte dispatched a military expedition to Beirut to investigate the atrocities of the 1860 civil wars in Mount Lebanon and Damascus, the grand vizier Fuad Pasha successfully averted the imminent European military intervention in Mount Lebanon. He based his policies as much on the recommendations of the International Commission of Inquiry as on the body of previous Ottoman reform experiences in Bilad al-Sham. Local petitions and imperial inspection tours had combined to produce the vision of an ideally bounded and administered province. Between Lord Dufferin’s pro-imperial proposal to assimilate Mount Lebanon into the rest of Syria on account of the obvious previous failure of “native government”, and Béclard’s vision for an independent Christian mountain, Fuad Pasha’s plan to keep the two provinces of Sayda and Damascus distinct and to institute an independent supreme council of district governors (qaimaqams), proved more realistic.84

When the Règlement Organique was finally ratified in 1861, it constituted a model of shared rights and responsibilities carried by an inter-confessional Administrative Council of Mount Lebanon. As an Ottoman institutional creation the council contained the monopoly over access to political power and replaced a quasi-feudal socio-economic hierarchy with a “politico-administrative aristocracy of office”.85 Indeed, the new order in Mount Lebanon was to be adopted in other provinces and ultimately served as a blueprint for the provincial law of the entire empire in 1864.86 Through reforms in the provinces the Tanzimat created its own system of administrative and territorial references and institutionalised a centripetal...

84 Farah, Politics of Interventionism, 682, 685, 692.
process of integration that tied the Ottoman provinces and its notability ever closer to Istanbul.

The incorporation of Mount Lebanon into the orbit of direct – albeit regionally autonomous - Ottoman rule antagonised those powerful clerical and landed Maronite circles in the mountain who, since the withdrawal of the Egyptian forces, had advocated Maronite Christian rule over the entire mountain. Supported by like-minded French consular and missionary circles, they lobbied against what they considered the imposition of an Ottoman governor, notwithstanding the Règlement’s provision that he must be of Christian denomination. Maronite resistance to Dawud Pasha, the first governor of Mount Lebanon, remained strong until the unsuccessful Karam revolt of 1866 led by an aspiring young notable of the northern mountain.

In significant contrast, a veritable ‘honeymoon’ between Christian and Muslim notables and Fuad Pasha developed in Beirut. The Ottoman special envoy used lavish medal ceremonies to forge allegiance between the city’s upper echelons and the reforming Ottoman state. The notables of the city reciprocated in this highly conspicuous political grooming game. In Hadiqat al-Akhbar, Beirut’s first bi-weekly newspaper, the city’s literati outdid each other with poetic eulogies to Fuad Pasha. Jirji Mudawwar organised a sumptuous party for Dawud Pasha after his inaugural speech. The Sursuqs flew Ottoman flags from their family mansions in East Beirut and held a banquet for the special envoy from Istanbul. In emergency measures, the local authorities repaired and paved roads in the Eastern al-Qirat connecting the living quarters of Fuad Pasha and his officers with the Grand Serail across town. In honour of the Ottoman government the main throughway from al-Qirat to the city centre was renamed ‘Tariq Fuad Pasha’, and the road to the Grand Serail was renamed ‘Tariq

88 See chapter four for more details on Young Maronite politics of the Mountain.
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Sultaniyya’. The newspaper praised the reestablishment of order and stability by Fuad Pasha and passionately pressed for continued Ottoman presence.

The innovations in telecommunication and transportation that swept the Middle East at the time nurtured this process of integration. In November 1860, Beirut became the first city in Bilad al-Sham to open a telegraph station, although it was connected to Istanbul only after Aleppo’s station was completed. The first telegraphic despatch [sic] went from Beirut to Constantinople February 1, 1863. In the same year, the Beirut-Damascus Road was completed after some five years of construction. The road divided Mount Lebanon into north and south and shortened the arduous and often dangerous passage over the mountain from two days to 12 hours. Seven lines of European steamers called regularly at the port of Beirut and the trade volume began to exceed pre-war levels. In particular, the rapid extension of the local silk industry after 1860 spearheaded Beirut’s economic recovery.

The development of Beirut as a transport and communication centre also affected public throughways inside the city. Writing on Beirut’s post-war recovery, Jessup commented that “the streets of Beirut were being widened and macadamized to allow the carriages of the French Damascus Road Company to pass.”

The Beirutis had reason to be optimistic and felt they were in favour with the imperial government in Istanbul. In 1862, the sultan donated to Beirut “three hairs from the beard of the prophet Mohammed, to be placed in one of the mosques,” in recognition of the city’s position and function as one of the gates of the Ka’aba - the official port of the Ottoman pilgrimage to Mecca. Beirut was not only infrastructurally linked to Istanbul and
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Damascus, but also symbolically. The city came to be grounded in the orbit of Ottoman state power. So much so that in 1902 the governor general of Beirut, Rashid Bey, reacted brusquely to revived attempts by the then governor of Mount Lebanon, Muzaffer Pasha to incorporate coastal cities into the mountain-mutasarrifiyya. Rashid Bey reportedly quipped that “to Christianise Beirut would be to emasculate Damascus, and the Porte would never accept this eventuality.”

When the Provincial Law of November 8, 1864 was applied to Bilad al-Sham the following year, the news came as a heavy blow to the aspirations of Beirut’s notables. Beirut had been a model city of Ottoman provincial reform in the 1840s, but this privileged role now fell to Damascus from where the governor general, Shirvanizade Mehmet Rushdi Pasha (April 1863 – October 1865) implemented the imperial reforms. The official announcement of the imperial firman occurred in Damascus on May 1, 1865. It decreed that the historical provinces of Sayda and Damascus were to be merged into one new ‘super-province’ of Syria with Damascus as its capital. As a consequence of this annexation, Beirut lost its privileged status as provincial seat of government of Sayda.

Administrative offices were dismantled, staff was required to move to Damascus and the city’s new secondary administrators were left without initiative and authority. Beirut was downgraded to one of eight mutasarrifiyyas (or sub-provinces) reporting to the capital Damascus. In his reform proposal to the imperial government dated July 21, 1865, Rushdi Pasha justified his division of Bilad al-Sham at great length. He insisted with no small satisfaction that his reorganisation of local councils and tribunals reflected the region’s complex demographic composition. His proposal was based on statistics and “on a map of Syria, with recourse to those with an understanding of true information in terms of geography.”

The notables of Beirut began their campaign as soon as they learned of Rushdi Pasha’s annexation mandate. Between 1864 and 1888 scores of petitions by Muslim and Christian dignitaries were sent to the Porte begging the sultan to turn Beirut into a provincial capital. On April 24, 1865, the Greek Catholic patriarch of Syria, Gregorius, who resided in

---

105 BBA, YEE, 37/302/47/112.  
106 BBA, Meclis Vala Vesika, no. 24238, translated into Arabic in ‘Awad, al-Idara al-'Uthmaniyya, 347-351.
Beirut, sent a first petition in Arabic to the Sublime Porte in Istanbul. This petition was signed by Christian priests, teachers and merchants who effectively invited the imperial government to assume direct rule as a way to facilitate sustainable urban growth. This line of reasoning was diametrically opposed to those ideologues of the mountain who at that time were still advocating an Ottoman-free zone in Mount Lebanon.

Some 200 urban notables signed a second petition two days later calling for the establishment of an Ottoman provincial capital in Beirut. The petition first thanked the Sublime Porte for the recent construction work in Beirut, “as a reinvestment for the tax collections in Beirut.” To nip criticism from Damascus in the bud the petition went on to assure that Beirut

is not envious of Damascus or other inland cities, since commerce, the annual pilgrimage and the surrounding agriculture of Damascus had made it a successful but different city. Damascus does not need the status of a capital, as the most important factors are its hinterland and the headquarters of the imperial army. By contrast, our city has only flourished at the time it became a seat of government for the province of Sayda. Beirut’s progress is dependent on attracting more people to the city. At the moment, imperial coffers do not provide for that, [which] is a pity, after Beirut has progressed so much in the architectural domain.

However genuine the cause, both petitions from Beirut must have appeared as an act of insubordination to Istanbul. But its signatories left no doubt that they saw themselves and their city as acting in the Ottoman spirit of reform. Indeed, the text criticised the imperial government for not doing more to promote Beirut as an Ottoman city. This second petition seems to have been drafted by the leading faction of Beirut’s Sunni `ulama. But seals of denominational institutions (the Maronite and Armenian patriarchates) and Christian families attest to a supra-confessional campaign for the city of Beirut. Together, these individuals and their families were to constitute the local, formative force behind Beirut’s development in the second half of the nineteenth century and beyond. Many of them reappeared on subsequent municipal councils, worked as journalists, were prominent as patrons of public

---

107 Gregorius became bishop of Acre in 1856 and later founded the Greek Catholic Patriarchal school in Beirut. He died in Damascus in 1897. See Shakir Khury, [1908], Mujama al-masarrat, (Beirut, 1992), 363.

108 Both petitions are enclosed in BBA, Dahiliye Iradeleri 37280.

109 BBA, Dahiliye Iradeleri 37280, April 26, 1865.

110 The name of the then mufti, Shaykh Muhammad Fatahallah, was the only conspicuous absence.

111 The names on this petition, as far as they could be deciphered, are listed in the annex.
construction, or reemerge as real estate investors and concessionaires in the early twentieth century. The Damascene notables for their part, sent irate counter-petitions to Istanbul. They employed a narrative of persuasion that was based on the city’s customary privileges. The petition accused the Beirutis of destabilising the empire. Their insolent claims, the Damascenes wrote, were entirely illegitimate on the grounds of their violation of tradition and their disregard for history:

The Beirutis have submitted a petition demanding that their city be the markaz of a wilaya [arguing that] their city is a commercial place. [In doing so,] they did not take into consideration the fact that Damascus unites different worlds and pillars [commerce and other]. It is the responsibility of the city of Damascus to bring different millets to coexist and to take care of their different aspirations. Damascus is the gateway to Mecca and dealing with aspects of the pilgrimage is one of the most noble duties that cannot be regulated without the presence of a governor general. Nor did they consider that their thoughts are below the ideas of the great State [al-dawla] in demanding to change what the Sublime Porte has decreed... . We submit this petition hoping that you do not consider the demands of the Beirutis.

The difference in self-representation between the two documents is striking. The Beirutis argue in the language of reform, holding the Ottoman government accountable for its reform intentions and demanding them to be applied to their own cause. In order to avoid sounding too disrespectful of imperial authority, they phrased the text so as to play down the gravity of their demand by reminiscing about the days when Beirut had been Ottoman provincial capital of Sayda. By contrast, the Damascenes presented themselves as the time-honoured guardians of the sultan’s rule and the protectors of the religious minorities in Bilad al-Sham. Were the sultan to grant the demands of the Beirutis, he would betray his most loyal servants in Damascus while putting his lot in with an disrespectful bunch of merchant upstarts in Beirut.

Rushdi Pasha was clearly overwhelmed with the task of applying the Provincial Law in his new ‘super-province’ – a province that would have been “too vast even for Plato to administer”, to forestall Khalil Ghanim’s polemic in Parliament. The popularity of the governor general dwindled fast and when he failed to find ways to contain the 1865 cholera

\[112\] See next chapter.
\[113\] BBA, Dahiliye Iradeleri, 37280, undated, but judging from the dates on the seals, it was the same year, 1281/1865.
epidemic he was recalled to Istanbul. After a brief and equally hapless attempt by his
successor to manage the vast province, Mehmet Rashid Pasha took office in Damascus
(August 1866 – October 1871). Upon arrival in Damascus, the new governor general set
about to lay the foundations for a new administrative and infrastructural centre outside the
walled city on Marja Square. In the years to come, and particularly during Midhat Pasha’s
rule (1878-80), administrative and public buildings around the old Serail (built in 1808)
mushroomed. As capital of a super-province, Damascus became a model Tanzimat-city and
experienced a tremendous architectural and urban expansion extramuros. The countryside of
previous centuries was connected through wide boulevards to the city centre, to distant
Hawran in the south, Aleppo in the north and on the Beirut-Damascus road to the
Mediterranean coast.

The Beirutis had envisaged these urban developments for their own city. To appease
them, Rashid Pasha granted Beirut the seat of the commercial court and the residence of the
foreign relations officer of the province of Syria. Rashid Pasha also convinced his
government in Istanbul to fund a Rushdiye school in Beirut, which appears to have been in
planning near Sahat al-Burj since 1861. But these measures did little to console the
Beirutis. The news of the annexation to Damascus had come at a particularly bad time for
Beirut. After two good years of trade in 1862-3, import and export activity of the port
dropped sharply after a cholera epidemic hit the Levant in the summer of 1865, costing the
3,000 lives and causing the evacuation of 60,000 Beirutis. Trade came to a near standstill
in Syria and when it picked up again in 1867 the balance of trade was markedly negative.

114 See next section of this Chapter.
115 See Annex Three.
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Under these worrying circumstances, the Beirutis put much hope in the first general assembly of the new super-province of Syria, held in Beirut in December 1867. In the run up to the meeting of representatives from every sub-province, the Beirut newspaper *Hadiqat al-Akhbar* sent clear messages to the Ottoman government as it expressed frustration at Beirut’s administrative down-grading and linked it causally to the recent recession:

Last year Beirut was afflicted by severe financial setbacks leading to a suspension [*ta’til*] of its trade. This is clearly a consequence of the abolition of the Eyalet of Sayda, and of the transfer of the centre of the province to Damascus.¹²²

In October, Khalil al-Khuri, the editor of *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, stepped up the pressure and publicly floated the idea of power-sharing between Damascus and Beirut:

The people of Beirut are still severely affected by the economic downturn that has gripped their city and their properties. They complain that this is related to the transfer of the provincial centre from their city [to Damascus]…. We have already published their grievances that the sultanic government which is obliged to continue the cultivation [*‘umran*] of the country and the well-being of its population, does not respect the city of Beirut which is among the principal cities under the shadow of the Caliphate of his majesty the Sultan…. We derived from what we have learnt that the imperial government is envisaging to uplift the damaged city. If it has not been made a permanent centre given the importance of internal matters accorded to Damascus it is necessary that Beirut be made to share with its neighbour the centre of the province.¹²³

The idea of this article was formulated as a petition demanding a power-sharing compromise, whereby the governor general was to reside in Damascus in the summer and in Beirut in the winter.¹²⁴ When the petition arrived in Istanbul in early 1868, the government studied the proposal carefully, but in a long report on the conditions in the province rejected it on the grounds that it was impracticable.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, under the new governor general, relations between Beirutis and the provincial government improved considerably. Rashid Pasha himself appeared to have been equally efficient and popular. He was able to divert Beiruti demands for an administrative upgrading of their city onto other more feasible issues such as the establishment of the enlargement of the port and a municipal council.¹²⁶

---

¹²² *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, May 28, 1867.
¹²⁶ These are the subject matters of Chapters Two and Three respectively.
Rushdi Pasha’s previous claims to cartographic accuracy notwithstanding, provincial borders and hierarchies did not prove beyond negotiation. Personal rivalry for the grand vizierate in Istanbul between the anti-reformer Mehmet Nedim Pasha (Sept. 1871-July 1872) and the reformer Ahmet Shafiq Midhat Pasha (July 1872 - Oct. 1872) caused a period of instability in the early 1870s during which Syria was subjected to a bureaucratic game of musical chairs between Aleppo, Jerusalem, Hama and Beirut. In June 1872, Mehmet Nedim Pasha gave orders from Istanbul to sever the Palestinian districts from Syria and create a new province in Palestine. The governor-general of Syria Subhi Pasha (October 1871 – February 1873) considered this an attack on his authority and offered to resign. His resignation still pending, the newly appointed governor of Beirut, Zuhdi Pasha, arrived in August with orders from Midhat Pasha to detach Beirut from the province of Syria and establish an autonomous coastal sub-province.127

Before any new directives could be implemented, however, Midhat Pasha was replaced by a conservative grand vizier after only two months in office. Probably under European diplomatic pressure on the Porte, Jerusalem was turned into a regionally autonomous province - a mutasarifiyah similar to Mount Lebanon - directly subordinate to the Ministry of the Interior in Istanbul.128

The Ottoman decision to make Jerusalem the capital of a regionally autonomous sub-province set the stage for future campaigning. The Christian notables of Beirut sensed a new opportunity for the creation of the province of Beirut, and argued a case of precedent at the Porte. However, they were rebuffed “for such unreasonable and self-interested demands, and threatened with...punishment.”129 The Porte must have suspected that the motive of the prime movers behind the petition, Habib Bustrus and Niqua Sursuq, was personal benefit. In 1869 they were among a group of landowners from Beirut, who purchased the land of 17 villages in northern Palestine and by 1872 owned about 230,000 dönüm (57,500 ha), with a

peasant population of some 4,000. Shifting the jurisdiction of their newly acquired land would place their landowning affairs on their own doorstep.

1.2.2. The Ottoman Parliamentary Debate over the Status of Beirut and Abdülhamid II

Tips the Scales

In the 1870s, the newly established Muslim newspaper, *Thamarat al-Funun*, joined the struggle for the province of Beirut. An article in the local news section held the Ottoman government responsible for the city’s welfare, particularly with regard to recent cases of precedent in the Ottoman coastal provinces:

It is well-known that the majority of the coastal population – and Beirut at the vanguard - has sent telegrams to the Porte to request to separate it from the administration of the province of Syria. The annexation (al-indhimam) has proven to be a strain on work and it is no longer feasible. If one’s eyes are closed who will know the aspects of injustice. The coastal people are not demanding something outrageous and unprecedented, given what formations have recently occurred. Adana with its dependencies was severed from Aleppo and made an independent province. Likewise the island of Cyprus was severed from the province of Mediterranean Archipelago and made an independent *mutasarrifiyya*. In this familiar pattern, the *mutasarrifiyya* of Jerusalem was made independent.

By the late 1870s, the campaign drew larger circles and the Beirutis took their cause to the imperial capital itself. The general euphoria around the establishment of the imperial Parliament provided a new and wide window of opportunity for provincial grievances to be voiced and heard. The delegates for Beirut managed to raise their cause in three Parliament hearings on December 31, 1877, and January 17-18, 1878. A series of heated debates pitted the Beirutis Niqula Naqqash, Khalil Ghanim, ‘Abd al-Rahim Badran and the forceful

---

132 *Thamarat al-Funun*, February 21, 1878.
reformer Yusuf Ziya al-Khalidi\textsuperscript{133} from Jerusalem against the Damascene and Aleppine delegates.\textsuperscript{134}

The Beirutis and al-Khalidi presented a memorandum to the Lower House of Parliament and argued for a separate province of Beirut on two grounds. First, not only would a coastal province be nothing more than a return to the previous state of two provinces, but subsuming the districts from Acre to Tripoli under Beirut would also contain the same geography as ancient Phoenicia and could therefore be called the province of Phoenicia - “Finikye vilayeti namylie”.\textsuperscript{135} Second, against the Damascenes’ charge that an administrative change in favour of Beirut would result in “a misallocation of resources for the central government”\textsuperscript{136}, they argued that “the dissolution of the current province will yield results that would be beneficial to the imperial treasury [as] the wages of the governor general will be covered by extra income.”\textsuperscript{137} With Beirut’s estimated “annual budget of around 240,000 piastres … the division of Syria will raise no complaints or extra costs.” The memorandum concluded by “proposing to inaugurate the new province around Beirut at the beginning of the next fiscal year [in March 1878].”\textsuperscript{138}

In constant contact with proceedings at Parliament, the journalists in Beirut stepped up their pressure. In the January session a telegraphed petition with some twenty signatures from Beirut was read out that reminded the House of the inconvenience of distance between the two cities. The first to respond, Tawfiq Efendi from Damascus retorted that “the journey from Beirut to Damascus only takes about ten hours. That is not a big deal!”\textsuperscript{139} One Sa’idi Efendi from Aleppo wondered whether the then governor of Beirut, Ra’uf Efendi, might be behind the latest Beiruti request seeking personal promotion. And one Alish Pasha from the

\textsuperscript{133} Yusuf Ziya born into a distinguished Jerusalem family in 1842. He was educated at Robert College in Istanbul and studied medicine in Istanbul. He returned to Jerusalem at 24 and served as energetic municipal president for nine years. He was a leading provincial reformer. See Alexander Schölch, “Ein Palästinensischer Vertreter der Tanzimat-Periode: Yusuf Diya al-Khalidi,” \textit{Der Islam} 57 (1980), 311-21.


\textsuperscript{135} Us, \textit{Meclis-i Mebusan}, 132. In the 1890s, the Ottoman discovered a Phoenician loggia in Beirut. Was Ghanem a member? BBA, \textit{YHUS}, 265/96, March 17, 1892/1310 and \textit{YHUS}, 265/177, March 26, 1892/1310.


\textsuperscript{137} Us, \textit{Meclis-i Mebusan}, 132.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid.
Danube province defended the status quo because “at this time we have so many marshals and governors general. We do not have enough sub-provinces [mutasarriflik].”

Incensed by these evasions, Khalil Ghanim took to the floor: “The people there [in Beirut] wrote for the sake of their own welfare. They do not necessarily want Ra´uf Efendi as a governor general. If the Porte wishes, it can send another official.” He defended Naqqash’s previous memorandum and suggested that more “research into the matter was needed.” He argued passionately that

the Beirutis want to be separated from Damascus. Beirut is a commercial place. Moreover, between Beirut and Damascus lies the special province of Mount Lebanon. They are cut off from each other. I also wish general welfare to Damascus, but Beirut and Damascus are different, they are not connected. Tripoli is similar to Beirut, like Hawran is similar to Damascus. Hawran is an arena for cotton production. Tripoli and Beirut are arenas of trade. One province is too vast. There are immense problems in the sub-province of Hawran. That is where, as Badran Efendi informed you yesterday, the Druze Mountain is located and the situation is fragile. And there is another mountain range near Tripoli, that of the Nusaris [Alawis]. In short, even Plato could not have governed there. So how can the existing administration be made equitable? Naqqash Efendi presented us with a memorandum. Now we need to form a committee to investigate. The inspectors will inform us by telegramme on the basis of which a general reorganisation may be proposed to the House.

After the president of the House heard the arguments of both sides, he decided to heed Ghanim’s proposal for a Parliamentary commission of inquiry. However, back in Beirut the composition and work of the commission attracted sharp criticism from the press in Beirut which complained about parliamentary intransigence and lack of sympathy regarding their entirely legitimate cause:

We held great hopes when the Syrian delegates [discussed the issue] in parliament and we waited patiently until we read in a newspaper from Istanbul what happened in the council. But we wonder with curiosity why the Syrian delegates agreed to charging Sa´idi Efendi, the delegate for Mar´ash [in the province of Aleppo] who does not have insight into the concerns of the coastal people, with the leadership [of the parliamentary inquiry]. Or for that matter ‘Alish Pasha, the delegate for Tuna who has no interest in the conditions of the Arab lands, and he speaks from outside the issue. Both interpreted our demands with misunderstanding and changed what we wanted without knowledge of our situation and the urgency of our needs. For overcoming this separation is akin to the needs of the thirsty for water and is intended for the benefit of the state and the people.

139 Ibid., 252.
140 Ibid
141 Ibid., 253. Khalil Ghanem was a Maronite lawyer from Beirut who became a leading Arab Young Turk in the 1890s. He died in Paris in 1902. See BIO archive.
Imagine the increase in revenue which would only multiply in the future! It is misunderstood to be saying that this demand is the opinion of Ra‘uf Efendi, our current mutasarrif because he is sincere and these people do not provide evidence for their claims ... The demand [of a separation from Damascus] comes not only from Beirut but also from Acre and Haifa. Clearly it is not only some misled people of Beirut who desire it [a province] but rather people of education and lovers of the fatherland. The knowledge that we have, especially after the abolition of oppression and the free expression of thought, obliges us that we demand the best for the welfare, success and progress of our country.  

Istanbul judged that the time was still not ripe for a promotion of Beirut. The success of Syria’s governor general in 1878, the ‘exiled’ former grand vizier Ahmet Midhat Pasha, caused more discomfort than pride in Istanbul. In the Porte’s eyes, the hesitation of the Parliamentary inquiry to give Beirut the status of provincial capital was vindicated when a few months later anti-government posters in Beirut and Sayda alleged wide-spread anti Ottoman sentiments in the province of Syria. The conservative camp in the Porte around Mehmet Nedim and Küçük Sa‘id Pasha registered with concern the fading deference towards Ottoman rule in Syria while the popularity of Midhat Pasha among the population of Beirut appeared to be rising. In Istanbul, Beirut was still considered the gate for European influence in the Arab provinces. Cultural and educational societies in Beirut and Sayda, the Jam‘iyyat al-Maqasid al-Khayriyya of 1878, whose formation had been encouraged by Midhat Pasha, were quickly dissolved and incorporated into the provincial educational board under his successor in Damascus.

But the times were changing and the tide turned in Beirut's favour after the Ottoman Empire lost its Balkan and Egyptian territories to European powers. The Palace felt, with some sense of urgency, the need to achieve more comprehensive control over the remaining Arab provinces. In 1883, Abdüllahid dispatched an imperial commission to Damascus, which was to assess French activities in the region. As a result, the commission returned with

---
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the recommendation that the province of Syria be divided into two provinces - a coastal province, with Beirut as the capital, and an interior province centred around Damascus. Such pro-active proposals remained in government drawers until 1885. Matters seemed to turn increasingly in Beirut’s favour when Kamil Pasha, a former provincial official in Damascus, Beirut and Jerusalem, assumed the grand vizierate. Like Midhat Pasha before him, Kamil Pasha had gained first-hand experience in the provinces and it is possible that the very appointment of this stranger to Palace politics was due to Abdulhamid’s Syrian entourage. During Kamil Pasha’s term of office, Syria appeared to receive more attention than under his predecessors in Istanbul. He held close relationships with Arab circles in Istanbul around Joseph Mutran and Ahmed Izzet Bey who at the time were employed in the commercial department of the Ottoman government.

As the long-serving British consul in Beirut, Jackson Eldridge, commented, Kamil Pasha’s appointment “has had an excellent effect in Syria where [Kamil Pasha] is well known, highly respected and esteemed by all classes.” Although neither his memoirs nor a biography give any indication of his role in the creation of the province of Beirut, it appears to have been the perception of at least one newspaper in Beirut that Kamil Pasha could have been the person to tip the scales:

In a letter from Istanbul somebody says the most important thing for every Beiruti, nay, everyone in the new province is to thank the Sultan’s wise concern and the Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha who has not forgotten his time in Beirut.

Indeed, when two years into Kamil Pasha’s term of office, the palace received a memorandum by an Ottoman resident in Beirut, which reiterated the necessity for an administrative upgrading of Beirut, the Sultan ordered Kamil Pasha and the Council of Ministers to devise a plan for a provincial reorganisation of Syria. The ministerial discussions in Istanbul that ultimately led to the imperial decree for the creation of the new

144 Gross, Ottoman Rule, 362-3.
145 See Chapter 4.
146 *Lisan al-Hal*, February 27, 1890.
147 Quoted in Gross, Ottoman Rule, 375.
province, leaked out to the Syrian press and consular staff in December 1887. The news generated hectic mobilisation of lobby groups in Beirut and Damascus akin to that of 1865, the year of the first petition. Initial jubilation in Beirut was promptly nipped in the bud by reports that the Council of Ministers had rescinded the separation plan. Lisan al-Hal warned its readers that “the province of Beirut is no longer a subject of discussion” in Istanbul. In these tense days, one Salim Ayyub Thabit, pleaded in the same newspaper “not to delay the creation of the province of Beirut.”

Sultan Abdülhamid II was hesitant and halted all further developments. He appeared to be torn between continuing a policy of procedural blockading vis à vis European agents in a weak sub-province of Beirut, and a policy of imposing Ottoman regulations on the European powers under a strong and more experienced governor general based in Beirut. The impracticality for foreign consuls in Beirut of dealing with the Ottoman authorities in distant Damascus, whether Ottoman junior bureaucrats in Beirut or junior diplomatic officials in Damascus, had been an obstacle for European diplomacy. On the other hand, efficient administration in Beirut could provide a buffer zone against European influence into the heartland of Ottoman Syria and could control and reduce political brinkmanship. Finally, sometime in February 1888, the sultan irrevocably backed the creation of the province of Beirut.

Under these conditions of administrative limbo, unrest occurred in the outlying areas of Beirut. South of Beirut, “in a quarter called Mazra’at al-Arab, Arabs have raised their arms against police officers”, and violent clashes between Greek Orthodox and Muslim residents escalated after heavy handed police retaliation. A month later a Muslim attacker killed two Greek Orthodox near a church. The European consuls were convinced that it had to do with the Ottoman government’s decision to separate the provinces of Damascus and Beirut. The governor general of Syria for his part complained to the Porte against “misled”,
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154 Mr. Eyres, the British consul in Beirut, complained about arduous travels across the Lebanese mountains in a number of correspondences to the British ambassador to Istanbul. See, for example PRO, FO/195/1613, March 14, 1888.
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influential Beiruti circles at the Palace. To Rashid Nashid Pasha (1885-8) the imperial decision to reduce his authority without consulting him was the swan song of his five years of troubled administration. He addressed the Beirutis in Thamarat al-Fumm criticising them for lack of respect for the benevolence of the sultan. Nashid Pasha repeated the old arguments that a new coastal province would play into the hands of foreign powers and would lead to a drop in revenues by half. But his was a lost battle by early 1888. Instead of heeding his advice, the Porte recalled him from office even before Beirut was officially separated from Damascus. He died of a heart attack the day he received notice of his dismissal. Apart from a brief spell of rumours in 1895, purporting that Beirut was going to be reannexed to Damascus and Jerusalem was to be elevated instead to a full province that comprised Beirut’s southern sub-provinces, Beirut was once and for all severed administratively from Damascus.

The Imperial decree for the creation of the province of Beirut was finally proclaimed from the Grand Serail, the Ottoman headquarters in Beirut, upon the arrival of the first governor General, 'Ali Rida Pasha, on March 7, 1888. The event drew a large crowd of people, which included local administrative, military, clerical dignitaries, Nassuhi Bey, the incumbent governor of Beirut and Wasa Pasha, the governor of Mount Lebanon. Accompanied by marching music by the Ottoman military orchestra, the imperial decree was read out first in Turkish by 'Ali Pasha’s secretary, and then in Arabic, by 'Abd al-Qadir al-Dana, the president of the Commercial Court.

When the Beirutis finally got their way, the implementation of a Beirut province surprised both the French and British consuls in Beirut who suspected the other’s governments of secretive machinations and speculated what gains the other side could expect to achieve from the new situation. But the making of the province of Beirut was an entirely desirable that this question should be settled and that a Vali should be appointed to Beirut. More especially as the Mutasarrif Nassuhi Bey has displayed a most lamentable weakness” and considers himself not responsible in this case for the restoration of public order.

<table>
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Ottoman decision pushed for by the burgeoning commercial bourgeoisie of Beirut. For them, access to central authorities was essential to cultivate the friendship and goodwill of the Ottoman governor and the senior officials.

'Ali Rida Pasha’s arrival in Beirut was met with city-wide celebrations. Beirut had finally obtained its governor general, and further, this governor general was the also the preferred candidate of the Beirutis. For a week the notables of Beirut sent the Vali welcome messages, and he replied by visiting the notables and the foreign consuls. On 'Ali Pasha’s assumption of office, a Beiruti journalist expressed in Lisan al-Hal, what the population expected from the new governor general: “The people trust him; that is to say, that he will spot those bureaucrats who are corrupt and who corrupt their tenure secretly or publicly”.

The explicit admonition of corruption was as much a protest against previous practices as a condition for local cooperation:

“His highness ['Ali Pasha] may spread justice and security among the Beirutis, improve education, facilitate trade, revive agriculture, and initiate public work projects and in return it is upon us, the people, to support the Ottoman state [Dawlatuhu].”

1.3. Consolidation and Contestation of the Province of Beirut

The Ottoman decision in favour of Beirut extended the city’s political power far beyond the confines of geographical, confessional or familial ties with Mount Lebanon. As such, the creation of the province of Beirut was by no means just an administrative adjustment by the Ottomans. From 1888 onwards, merchants and politicians of the coastal towns had to come to make their representations in Beirut in order to press their cases. Governors general initiated urban development projects. As we shall see, the fields of public instruction and construction were particular objects of imperial concern. On the fiscal level, most of the annual provincial revenues first went to the treasury in Beirut before being redistributed. The creation of the province consolidated Beirut's economic position via the political functions performed by a provincial capital. In Beirut, the administrative channels of the entire province converged. Here the developments of other cities were determined, and their planning controlled. But as Beirut began to shape its administrative periphery, its

---

164 Lisan al-Hal, March 8, 1888.
165 Ibid., March 12, 1888.
privileged position was also frequently challenged by neighbouring provincial authorities and inside the new dependencies.
1.3.1. A Provincial Capital Shapes its Administrative Periphery

As a provincial capital, Beirut ruled over a geographical oddity that today spans four countries in the Middle East. The sub-provinces that fell under Beirut’s jurisdiction - Tripoli and Lattakia in the north and Acre, Haifa and Nablus in the south – were severed from their capital by the coastal strips of Mount Lebanon.166 In total, capital Beirut stretched over a surface area of 30,500 km² containing a population of 533,000 in 1895.167 In comparison, the coastal province had half the population in one third of the territory of the province of Damascus.

In Beirut’s own sub-province, the governor general ruled directly over a total of 323 villages in the districts (or qadas) of Sayda, Tyre and Marj ‘Ayun. In the northern and southern sub-provinces, he delegated his authority to representatives, mutasarrifs or governors. The governor of Acre administered the districts of Haifa, Tabariyya, Safad and Nazareth and a total of 222 villages. The sub-province of the Balqa was governed from Nablus. It included the districts of Janin, Tulkarm and Salfit and 212 villages. In the north, the sub-province of Tripoli incorporated 567 villages in the districts of Tripoli, Safita, Akkar and Husn al-Akrad. Finally, in the far north, Lattakia was probably the most surprising inclusion into the new province. The sub-province of Lattakia had the most densely populated hinterland of 150,000 inhabitants in some 1,250 villages. In terms of the political economy of the region, the imperial decision to make Lattakia a dependency of Beirut deprived Damascus not only of the vast areas of tobacco cultivation, but also of any Mediterranean outlet in its reduced province.

For many people the boundaries with Mount Lebanon were arbitrary and artificial. The first governors general of Beirut realised that it was one thing to have boundaries drawn but another to have them accepted and acted upon by the population. Considerable groundwork was required for the general population to get used to the new administrative boundaries and recognise new locations of registration and sources of tax authority. To this

166 This caused recurring problems for the governor general who on numerous occasions was forced to visit Beirut’s dependencies by boat. Likewise, every time the authorities in Beirut tried to build roads connecting its disparate towns across the coast plains of the province of Mount Lebanon they encountered vetoes from its administration. See for example, M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondence avec les Echelles, 1888-9, Beirut, March 12, 1889.

167 Vital Cuinet, “Syrie, Liban et Palestine: Géographie Administrative, Statistique, Descriptive et Raisonnée”, Turquie d’Asie, Vol. 5, (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1896), 3-4. The province of Beirut was thus three times the size of Mount Lebanon and compares to a less densely populated surface area of 100,000 km²
effect, 'Ali Rida Pasha commissioned the Beirut geographer Fadlallah Abi Halqa to draw a map of the new province of Beirut that measured an impressive 2.30m by 1.30m to be distributed to government offices and school buildings.\textsuperscript{168} Provincial boundaries drawn from cartographical representations did matter on the ground in terms of revenue flow, administrative competence and tax collection. As such they were jealously guarded by the respective authorities even though the ‘truth of the map’ sometimes brought consternation to the people living with the new divisions.

Even the inspecting governor general Isma'il Kemal (1891-92) noticed upon familiarising himself with the geography of his new province the peculiar relations between capital and countryside: “There are houses in the town, the gardens of which are outside the territories of the Wilaya.”\textsuperscript{169} Likewise, the particular location of a tiny village on the border between the Sayda district and Mount Lebanon almost caused a major diplomatic incident. Investigations into property dispute between a local Protestant mission and residents were undertaken by local lawyer Bishara Nammur but frustrated by the village’s overlapping jurisdiction. A British consular inquiry into the status of Maghusheh revealed that the village was under the administration of Beirut and Mount Lebanon “in equal halves”. However, while authorities in Mount Lebanon taxed each inhabitant half the dues, the Beirut authorities charged the full dues to a list of half the population. As a result total confusion ruled in which opportunistic Protestant property holders tried to avoid double taxation by ‘migrating’ between the legal authorities of the two provinces when convenient.\textsuperscript{170}

The Ottoman government’s drive at recording, registering and regulating all activities in the empire, such as population surveys, tax registries and property inspections, was carried out by the imperial authorities and provincial capital officials alike. In most cases, contact with the imperial authorities in Istanbul went through Beirut and in times of exposure to imperial and regional authorities, it helped to have a patron or at least a professional lawyer

---

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{Lisan al-Hal}, March 15, 1888. It became the basis of his geography textbook for secondary education published in Beirut in 1890. Abu Halqa, Fadlallah, \textit{Muhtasir fi-l-jighrafiyya}, (Beirut: Matba'a Jaridat Bayrut, 1890). In it the pupils were taught that the new province consisted of three parts, with a detailed breakdown of the districts in each sub-province. For a more systematic treatment of maps in Ottoman state schools, see Fortna, Benjamin, \textit{Education for the Empire: Ottoman State Secondary Schools During the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876-1909)}, (Chicago: Ph.D. Thesis, 1997), 156-196.


\textsuperscript{170} PRO, 206/229, “Report on the Protestants in Mount Lebanon, 1903”, by Reverend Hoskins.
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in the provincial capital. The new geo-political provincial reality was challenged on numerous occasions, particularly from the authorities in Mount Lebanon. In the first of a series of challenges from Mount Lebanon, the governor Dawud Pasha campaigned for the incorporation of the coastal towns into Mount Lebanon soon after he took charge.171 While the Maronite clergy and the mountain as a whole remained silent on the issue of the incorporation of the coastline, after the creation of the province of Beirut, bickering over jurisdiction caused increasing tensions between the city and the mountain. In early 1892, the aging governor general, 'Aziz Pasha, was dismissed over “inappropriate interference” in the jurisdiction of Wasa Pasha, the governor of Mount Lebanon.172 At the end of the 1890s, the governor general of Beirut and the governor of Mount Lebanon accused each other of trespassing on each other’s territorial authority and by 1903 both were removed from office.

Absorption into Beirut’s politico-administrative ambit also had profound repercussions on the city of Nablus. The Balqa region had been the most hotly contested sub-province and the last line of defence during Nashid Pasha’s struggle against the creation of the province of Beirut. Even after the new governor general arrived in Beirut, Nashid Pasha still insisted on keeping Nablus for Damascus. Beirut merchants on the other hand benefitted from this territorial acquisition. It enabled them to enter a locally controlled commodity chain which the Ottoman government had long wanted to break up by auctioning the right to collect tax-in-kind to external merchants.173 From 1888 onwards, Nabulsis had to travel to Beirut instead of Damascus to plead their cases in court. But in the new provincial capital, family connections with court officials tended to favour their merchant rivals. The Beirut courts acquired such an anti-Nablus reputation that many of Nabulsis refused to even show up.174 In an attempt to put an end this structural disadvantage, in 1906 Nabulsi notables sent an appeal to Istanbul demanding the secession from Beirut and the attachment of the Balqa and the district of Nazareth to the autonomous sub-province of Jerusalem.175 Significantly, this request came in the wake of the seventh Zionist Congress which had voted for Palestine as Jewish homeland and in whose wake several Beirut based land owners – most notably

172 BBA, YHUS, 253/14, April 2, 1892/1309.
173 Doumani, Rediscovering Palestine, 114.
174 Ibid., 176.
175 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondance Avec les Échelles, 1912, Beirut, May 31, 1906. The appeal was turned down by the Ottoman government.
Elias Sursuq – obtained the governor-general’s permission to sell their vast land-holdings in the Balqa region to the Zionist Fund.

The concurrence of regional challenges to Beirut’s economic position and nationalist and decentralist movements in the Arab provinces after the Young Turk Revolution also gave rise to questioning anew the provincial boundaries in Bilad al-Sham. Advocates for a territorial merger between Beirut and Mount Lebanon grew more vociferous. At a time when international markets grew more competitive, some Damascene and Beiruti merchants also joined forces in infrastructural projects so as to increase local industrial output in tobacco, grain, cotton, silk and other export-oriented goods. In both cases the fear of economic decline laid to rest previous rivalries and jealousies. 176

Nevertheless, such considerations of joining forces in the face of international economic challenges did not sweep aside the administrative geography as point of reference for local reform plans. At the end of the General Assembly of the province of Beirut in January 1913, the Beirut Reform Committee issued a famous decentralist manifesto that called for a constitutional, parliamentarian Ottoman government and more local decision-making power. 177 But significantly it retained the idea and the physical shape of the province of Beirut. 178 Clearly by the time Arab nationalist ideologies took root in Syria, urban, particularly emigré intellectuals acknowledged distinct characteristic differences between the people of the mountain and the city, but declared that “the Lebanese and the sons of the vilayet had become one with heart and soul.” 179 This statement seems to imply that Ottoman administrative units took effect on the mentalities of their inhabitants. But before 1914, there was nothing to suggest that merging mountain and city as was increasingly suggested by Christian and Muslim notables 180, was the only viable arrangement. For this idea to be implemented physically, the Ottoman Empire first had to be defeated in the Great War.

177 For a list of the members of this committee, see the Annex.
178 For the text, see Le Reveil, 31/1/1913. For a more detailed study on the Beirut Reform Movement of 1912-3, see Fawaz Sa‘adun, Al-haraka al-islahiyiyat fi Bayrut fi awakhir al-‘asr al-‘ummani, (Beirut, 1994).
180 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondence avec les Echelles, 1912.
1.3.2. The New Provincial Institutions: the Governor General and the Administrative Council

One of the immediate effects of the creation of a provincial capital on the city of Beirut was the mushrooming of administrative services and the expansion of the imperial bureaucracy staffed by salaried officials. At the turn of the century, the city accommodated the local and imperial bureaucrats not only of the provincial capital of Beirut, but also many from the Mutasarrifiyya of Mount Lebanon. “Officials came down to Beirut or went up to the summer resorts in Alay or Makin for [social] gatherings.”181 A rough estimate based on the Ottoman yearbook of the province of Beirut for 1310 (1892/3) lists some 200 appointed imperial positions, 25 police officers and over 200 gendarmes at work in Beirut alone. Moreover, elected members on local and provincial councils of the departments of health, education, justice, gendarmerie, awqaf, sicill-i ahval and public works put the number of officials in the service of the Ottoman state in Beirut at around 400.182 These Ottoman bureaucrats had in common specific career patterns, daily routines through fixed or flexible office hours, and a distinct self-interested identification with the Ottoman state.183

Other people worked – these bureaucrats had a career. As individuals with ample time and relative wealth and standing, this significant professional class of urban society had a tangible impact on daily life and sociability in Beirut. In his memoirs, Bishara al-Khuri remembered the omnipresence of the Ottoman bureaucrat in Beirut’s public life: “when I was born into this world [in 1890] I opened my eyes onto a sea of bureaucrats.” These bureaucrats formed a conspicuous social group in Beirut distinguishable by their Ottoman civil service uniform. Dressed and addressed as Efendis, their corporate attire – black tailcoat and skin-tight, taylor-made trousers, white dress shirt, stand-up collars, bow tie and the obligatory ruby-red fez matched with a well-kempt beard or trimmed moustache – produced an angular facial- and regular bodily appearance that radiated distinctly modern state

182 Salname-i Vilayet Bayrut, 1310 (1892/3). Compared to Beirut’s administrative positions registered in the 1884/5 Yearbook on the province of Syria, this meant a 400% increase.
authority. As such the bureaucrats' uniforms were at marked variance from the ostentatious fashions of the day, described here by a British resident at the mid-nineteenth century:

As the inhabitants grew more wealthy, greater attention began to be paid to dress and fashion. The Europeans set the example, and Turks, Greeks, and Armenians followed it. Not that these latter gave up their Oriental costume, but this, in lieu of being some ordinary material, was now made of rich silk and satins. The Europeans promenaded in the latest Parisian fashions, and the natives in the richest Oriental robes.185

Growing prosperity and security made Beirut a time and a place for conspicuous consumption in which the body became one of the markers of what Bourdieu called “cultural nobility”186 while the local textile fashion developed a field of social refinement.187 Significantly the representation of the self in the proceeding quote was not so much an imitation of western tastes but a reinterpretation and elaboration of existing patterns.

In conscious contrast to a kaleidoscopic proliferation of fashions, individuals in the civil service only distinguished themselves through an elaborate stratification of Ottoman ranks and medals conspicuously attached to the uniforms on chest and shoulders. As markers of authority, state insignia were worn at official commemorations and ceremonies, processions and music festivals where they denoted status, integrity and achievement. Particularly under Abdüllahmid, occasions such as the arrival of a new governor general or the anniversary of the sultan’s birthday or coronation were important social events. Bureaucrats “would spend the night before as excited as children, cleaning and ironing their ceremonial clothes and polishing their medals with oil.”188 Local merchants and young professionals were attracted to these fine distinctions, much like a cynical Gramsci noticed of imperial Italy: “Lawyers, professors and functionaries joined in with enthusiasm aroused by every new possibility of fishing for titles and medals.”189 To the Ottoman state, however, its officials posed as the embodiment of imperial order in the province.

### Ottoman Governors General of the Province of Beirut, 1888-1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>office held</th>
<th>previous positions</th>
<th>next position(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Raʿuf</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>1889 (5months)</td>
<td>gov., Beirut (77-9), gov. Jerusalem (79-89), client of Midhat</td>
<td>gov. gen., Bitlis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ahmad ʿAziz</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>8/1889-12/91</td>
<td>Bosnian origin, client of Hajji ʿAli Bey at the palace, favorite of sultan, gov. in Yemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ismaʿil Kamal</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>1/1891-8/92</td>
<td>gov. gen. in Gallipoli</td>
<td>1. president of Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nassuhi</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1894-12/96</td>
<td>gov. in Beirut, 1883-7, gov. gen. in Adana</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hassan Rafiq</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>interim</td>
<td>gov. gen and mushir in Damascus, Young Turk investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hussayn Nazim</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>1897 (3 months)</td>
<td>Istanbul municipality, police chief, client of Izzet Pasha</td>
<td>Governor general in Damscus, Izmir, Edirne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rashid</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>7/1897-1903</td>
<td>from Shurayi Devlet, at Ministry of Interior, client of Izzet, Tahsin</td>
<td>Governor general in Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ibrahim Khalil</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>1903-7/08</td>
<td>from Argyrocastro in Albania, gov. gen, Hudavendigar (Van?), Sivas, client of Izzet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nazim</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>9/1908</td>
<td>gov. gen. in Salonika, Adrianople, Baghdad, educated at St. Cyr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shukri</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>interim</td>
<td>gov. gen in Damascus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mehmet ʿAli</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1908 (14 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor in Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ʿAli Ekrem, ibn Namik Kamal</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1908 (13 days)</td>
<td>gov. in Jerusalem (06-08)</td>
<td>Archipelago, Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Farid</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>1908 (14 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Edhem</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>12/1908-9/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hussayn Nazim</td>
<td>Pasha</td>
<td>interim</td>
<td>gov. gen. in Damascus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A.R. Nur al-Din</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1910-11</td>
<td>Councillor of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Hazim</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>12/1911-9/12</td>
<td>Unionist, Anti-BRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sami Bakr</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>10/1913-10/15</td>
<td>gov. gen. in Trabzon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ʿAzmi</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1915-17</td>
<td>gov. in Tripoli, 11-13 Jerusalem (10-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ismail Hakki</td>
<td>Bey</td>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>simultan, gov. MtL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.2.1. The Governor General or Vali

Governors general held both the most powerful and arguably the most volatile position in the provinces. The Provincial Law of 1864 vested them with paramount authority over imperial staff and local councillors in their provinces. Inside the imperial government, they reported directly to the Minister of Interior, but often the sultan, his Arab advisors and grand viziers interfered. From 1888 to the Young Turk revolution of 1908, Beirut had ten governors general. Under Abdülhamid’s rule, and particularly after the initial settling-in problems of the first three governors general, Beirut enjoyed a relatively stable provincial government with an average term of three years between 1892 and 1908.

The first three governors general of Beirut were experienced, elderly administrators of cosmopolitan background whose main task was to pacify the rural population and achieve more efficient provincial taxation. ‘Ali Rida Pasha had been Ottoman ambassador to Paris, governor general in Izmir and previously a successful governor of Beirut in the late 1860s. His successor, Ra’uf Pasha, although less revered than ‘Ali Pasha, also had strong credentials as one of Midhat Pasha’s law-and-order reformers and as “governor of Beirut during the difficult times of the Russian War” before he assumed a long governorship in Jerusalem. In Beirut, however, he found himself the victim of tensions between the sultan and Kamil Pasha after only five months in office. When the third governor general of the rank of Pasha arrived in Beirut, ‘Aziz Pasha’s reputation also preceded him. The British consul remarked that “he has already won golden opinions from the population by his courtesy and genial manners. He appeared to be of great ability and intellect.” ‘Aziz Pasha had been the original candidate for the post but rivalry between Porte and Palace in 1888 stalled his appointment.

In 1890, The British General Consul, informed his ambassador in Istanbul of “much improved government in Beirut” under ‘Aziz Pasha. He was considered as practically

---

191 Compared to Nazim Pasha’s extended provincial government in Damascus at the time, Beirut lacked one dominating governor general.
194 BBA, YHUS, 224/47, August 15, 1889/1306 and 223/6, July 1, 1889/1306.
195 PRO, FO, 195/1648, Beirut, July 30, 1889.
196 His influence at the palace rested on his intimate relation with Hajj Ali Bey, first Secretary of the sultan.
197 PRO, FO, 195/1683, Beirut, May 20, 1890.
minded and "ambitious to execute justice without fear or favour." Mastery over consular circles in Beirut allowed him a free hand in the "unruly" Nablus region where Protestant missions tended to regard with suspicion any Ottoman involvement from Beirut. On the contrary, 'Aziz Pasha was praised for his *tour de force* through the Balqa as he not only "made it possible to track down a mob of bedouins that had robbed an English traveller of all his possessions" but 'Aziz Pasha also "effected the dismissal of the [responsible] Qaimaqam of Tiberias."198

The memoirs of the fourth governor general, Isma'il Kemal Bey, offer a rare and vivid account of the career path of an imperial bureaucrat in general and his perspective on office in Beirut in particular. They depict the life of the first president of independent Albania, who spent almost fifty years in the Ottoman civil service.199 He was considerably younger than his predecessors. In his early career he was influenced by Midhat Pasha, whom he served in junior assignments in the Danube and Damascus in 1878. In 1890, dissatisfied with the Ottoman civil service he retired and pursued businesses as an industrialist and concessionaire. When defamers in the Ottoman government charged him with profiteering, the Sultan used his secret service to clear his name. Abdülhamid soon urged him to return to his service and offered him various governorates. But only after considerable pressure from the Ministry of Interior and a promotion to the rank of a *Bala*, did he agree to be posted to the province of Gallipoli.200 But two months into his appointment, he was suddenly posted to the governship of Beirut at the Sultan's behest, again quite reluctantly.

Upon arrival in mid-winter 1892, however, he overcame his initial unwillingness. In his memoirs, he remarks how deeply impressed he was with "the importance and the beauty of his new assignment".201 He declared Beirut "a source of opulence and an arena of learning." He promised to "speed up the progress of civilisation and to proliferate the enlightened knowledge of this epoch."202 Moreover, Isma'il Kemal Bey confessed to his editor that he was positively astonished to meet so many familiar faces in Beirut and Mount Lebanon. His old friend Wasa Pasha, was an "Albanian compatriot", at whose deathbed he

---

198 PRO, *FO*, 195/1683, Beirut, April 24, 1890.
200 In the Ottoman bureaucratic ranking system, a *Bala* was between Bey and Pasha. See S. Kekule, *Über Titel, Amter, Rangstufen und Anreden in der offiziellen osmanischen Sprache*, (Halle: Kaemmerer, 1892).
sat some months into his office. The presence of so many administrators from his time in Damascus gave him a sense of continuity that he considered unusual for the Ottoman provincial administration. But when he was called to Damascus to replace temporarily the seriously ill governor general, he was appalled at the general disorder in the city, where the very government buildings, military barracks and schools that Midhat Pasha had inaugurated were run down and in a state of neglect. In his memoirs, Ismail Kemal Bey blamed the separation of the two Syrian provinces for this decay. In his eyes the separation deprived Damascus of the sea and Beirut of the hinterland. This resulted in the “paralysing of all works of economic development, which required unity of direction and administration.”

In comparison to Damascus, Beirut’s urban development was catching up, not least through his own planning initiatives. Isma’il Kemal was the first governor general since the creation of the province of Beirut to have systematically impacted on the transformation of the provincial capital’s urban fabric. He encouraged the development of the port and planned for the construction of two new streets, to better connect the port and the city centre. He also introduced reimbursement schemes for property owners affected by street piercing through the old city. At the same time, he appealed to the urban notables to “interest themselves in the affairs of the country, of which they were the leading inhabitants.”

However, his tenure proved too short to see his ambitious urban restructuring projects materialise. When, after only seven months in office, the sultan assigned him to compose a report on the state of the empire, local notables and foreign consuls alike praised his leadership. The municipality of Beirut regretted his departure. His memoirs proudly registered that “the town of Beyrouth presented me with a souvenir album of photographic views of the place and its monuments bound in massive gold with an emerald in the centre.” The nature of the gift and its value were expressions of the acute awareness of the municipality of their city as an artifact and their gratitude for the governor general who contributed in ‘sculpting’ it.

203 Kemal, Memoirs, 192.
204 Ibid., 193.
205 Ibid., 201.
206 Ibid., 202.
207 PRO, FO, 195/1761, Beirut, August 2, 1892. However the scheme was only completed in 1894.
208 Kemal, Memoirs, 194.
209 PRO, FO, 195/1763, Beirut, August 2, 1892.
210 Kemal, Memoirs, 206.
Subsequent governors general were able to shape Beirut’s urban development more actively. In part, this owed to the fact that they enjoyed longer terms of office. More importantly, however, they were busy with regulating and containing the growing financial capitalisation of Beirut through international companies. Under the first four governors general, the provincial capital Beirut functioned as the platform of Ottoman centralisation efforts in the entire province. In this regard, the Alawi hinterland of Lattakia became a high profile test case for both the application of the provincial government’s ‘benevolent reforms’ and Abdülhamid’s very own approach to his empire as Memalik-i Mahruse Şahine – the “well-protected domains” – as the Ottoman Empire was officially called.\(^{211}\)

Like his Bosnian predecessor ‘Aziz Pasha, Isma‘ıl Kemal’s main task was to pacify what the Ottoman government considered isolated and disintegrated mountain regions of the province. On the governor general’s obligatory provincial inspection tour, Ismail Kemal Bey visited the Alawi moutain - or Jabal Nusayri - to supervise cultivation of tobacco and the planning of railway tracks through the region.\(^{212}\) He noted the “unjust treatment of the Nusairis” by the local qaimaqam, and ordered him to treat them justly as a means “towards attaching them to the government.”\(^{213}\) Considered heretics to Orthodox Sunni Islam, the Tanzimat reformers had earlier been unable to incorporate them. Military incursions and punitive expeditions led to random Ottoman plunderings, abductions and executions, but did little to improve conditions for cultivation, trade and travelling.\(^{214}\) Instead, these measures only hardened local resistance to centralisation and suspicion towards the Sunni city of Lattakia.

Under Ziya Bey, governor of Lattakia between 1885 and 1892, roads, civil schools and Hanafi mosques were built, large-scale educational programmes initiated and “entry into the bureaucratic Efendiyya class encouraged.”\(^{215}\) The governor gained popularity among the

---


\(^{212}\) Michael Hartmann, “Das Liwa el-Ladkije und die Nahije Urdu,” *ZDPV* 14, (1891), 166, and Michael Hartmann, “Das Bahnnetz Mittelsyriens,” in *ZDPV* 17 (1895), 56-64.


Alawis for granting them “a full share in local administration and by promoting education amongst them.”216 Under imperial instructions Ziya Bey was active in inducing these Ansariehs [Alawi] to embrace Sunni Islam. Apparently successful, 15,000 out of a total of about 60,000 have come forward and accepted the [Hanafi] Muslim doctrines. The Sultan takes great interest in this movement and ten mosques and ten schools have already been erected at his expense. [And] the Civil List is funding another forty of each. The Ansariehs hope to be treated equally and not, as formerly, as pariahs by the bona fide Muslims, hence their large-scale conversion.217

From the 1880s onwards, government buildings, or konaks, were constructed in the head towns of the northern sub-provinces of Banias, Hosn al-Akrad and Akkar.218 At the same time provincial inspectors ordered the urban Sunni population to accept Alawi converts to Hanafi Islam and to integrate them as legal equals into their society.219 What Protestant missionary activism was to the inhabitants of the southern sub-provinces of Beirut, especially Acre and the Balqa, Ottoman administrators’ proselytism was to the inhabitants of the northern sub-provinces, especially the Alawis.

The memoirs of Yusuf al-Hakim, a Lattakia-born career bureaucrat, add another dimension to Ottoman rule in the province of Beirut: direct intervention from the sultan’s palace that by-passed the authorities in Beirut. By the time Lattakia was incorporated into the province of Beirut, the notables of the town had enjoyed the good offices of two governors, who shared their bias against the Alawis. In the 1870s and 80s, Ahmad Pasha al-Sulh who was to be elected to Beirut’s first Provincial Council and, succeeding him, Ahmad Pasha Abaza who had been the first municipal president of Beirut between 1868 and 1877 appear to have had some success in reestablishing local trust in the Ottoman government. But in the early 1880s, the Ottoman authorities in Damascus faced violent resistance to centralisation policies in this region.220

After 1888, Istanbul-led nepotism infringed on the authority of the governor general in the provincial capital. But it appears from al-Hakim’s memoirs that while the urban population of Lattakia deplored rampant corruption, the rural populations greeted the new

216 Douwes, “Knowledge and Oppression”, 167.
217 PRO, FO/195/1723, Beirut, August 10, 1891.
218 As well as in the southern districts of Safed, Marj ‘Ayun, Janin, Tulkarm. PRO, FO195/2075, Beirut May 2, 1900.
219 Deringil, The Well-Protected Domains, 83.
220 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondence des Echelles, 1882-1885.
investment in infrastructure and education as a lesser evil than previous military oppression. From the 1890s, governor appointments to Lattakia were settled in Abdülhamid’s Palace rather than in Beirut. The region was rich in tobacco whose production had fallen under the international Tobacco Régie. In a controversy over the Tobacco Régie’s buying and selling preferences in 1902, Habib Malhame, as councilor of the Régie, traveled to Lattakia to warn the local and British tobacco merchants to honour the monopoly rules. Izzet Pasha al-ʿAbid, the sultan’s favorite advisor and notorious Damascene concessionaire, first secured the governorship for his in-law Ahmad Sayf Bey in 1894 and then for his own son ʿAbd al-Ghani in 1896. Likewise Sadiq Pasha, the son of the grand vizier Kamil Pasha, was appointed governor of Lattakia twice (1896 and 1905). In another direct palace intervention, Mahmud Bey, a client and relative of another of the ‘sultan’s Arabs’, al-Sayyid Abu al-Huda, was parachuted into office in 1901.

1.3.2.2. The Provincial Council

The innovations enacted by the governor general throughout the province enhanced Beirut’s regional primacy through taxation, registration, construction of roads and railways or communication. Increasingly, all walks of public life converged in Beirut. If the position of the governor general constituted the most powerful manifestation of direct imperial rule in Beirut, the provincial council was the most powerful manifestation of the stranglehold of Beirut notables over its administrative hinterland. The Ottoman Provincial Law had turned provincial capitals into powerful localities where decision-making and lobbying converged. Applications for concessions were reviewed in the Provincial Council. Taxes and revenues were assessed in the Provincial Council. Land sales and property deeds were ratified in the Provincial Council. Projects of infrastructure and public works throughout the province were decided in the Provincial Council. Sites for industry were allocated by the Provincial Council and resolutions of all municipalities were checked by the Provincial Council. In short, whoever sat on the general council for the province was a very powerful man.

221 PRO, FO 195, 22/5/1902.
222 al-Hakim, Bayrut wa Lubnan,16-18. Likewise, Tripoli, Acre, Haifa and Sayda were also places of extensive palace intervention. See, M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondence des Echelles, Beirut, carton 279.
223 Young, Corps de Droits, 62-65.
The geographical distribution of members of Beirut’s provincial council shows the extent of the capital’s dominance. The records available suggest that in twenty years all but a handful of members were from Beirut. In theory, this distinctly ‘capital-heavy’ arrangement was to be balanced out by the provincial assemblies. Officially it was stipulated that the pan-provincial assembly was to be in session annually for no longer than forty days. But only one such meeting actually occurred – in 1912/3 (1330h). In Syria, too, the 1867 Assembly of the Province “was perhaps the only one to be so assembled prior to the pan-Syrian congress of 1919.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year</th>
<th>1305 – 1888</th>
<th>1310 – 1892</th>
<th>1318 – 1899/00</th>
<th>1319 – 1900/01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majlis Idara Vilayet</td>
<td><strong>Vali</strong></td>
<td><strong>Na‘ib Qadi al-Shari’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defterdar Ra‘is mal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mufti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majlis Idara Vilayet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vali</strong></td>
<td>Ali Pasha</td>
<td>Khalid Bey Ef.</td>
<td>Rashid Mumtaz Bey</td>
<td>Rashid Mumtaz Bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Na‘ib Qadi al-Shari’</strong></td>
<td>Isma‘il Ramiz Bey</td>
<td>Abdah Kamaladdin</td>
<td>Ahmad Shukri Ef.</td>
<td>Ahmad Shukri Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defterdar Ra‘is mal</strong></td>
<td>Muh Sharif Ef.</td>
<td>Hanif Ef.</td>
<td>Edhem Ef.</td>
<td>Edhem Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mufti</strong></td>
<td>Fikret Bey</td>
<td>Abdallah Najib Ef.</td>
<td>Fasih Bey</td>
<td>Mahmud Bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nagib al-Asraf</strong></td>
<td>Sh AR. Nahhas Ef.</td>
<td>Abdal-Basit Fakhuri</td>
<td>Abdal-Basit Fakhuri</td>
<td>Abdul-Basit Fakhuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Members:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saad al-Din Qabbani</td>
<td>Sh AR. Nahhas Ef.</td>
<td>Sh AR. Nahhas Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yusuf Ef. Sursuq</td>
<td>Hassan Bayhum Ef</td>
<td>Sh AR. Nahhas Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elias Ef. al-Arab</td>
<td>Nakhla Tuweini Ef.</td>
<td>Amin Muhkayishe Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mika‘il Fara‘un Ef</td>
<td>Ibrahim Tabit Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmad Fa’iq Ef.</td>
<td><em>Salim Musaddiya</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year</th>
<th>1322-1904</th>
<th>1324-1906</th>
<th>1326 – 1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majlis Idara Vilayet</td>
<td><strong>Vali</strong></td>
<td><strong>Na‘ib Qadi al-Shari’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defterdar Ra‘is mal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majlis Idara Vilayet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vali</strong></td>
<td>Khalil Pasha</td>
<td>Khalil Pasha</td>
<td>Ibrahim Khalil Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Na‘ib Qadi al-Shari’</strong></td>
<td>Muh Ef. Tawfiq</td>
<td>Muh Ef. Tawfiq</td>
<td>Amir Khalusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defterdar Ra‘is mal</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Shawqi Bey</td>
<td>Malik Bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mufti</strong></td>
<td>Mahmoud Bey</td>
<td>Mahmoud Bey</td>
<td>Ahmad Bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abd al-Basit Fakhury</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nagib al-Asraf</strong></td>
<td>Abd al-Rah.</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah.</td>
<td>Abd al-Rahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Members:</strong></td>
<td>Amin Muhkayishe Pasha</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah.</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyye</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyye</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rashid Bayhum Ef</td>
<td>Rashid Bayhum Ef</td>
<td>Rashid Bayhum Ef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iskandir Tuweini Bey</td>
<td>Najib Trad Ef.</td>
<td>Najib Trad Ef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishara Sabbagh Ef.</td>
<td>Nadra Mutran Bey</td>
<td>Nadra Mutran Bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Najib Hani Ef</td>
<td>Najib Hani Ef</td>
<td>Najib Hani Ef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abd al-Rahm Haqqi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

224 Ibid., 39. Although it was stipulated that four members were elected, Beirut was granted six members, like the provinces of Adrianople, Kosovo, Monastir and Salinoka.

225 *Beirut Vilayet-i umumisinin 1330 senesi icitma’inda itihaz eylediği mukerirat*, (Beirut, 1912).

The mufti and naqib al-ashraf of Beirut were permanent provincial council members by virtue of their official function, as were the imperial bureaucrats sent from Istanbul - the governor-general, the judge (naʿib), the treasurer (deftardar) and the secretary general (maktubci). Of the remaining six elected members of Beirut’s first provincial council (the law explicitly required Muslim-Christian parity but remained vague as to the representation of the sub-provinces\(^\text{227}\)) four were Beirut notables of at least the second generation. The fifth member, Ahmad Pasha al-Sulh, originally from Sayda and the governor of Lattakia and Acre previously, had taken residence in Beirut some years earlier. The geographical origins of Yusuf Nasr are unclear.\(^\text{228}\) In the following years, this trend towards a ‘capitalisation’ of the provincial council continued. In the early 1900s all elected members were Beirut-born.\(^\text{229}\) Moreover, members like the Bayhums, Dimashqiyyas, Mukhayyishs, Sabbaghs were bankers and concessionaires who were active in the developmental projects in the Arab provinces. Their administrative positions allowed them to be inside the decision-making apparatus of the province and wield extensive powers in the process of ‘financial capitalisation’ to which we now turn.

The particular centre-periphery relations in late Ottoman Beirut defied neat polarisations into a binary imperial and local antagonism of political formation and socialisation. Instead, the embrication of imperial and local structures of decision-making determined Beirut’s urban trajectory as a political and economic centre. Local interest groups not only depended on, but also sought, the presence of Ottoman imperial power in Beirut. The particular structure of the Ottoman provincial administration manned by imperial bureaucrats and local councillors with converging interests was to play an important role in capitalist urbanisation, the production of dominant and marginal spaces in \textit{fin de siècle} Beirut. The names of the 200 petitioners who united in 1865 to struggle for the capitalisation of Beirut in the geo-administrative framework of the Ottoman Empire, will reemerge in the narrative of this thesis – be it as local investors, municipal members, newspaper editors, propertied merchants, career bureaucrats or in ‘the politics of the mountain’. In all cases, they


\(^{228}\) French consular reports list Jirji Naqqash instead of Elias ‘Arab as elected member.

\(^{229}\) Nadra Mutran may have been born in his family’s town of Baalbek which lay outside the boundaries of the province of Beirut.
worked hard to sustain *fin de siècle* Beirut both as a normative, urban ideal and a physical expression of a provincial capital.

**Conclusion**

This first chapter traced Beirut’s development from a minor maritime town subversive to Ahmad al-Jazzar Pasha’s rule in Acre to a port-city during the Egyptian occupation and to a provincial capital of the Hamidian regime. The dynamism of this ever-expanding city brought about a process of constant reworking of commercial, political and cultural horizons which was fundamentally shaped by the hopes and fears of its leading inhabitants for the future of their city. Moreover we have traced how the Beirutis invited central Ottoman authority to their city and how the administrative upgrading of their city enabled the city to attract international investment in urban development and thereby gain significant and long-lasting structural advantages over rivaling port-cities in the region.

The historical trajectory and periodisation of this chapter centred around 1888, the year Beirut was made an Ottoman provincial capital. Urban and regional transformations, events and their contemporary, local interpretation before 1888 have been reconstructed into a historical narrative of capital creation – ‘political capitalisation’ – in the geo-administrative framework of the *Tanzimat* reforms. The next chapter will assess the effect of the outcome of this struggle on Beirut’s urban development and regional economic position.
Chapter 2: Capitalist Urbanisation and the Conflicts over Claims to the City

As long as there existed state power capable of maintaining a semblance of order, direct domination was less important. This changed fundamentally with the predominance of capital exportation which involved much more vast interests. When railways were built, land was expropriated, when ports were installed and mineral resources were exploited, the risk is much greater than when it sufficed to buy and sell merchandise.¹

Rudolph Hilferding was arguably one of the more circumspect early Marxist theoreticians of the nexus between capitalism and colonialism and was in many ways the ‘missing link’ between Marx and Lenin. According to him, the sheer volume of financial capital moving around the globe and into the colonies under the political conditions of European imperialism raised the economic stakes of the large investment companies. These higher stakes – so the analysis went – inevitably led to a state politics of direct rule, expansion and conquest of colonies. The ensuing attempts by European powers at monopolisation of the colonial market not only put other European economic rivals at a disadvantage, but also restructured and/or destroyed “indigenous” social relations. The link between capitalism and colonialism is the subject of continuing debate amongst the historians of the European centre.² Although not entirely denied, in our ‘view from the periphery’ the structural and epistemological nuances and variations of capitalism and colonialism were probably less apparent to local actors who experienced them. The social spaces they inhabited were fundamentally restructured as much by European, state-backed finance capital as by colonial economic expansion.

In a comparative perspective, the societies of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century experienced capitalist and colonial expansion differently from other peripheral regions in the world-economy. The Ottoman lands became peripheralized at different times and in different places. State bankruptcy in 1878 and the subsequent financial control by the European Public Debt Administration (short: PDA) neither turned the Ottoman empire into a

² See for example Jacques Marseille, Empire Colonial et Capitalism Francais – Histoire d’un Divorce, (Paris, 1984); and Samir Saul, La France et l’Egypte de 1882 à 1914: Intérêts Economiques et Implications
formal colony, nor integrated it into the ‘informal empire’ of one particular imperialist power. Rather, the Ottoman Empire presented a case whereby

the central bureaucracy was strong enough vis-à-vis imperialist powers and/or the rivalry among those powers was such that these countries never became part of a formal or informal empire. As a result of this particular constellation of power, greater integration into the world-economy could not readily proceed through an alliance between the dominant interests in the center countries and those social classes in the periphery whose interests lay in the same direction. Instead, this process advanced through an accommodation between the former, the [merchants and export-oriented landlords] and the central bureaucracy.3

The beginning of “organised capital”4, which socio-economic historians of Europe date to the second half of the nineteenth century5, and which historians of Ottoman integration into the world-economy date from the bankruptcy of the Ottoman state in 18766, arrived in Beirut in full force only after 1888. It will be argued in this chapter that in pre-provincial-capital Beirut, numerous local attempts to carry out large public works projects, such as the enlargement of the port, failed due to financial constraints. At the same time, foreign companies hesitated to invest in Beirut while it was under the provincial jurisdiction of Damascus. Nevertheless, it is significant for both this study and an understanding of colonial, capitalist expansion more generally, that successful international infra-structural projects were conceived first in the cities and towns of the ‘ peripheral’ regions of the world-economy and not in the palatial environs of Paris, Brussels, London or even Istanbul. Not only ‘natural advantages’, but local agency also played an important role in the choice of investment sites.

2.1. Concessionaires and Shareholder Companies capitalise on Beirut

The new dimension of inter-urban rivalry to attract large-scale finance capital easily favoured capital Beirut over other port cities, in particular Haifa and Tripoli. As with the Beirutfuti struggle for the creation of a provincial capital, local merchants and notables together with resident foreign entrepreneurs were successful lobbyists owing largely to their contacts

---

in Istanbul. Beirut’s ‘financial capitalisation’ had tremendous impact on the transformation of Beirut’s urban fabric and entrenched the city’s economic and political primacy in the region. During Abdülhamid’s reign the city authorities nevertheless averted a wholesale surrender to international capital and instead by and large managed to accommodate capitalist endeavours to suit their own vision for the city. The fear that Beirut would turn into a mere stepping stone for international trade – or, in today’s speak, of Beirut becoming a ‘colonial bridgehead’ – united Ottoman governors and the municipality. In very different ways, actual physical resistance was exercised, on the other hand, by the work force subjected to the effects of capitalist encroachment on their livelihood and social space. The last part of this chapter therefore treats industrial action as acts of popular resistance to the ‘financial capitalisation’ of Beirut, as local expressions of (re)claiming the city of Beirut or of declarations of what Henri Lefebvre considered “the right to the city.”

How ever strong European influence may have been under Ottoman rule foreign powers ultimately remained outside the decision-making process in the provinces of Beirut and Bilad al-Sham. As trade figures for Beirut’s port show, French investment in urban facilities proved slow to amortize. The fear that prosperity might prove ephemeral that had previously permeated the local petitions for a provincial capital also gripped the investment companies in the 1890s and led to fierce battles with the municipality of Beirut and with the local workforce.

2.1.1. The Port of Beirut: “the bride among the ports of the East”

In the first half of the nineteenth century Beiruti merchants and notables had frequently undertaken improvements to the harbour walls and arcaded warehouses. These remained piece meal repairs but appeared to maintain existing trade volumes. The initial idea for a large-scale port enlargement project was conceived by a French naval officer in the

---

aftermath of the civil war of 1860 and designed by the French chief engineer of the Suez Canal, Stoeklin. It appears that he was commissioned by Edmond de Perthuis, agent of the Marseille-based streamline company Messageries Maritimes and the director of “Compagnie Imperiale Ottomane des Diligences” which had recently completed the Beirut-Damascus road.10 The plan was not only to enlarge the port ten-fold, but it was also the ambition of de Perthuis – the most powerful foreign resident in Beirut during the second half of the nineteenth century – to create a direct link between his shipping company and his Beirut-Damascus road enterprise. This scheme would effectively give him a monopoly over all modern transport and travel facilities between the coast and Damascus. Although at the time the project remained in the office drawers of the road company and the imperial government in Istanbul, it was to be the basis of subsequent extension plans and the subject of bitter disagreement with the municipality of Beirut.

Ten years after the provincial authorities in Damascus had dropped renewed Beirut initiatives for a port enlargements11, the issue was raised publicly again under Midhat Pasha’s forceful governship between 1878 and 1880. Encouraged – or maybe alerted – by his development project of Tripoli’s port which brought about the first tramway in Bilad al-Sham that connected the port to the city centre, Beirut’s newspaper Lisan al-Hal published a series of articles reminding the Ottoman government of its commitment to Beirut’s economic progress and urban improvement.

Midhat Pasha urges everybody to participate in urban reforms. He has experience from travelling extensively in European cities. He has inaugurated many new ports and roads, as well as flowing parks that fill the hearts of every individual. Therefore the people of Beirut embrace his concern for the construction of a new port. They are aware of the honey inside this beehive. … Since the people of our julia felix know that it was a commercial centre since ancient times the construction of the new port will return commercial activity to our city. What they invest will in a short period of time generate high interests.12

And a couple of months later,

The issue of roads and the difficulty using them is well-known in our country as the condition of our port is poor. Midhat Pasha who knows European railroad systems and safe harbours knows that the best way for the growth of our country and our trade is good ports and easy transportation. He has seen that Syria is lacking improvement and he

10 René Tresse, “Histoire de la Route de Beyrouth à Damas,” La Géographie 56 (1936), 248.
strove to renovate its state. He proposed a tramway link between al-Mina and Tripoli and a carriage road between Tripoli and Homs and Hama.
Our city is concerned about the state of the port and ... a committee was appointed which decided on a suitable place for the work of the port and then research was conducted as to how to reach what is necessary in terms of funding [dirahim].

Indeed, according to one source from the governor general’s camp, after Midhat Pasha turned his attention to Beirut in December 1878, the economy reacted instantly to the new activity and the value of land property briefly sky-rocked by 40% in 1879. The integrity of Midhat Pasha seemed to allay the “insurmountable” fears of foreign finance capital which arose from “the lack of guarantees by the Ottoman government which European capitalists encountered in investing their funds.” But the financial obstacles remained difficult to overcome as the Beirutis were unwilling to pay the new taxes imposed on margerine, oil, firewood, wheat and flour allocated to implement the project. Instead, the French consul warned his Foreign Minister in Paris that the local inhabitants believed the Ottoman treasury should spend its revenue on more pressing issues.

Given such popular reluctance, merchants and municipal members formed a lobby group whose members raised some 20,000 lira of private funds for the port project. Lisan al-Hal broke down the contribution of the ten members alphabetically: the municipal president, “Ibrahim Fakhri Bey, [pledged] 2,000 lira, Khawaja As’ad Malhame 500 lira, al-Sayyid Ayyas 2,000 lira, Khawaja Bustrus 3,000 lira, al-Sadat Bayhum 2,000 lira, Khawaja Jirji Tuwayni 1,000 lira, Khawajat Ra’ad and Hani 500 lira, Khawajat Sursuq 3,000 lira Khawaja Nakhla Mudawwar 500 lira and Khawaja Yuhanna Abkariuş, 500 lira.” The newspaper praised the individuals with characteristic panegyrics:

We have the right to be proud of the mentioned businessmen. We can be reassured of their determination and strength in the service of the home country [watan]. Even if the obstacles prevented them from the clear threat of danger, the shadow of the our sun shone on our blossoming pride and hope.

16 According to Lisan al-Hal, March 7, 1879, “their value will amount to 10,000 lira, plus the average tax on passing goods amounts to 15,000 Lira, but it is hoped this income will increase shortly after the construction of the port the taxes raised then. [The municipality guarantees] to pay 6% of interest annually, through consumption tax, and 1%, through amortization, of the originally invested capital.”
17 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton 313 (1882-1912), Beirut, June 8, 1879.
Having thus identified and advertised the heroic deeds of the investors, the editors of *Lisan al-Hal* specified their plan of action:

Now that the Porte has removed the obstacles many of the local notables and municipal members decided to meet under the leadership of Ra'uf Bey to determine a place for the construction of the new port. They picked a site on Ras al-Shamiyya near Khan Antun Bey stretching to the building of the Khawajat Mudawwar. The deciding factor was that the balancing of the costs was not less than 15,000 shares at 20 lira per share payable in four installments, one every year. Now it was imposed upon the municipality to contribute by holding 2,500 shares guaranteed to the operating company. If the population wants to participate, the director of the company is obliged to offer options on one third of the shares. Of the mentioned meeting, those present should not hold more than 950 shares, in other words the amount of 15,000 lira. . . . This we ask from the buyers and sellers for sake of the completion of the port. Then we can rightfully say that the city of Beirut is the bride among the ports of the East and the beauty spot in Syria.  

In May 1878, the municipal departments met and completed a seven-point draft position for negotiations with European financial capitalists. The committee insisted on an Ottoman company whose “head office will not be outside Beirut but inside it.” It was to be financed by municipal taxes on visitors to the city. In return “the company has the right to levy taxes on everything that is imported to the city on the condition that the municipality has knowledge of all income.”  The municipality would yield the territory of the prospective landfill to the company.

While the French consul was deliberating with his superiors in Paris over the implications of this proposal and the financial responsibilities of the municipality, Midhat Pasha approached a prominent British engineer. Alerted by the governor general’s gambit, de Perthuis activated his contacts with the municipal council of which he had been a member until recently. The Stoeklin plan was discussed but again little headway was made. The entire enterprise was suspended once more when Midhat Pasha was forced to resign.

The idea of the port project received a new injection of optimism after 1883, when de Perthuis’ lobbying tours to Paris and Istanbul achieved the financial commitment of a number of large banking houses. In 1886 the Beirut port company was founded in Paris with the financial backing of the Ottoman Imperial Bank (BIO), the Comptoir d'Escompte, the

---

19 Ibid.  
20 Ibid., May 26, 1879.  
21 In 1880, the municipality asked the Porte for better conditions than were offered by the French port
Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas and the Messageries Maritimes. Edmond de Perthuis was
closer than ever to attaining his cherished prize when, on June 19, 1887, the minister of
public works, Zihni Pasha signed away the concession to the Baalbek-born and Beirut-based
Joseph Efendi Mutran (d. 1899).

The Ottoman government’s granting of the port concession to Joseph Mutran “and his
associates”22, signaled Abdülhamid’s policy of favouring Ottoman subjects in general and
loyal Arabs in particular, over foreigners.23 As such this policy represented a potent counter
measure against the international Public Debt Administration’s growing fiscal control over
the productive sector of the Ottoman Empire.24 Sultan Abdülhamid also used concessions as a
political tool to buy out Young Turk opposition. Thus Salim al-Shidyaq, one of the leading
critics of the Hamidian regime and editor of the Paris-based journal Hüriyet in the 1890s, was
effectively neutralised through the generous award of the concession for Beirut’s water
supply. Natural resources had become a political bargaining chip for the sultan and a means
to manufacture loyalty.

Between 1887 and 1889, Joseph Mutran obtained two more imperial concessions –
one for a tramway in Damascus and one for a railway between Damascus and Hawran. For
Beirut his concession proved an auspicious pointer and Lisan al-Hal expressed its gratitude
to “our friend” Mutran.25 He was one of the first of a series of Beirut merchants who
dominated the Ottoman concessionaire business under Abdülhamid II. Like the Malhames
and the Damascene Izzet Pasha al-Abid, he was part of a set of Istanbul-based, Arab supra-
local notables who moved between Beirut, Damascus and Paris, and in Istanbul between the
palace, the ministry of public works and the international Public Debt Administration. Once
these supra-local notables had bought the concession, they were free to sell it to foreign
company. From Adel Ismail, Documents Diplomatiques, Vol 14, 143, 204-5.
22 These were probably his in-laws, Najib and Salim Malhame. M. Dumast, Le Port de Beyrouth, (type-
written manuscript kept at the German Orient Institute in Beirut), 6.
23 Prior to his reign, the Ottoman government tended to give concessions directly to foreigners. Thus, the
Beirut Water Works Company, which was founded in 1874, bought the concession for operating the supply
of drinking water in Beirut from a French citizen, M. Thevenin. See, M.A.E., Nantes,
Consulat Beyrouth, 348, Exposé dated Beirut, February 13, 1913.
24 See chapter four.
On February 2 the same proclamation appeared in Beirut, a letter addressed to [ulayman] Bustani, the
Ottoman minister of Public Works. As the oldest of his generation, Joseph Mutran was the business man in
a family of politicians with Young Turk affiliation. Rashid and Nadra Mutran were authors of political
bidders. Under these conditions, the concession business soon developed into an ‘emerging market’ for Ottoman merchants in the service of the imperial bureaucracy or with relatives in powerful government positions. The political economy of the concession business differed considerably even from the relatively new dimensions of mass import-export commerce, although both the Mediterranean merchant and the Ottoman concessionaire maintained their roles of socio-economic intermediaries. Here it was not merchandise or raw material that was shifted, such as silk or cotton but capital and know-how. The concession business demanded greater liquidity and international banking credibility and far better connections in Istanbul on the part of the local buyer.26

Mutran Effendi quickly sold his concession to de Perthuis’ investment company for 600,000 French francs at some considerable margin of profit. The first executive meeting in 1888 was presided over by Edmond de Perthius and included illustrious bankers and pashas.27 Théodore Berger, R. Emond and Charles Jagerschmidt, director of Messageries Maritimes, were executives at the Imperial Ottoman Bank (BIO) in Istanbul and the Beirut-Damascus road. A. de Camondo was the scion of an old Jewish banking family in Galata28 and the chief executive of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas. Charles Goguel was registered as the “Régent de la Banque de France” and also a chief executive at the BIO in Istanbul. Denfert-Rochereau was the director of the Comptoir d’Escompte de Paris and executive of the Banque Maritime. Most active among them was Charles Mallet, president of the executive committee of the “Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Paris-Lyon-Méditerranée” a councillor of the BIO and de Perthuis’ successor in 1895. Last on the list of council members and the only Beiruti was Salim Efendi Malhame, at the time the general director of Ottoman revenues conceded to the PDA.29

pamphlets and resided in Paris, Cairo and Istanbul. The Mutrans had family ties to the Malhames and political ties to Izzet Pasha in Istanbul.

26 Thus in 1902, Joseph Malhame attempted to take over the PDA’s Tobacco Régie in the sub-province of Lattakia and the salt concession in Mount Lebanon. The same year, Musa Efendi de Freij obtained the right to exploit the coal and bitumen resources in the district of Jazzin, while Ahmad Izzet Pasha al-Abid obtained the greatest prize of them all – the Hijaz railway project which was to link Istanbul with Mecca.

27 The timeless book by David Landes, Bankers and Pashas, (Cambridge, Mass., 1958) on late nineteenth-early twentieth-century Egypt presents a detailed case study of the same processes of a political economy dominated by the vagaries of finance capital under the conditions of British colonialism.


The company’s finance capital was set at 5 million francs and divided into 10,000 shares at 500 francs. When the shares were tendered, *Lisan al-Hal* urged Beirut’s inhabitants to seize the opportunity:

We appeal to the local people to move quickly to register their names before the chance has passed because after the completion of the open registration, the group of shareholders raise the original value according to the importance of the operation and its achievement. We seek to increase the importance of the [local] capitalists [ashab al-mal] for this purchaser of shares has a special feeling for Beirut to prevent a majority of purchasers whose interests are contrary to Beirut.30

Again, the newspapers published the names and amounts invested by Beiruti shareholders. Thus the readers learned that the Sursuqs invested 25,000 lira and the Ayyas 20,000 lira in port company shares. The port company’s overwhelming financial power, both local and international, was barely checked by the stipulation that the port company’s tax scale was accountable directly to the Ministry of Commerce and Public Works in Istanbul.31 Despite powerful financial backing, the port company soon fell into debt and de Perthuis was forced to borrow money from assets of his more successful Beirut-Damascus road. By the time the port facility became fully operational in January 1895, the debt had grown to 20% of the investment capital - over half of which it owed to the road company and the BIO.32

Work on the harbour basin started in January 1890. Under the supervision of Henri Garreta, a qualified engineer of bridges and roads, the French construction companies Dollfuss, Muzey, Thévenin and Loury set about to dig out the basin and create the landfill for the quays. To this effect, the remains of the crusader castle, the twin towers of the port and the old lighthouse were raised to the ground to level the surface.33 The symbolism of the act of erasing these historic monuments was acknowledged by one employee of the French construction companies. In a brief, private moment the engineer had doubts about the destruction of three of Beirut’s most distinctive landmarks: “It may appear a little savage to destroy the ruins which gave Beirut’s entrance a picturesque aspect. For my part, I would not have dared to take the initiative of such a proposition.” But he instantly found solace in the

---

33 A year earlier the imperial lighthouse board decided to pull down the other lighthouse in Ras Beirut and replace it with a higher one. Newly built houses had obstructed the view from the port to the lighthouse.
excuse that “at Beirut nobody attributes to them the least importance, one considers them ugly, without character.”

The port company effectively held a monopoly over all commercial access to the sea within Beirut’s radius of five to seven kilometres. This not only led to frequent conflict with the British water company based as of 1896 on the northern border of the district of Beirut, but also criminalised the pursuit of the livelihood of local fishermen based in the Druze fishing harbour in ‘Ayn al-Mreisse and in Sayfi/Jummayze at the Bay of St. Andrew. Prior to the enlargement, these natural fishing bays had been alternative, small-scale outlets for local consumption. In fact, the status of de Perthuis’ company turned the port to extra-territorial property over which the city authorities had no say. The only aspects de Perthuis could not (yet) legally control were the port workers and the customs officials. When the company started in operate in June in 1893, these were the first flash points of discontent.

2.1.2. The Beirut-Damascus Railway, or the Logic of Capitalist Expansion

Within decades of its invention in 1832 by Robert Stevenson, the railway spearheaded European access to much of the globe and fundamentally restructured the perceptions of distance and time. The construction of railways in non-European regions that were not yet formally colonised was the subject of intense rivalries between financial capitalists and national governments in Europe from the 1870s onwards. In Bilad al-Sham the 1890s witnessed a shift of interest from the coast to the development of railways and carriage ways in order to make the wealth of natural resources in the vast inland regions accessible to profitable trade. Numerous engineers and Orient ‘experts’ were dispatched

PRO, FO/195/1648, Beirut, May 28, 1889.
34 Quoted in Thobie, Interêts Français, 175, fn. 235. Indeed, neither Thamarat al-Funun, nor Lisan al-Hal appear to have complained too much at the time.
35 In 1899, Abdulhamid II issued an irade, enforcing existing regulations, decreed that all fishing boats, foreign or native, required a licence of 10 piastres to fish in “Ottoman waters” (sic). PRO, FO, 195/2049, Beirut, June 13, 1899.
37 Hobsbawm, Age of Empire.
38 Shereen Khairallah, Railways in the Middle East, 1856-1948, (Beirut, 1991).
from Europe to explore and report on the topographical and geological qualities of the territories.39

The restructuring effect of the railway on the regional economy was not merely externally imposed by European powers on an unaware local population, but the local notables possessed an arsenal of strategies to push their self-interest. The Beirutis, in particular, were able to play off the British against the French and tip the scales of the evolving urban rivalry towards a railway endpoint in their city. They understood the importance of the expanding regional network of transportation and used the provincial council to connect Beirut’s port with the hinterland through the routes of railways.

In terms of the topographical conditions between Beirut and Damascus, a railway between the two cities was by no means a natural choice. The lines would have to pass over two mountain ranges and a summit of 1,500 metres. Thus it is not surprising that in a preliminary study on Syrian railway networks in 1887-8, Edouard Coze, the future technical director of the Beirut gas company, would not even mention the possibility of a Beirut-Damascus line and instead suggested other coastal cities like Tripoli as possible railheads.40 From the point of view of Aleppo and Damascus, a line to Tripoli would have been more desirable, as the former option would have added another route to the coast from the existing road link between Damascus and Beirut.

Coze’s may also have been a counter study to a earlier feasibility study by the Beiruti engineer of the province of Syria, Bishara Dib, advocating a railway network that centred around Beirut. To this effect Dib had passionately appealed to the governor general Ahmad Hamdi Pasha in Damascus:

We cannot wait until the foreign capitalists take over, we need to form subscription committees in Beirut, Damascus and elsewhere to raise a good part of the necessary sum of money. With your presence in Syria, Ra’uf Pasha, a former governor of Beirut as minister for public works and the integrity of the notables of Beirut it is possible!41

---

39 See for example the study and the map drawn by the German Orientalist Martin Hartmann in “Das Bahnnetz Mittelsyriens”, in ZDPV 17 (1895), 56-64.
Again, the local plan was not immediately adopted but served as the base for future Beirut lobbying. In early 1890, Coze relaunched his quest of a tête de la ligne, or railhead, in Tripoli for the “Carriage Company operating from Tripoli to Homs and Hama”. It was supported by Tripoli’s governor and the urban notables who set up their own investment fund.

Another challenge to Beirut was the struggle over the Haifa-Damascus rail link in the 1880s, which was conceded to a group of Damascene and Beiruti merchants and which was driven by the British adventurer Lawrence Oliphant. This project was clearly favoured by a more level topography. Oliphant’s designs for the Haifa-Damascus rail link rang alarm bells in de Perthuis’s camp for he feared that a tête de la ligne – or railhead – in Haifa would preclude a railway line to and from Beirut to materialise and ultimately jeopardise his plans for the Beirut port. De Perthuis and the merchants of Beirut intervened. They realised that the project threatened to divert the export of wheat from the Hawran from the port of Beirut to the port of Haifa. The provincial council protested to the governor general of Beirut and the Palace. With skillful manipulation and with cunning tactics and inside knowledge of how to persuade the sultan, they pointed out that the land through which the railway was to pass, belonged to the sultan. The swift intervention of the council proved successful. The construction of the British line, which started in 1892, was halted in 1898 after only eight kilometres had been built.

A number of municipal members, provincial councillors and merchants of Beirut convened in the residence (“dar”) of Muhi al-Din Bayhum in early February 1890 for a

---

42 Since 1883 it had existed as a shareholding company in which Sultan Abdülhamid himself held 250 shares. See Edhem Eldem, A 135-Year-old Treasure; Glimpses from the Past in the Ottoman Bank Archives, (Istanbul, 1998), 154.
43 M.A.E., Paris, Correspondance Politique et Commerciale, 1890, Vol. 35, Beirut, May 26, 1890. Because of this rivalry, according to the French consul general, "la Lutte existe bien ici entre de Perthuis et Coze, directeur de gaz et promoteur de la ligne de Tripoli."
44 In 1882, the sultan granted a concession for a railway from Acre to the Jordan river to Muhammad Sa‘id Pasha of Damascus, the Emir al-Hajj, Muhi al-Din Hamada, Yusuf Sursuq, Jirji Musa Sursuq, Michel Jirji Tuwayni and Hanna Khuri. To this effect, the Palace granted permission to construct a railway bridge in the district of Acre. BBA, Istanbul, Y.HUS, 179/135, Beirut, December 30, 1884/1301. See also Isma‘il, Correspondances Diplomatiques, Vol., 14, Beirut, January 29, 1883, 450.
45 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondences aves les Echelles, 1883-85, Beirut, March 5, 1884.
46 FO, 195/1683, Beirut, October 29, 1890.
conference on the railway issue.50 The host, an original municipal member of the first seven
years and the head of the Bayhum family, opened the meeting by calling on the audience to
support his struggle to make Beirut the railhead of the first prospective railway in Bilad al-
Sham. He reminded those present that it was a pressing issue for the Beirutis to offer
financial support to Bishara Dib’s project as “there are no connections between the coastal
towns.”51 The meeting decided to appoint a committee to conduct an inquiry into the
financial implications of a local investment fund. Muhammad Ayyas was elected president
and Ibrahim Thabit, Abu Raji Bustrus, Elias Arab, Bishara Hani, Jabur Tabib, Jirji Musa
Sursuq, Hasan Bayhum, Fakhri Bey, Misbah Ghandur, Musa Frayj, Nakhla Tuwayni, Nakhla
Fara’un and Bishara Dib were elected members.

_Lisan al-Hal_, whose editor, Khalil Sarkis, was himself a guest at the meeting,
supported Muhi al-Din Bayhum’s initiative but warned the public of the financial sacrifices it
entailed for the population:

We will soon see success or failure of preserving our central position [markazuna] and
wealth. … Remember, the distance between Beirut and Damascus is 180 km and the
distance from Hawran to Damascus is 70 km. The construction of one kilometre costs
roughly 4,000 lira, so what is needed are 1,800,000 lira. Having said this, the backdrop is
that Beirut and the committee members can only raise a maximum of 150,000 lira. This is
completely insufficient, especially if one has to pay for at least six years. It is well-known
that Beirut pays 15,000 lira annually in _virgu_ taxes. Even if the property owners were to
pay double that amount it would take fifty years.52

It became clear to the committee that the financial resources for such a vast infra-
structural project were not available in Beirut. The municipal and provincial budgets were
fully spent. Nevertheless under the direction of Hasan Bayhum, whose position on the
Provincial council and whose thriving grain trade in Hawran would have made him a leading
lobbyist, the Bayhums constituted the “Société anonyme ottomane de la voie ferrée de
Beyrouth à Damas” and successfully applied for an imperial concession in Istanbul which the
sultan granted to Hasan Bayhum for 99 years on June 3, 1891.

50 _Lisan al-Hal_, February 13, 1890.
51 _Lisan al-Hal_, _ibidem_, lists the following individuals as present at the meeting: “Ibrahim Thabit, Hajj
Ibrahim Tayyara, Elias ‘Arab, Bishara Arqash, Bishara Dib, our Jews, the Bayhums, Jabur Tabib, Jirji
Tuwayni, Jirji Musa Sursuq, Khalil Sarkis, Rizqallah Khadra, Rashid al-Mutran, ’Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani,
Muhammad Ayyas and son, Muhammad Badran, Muhammad Shakhbí, Muhammad Da’uq, Muhi al-Din
Hamada, Muhi al-Din al-Qadi, Misbah Ghandur, Najib Mudawwar, Nakhla Fara’oun, Yussef Biji. Others
were invited, but they excused themselves for health reasons.”
The Beirut-Damascus and the Damascus-Hawran railway plans were thus in the hands of two Beiruti concessionaires, Mutran and Bayhum. In 1892, Bayhum sold his company to de Perthuis who merged the Beirut-Damascus Road Company with the “Société de la voie ferrée de Beyrouth-Damas”. From the point of view of the foreign shareholders and investment capitalists of the road company, the opening of the railway line “practically put an end to the activities of one of the oldest and most lucrative French enterprises in the Ottoman Empire.” Financially, the road had thrown off an average profit of 11% and economically it had cemented the primacy of Beirut over other port-cities along the Levant. A year later the two concession companies of Joseph Mutran and Hasan Bayhum were merged into the renamed “Société anonyme ottomane des chemins de fer de Beyrouth-Damas-Hawran et Birecik sur l’Euphrate.”

As a consequence of these developments, de Perthuis finally held the reins of what had been four separate road and railway concessions while the Beirutis had irrevocably established their city as the dominant political and economic centre of Bilad al-Sham. In the short term the railway company had to run the enterprise at a considerable loss. But the turn of events revealed “the political power of the Beiruti merchants as they could enforce the creation of an uneconomic enterprise in order to deprive the city’s rivals from gaining an upper hand in capturing the trade of the hinterland.”

Like de Perthuis’ port company, the railway company was forced to borrow heavily from the BIO. With this financial injection, construction work of a total of 145 kilometres of tracks that crossed over mountain tops, numerous bridges, two viaducts and through 300-metre tunnels went ahead at a considerable pace. On August 8, 1895, attempting to coincide with the sultan’s birthday, the inauguration of the connection between Baramke in Damascus and Qarantina in Beirut was staged as grand, city-wide celebrations in both cities. At 10 miles per hour, the trains took nine to ten hours to cross Mount Lebanon, four to five hours less than the carriageway. It was presented in the press as a great success for industry and

52 Ibid.
53 Thobie, Interets et Imperialisme Français, 164.
54 BBA, Istanbul, YHUS, 269/7, Beirut, July 3, 1892/1310.
56 As well as, in this instance, from the “Société générale belge à Bruxelles” and the “Union financière de Genève.”
57 This rendered travel between Damascus and Beirut faster than travel between Beirut and the
modernity. In the years to come, other inland cities were connected to this railway line. Hama, Rayak, Baghdad and after 1902 the Istanbul-Mecca line all converged with the Beirut-Damascus line in Baramke, Damascus.

Parallel to the developments of the Beirut-Damascus railway, in June 1892, Edouard Coze – ever the rival of de Perthuis – undertook an extensive geographic and financial feasibility study of a coastal tramway between Tripoli and Sayda with Beirut as its centre point. The report designated Junieh, Jubayl and Batrun in the north and Furn al-Shubbak, Shiyyah, Khaldeh, Shuwayfat, Hadath and Damur in the south as relay stations.58 Rumours of the formation of this tramway company by Coze and the local Maronite merchant banker Dominique Khadra, immediately affected the property prices in the towns along the prospective tracks – in Junieh they jumped by one hundred per cent. But owing to strong opposition in the Administrative Council of Mount Lebanon, the line was forced to stop at Beirut’s provincial borders until the 1910s.

In sum, the workings of the logic of capitalist railway expansion which purported to serve the rational requirements of transport and communication between various parts of the region was also a strategy that served the dominant economic interest of European companies and local merchants. By the early twentieth century, to apply Lefebvre once more to Beirut, “contradictions [of capitalism] are no longer situated between town and country. The principal contradiction occurs and situates itself inside the urban phenomenon between the centre of [political] power and other forms of centrality, between the centres of wealth and the [inner-city] peripheries, between integration and segregation.”59 To these inner-urban forms of production of space we now turn.

58 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, 330, enclosure: report dated Beirut, July 23, 1892, entitled “Tramways Libanais; Etude statistique du Mouvement des Voyageurs et des Marchandises entre Saida, Beyrouth, Tripoli.” Despite the need for a land link between these cities, the development of this coastal tramway line face continuous legal difficulty. In 1896, the Porte refused permission to enter the territory of Mount Lebanon. See M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondance avec les Echelles, 1894-1911, Beirut, August 18, 1896. Instead, most traffic continued to be conducted by cabbotage companies which had a small fleet of boats along all the harbours of the eastern Mediterranean.
2.1.3. Big City Lights: The Gas and Electricity Company

The number of foreign residents in Beirut grew considerably during the 1890s. The population of the French ‘colony’ alone rose from 600 to 1,400 between 1891 and 1897.\textsuperscript{60} The main thrust of French colonial politics in Beirut and Mount Lebanon had been cultural in general and religious in particular. The educational policies of catholic Jesuit circles which addressed particularly the Maronite community had long constituted a most reliable avenue of French intervention.\textsuperscript{61} If this approach was never entirely abandoned, the dominant role of the Jesuits was superceded by a policy of supporting French economic investments in the entire region of \textit{Bilad al-Sham} relegating somewhat the primacy of the Christian Mount Lebanon in the French foreign ministry.\textsuperscript{62} But French, let alone foreign companies, were far from constituting a homogenous mass. In fact, foreigners struggled among themselves and often were bitter personal enemies with opposing colonial ideologies. Edmond Melchior Vicomte de Vogue, himself a leading advocate of French colonialism and connaisseur of Syria, once summed up this conflict up as polarised between “those of Notre Dame (Christian loyal, and backward looking), and those of the Eiffel Tower (Republican, anticlerical, and idealist, who willfully ignored the past).”\textsuperscript{63}

The engineer and technical director of the gas company, Eduard Coze, came close to the Eiffel tower stereotype. This resourceful engineer was the bitter enemy of Count de Perthuis whose increasing possessiveness of Beirut as his fiefdom and whose Orleanist tendencies and arrogant expatriate conservatism set him a world apart from French modernists such as the newly arrived, progressive, republican engineer Coze.\textsuperscript{64}

The concession to build a network of gas lighting in Beirut had been given to a foreigner back in December 1885. In January 1887, “la Societe anonyme ottomane du gaz de Beyrouth” was created and consisted of a seven-member board. Three board members were

\begin{footnotes}
\item[64] Ismaïl, \textit{Documents Diplomatiques}, Vol. 16, May 26, 1890, 18. He was the author of \textit{La Syrie et le Liban},
\end{footnotes}
also BIO executives, the company’s president and vice-president, the ubiquitous Charles Goguel and Théodore Berger, as well as the director of the BIO branch in Beirut, D. Stewart. Emile Coze represented “la société de gaz du Nord et de l’Est de la France” while Samson Jordan’s recommendation came from his executive post at the gas company of Marseille. In the early years, the only Ottoman member of the board was Musa de Frayj, merchant and municipal member in Beirut.65

The company quickly set about building a gas factory near the quarantine, a depot east of the main square, Sahat al-Burj, and some twenty miles of underground pipelines. By 1889 some 600 gas lamps were installed along the main streets and throughways of the city. Musa de Frayj announced with some pomp and circumstance his new position as local agent of this ‘enlightening’ company. On the occasion of the birth of his son in November 1889, he employed the latest gas lighting techniques to light up his ornate mansion in Zuqaq al-Blat – one of the finest and most conspicuous in the city – and created a veritable spectacle of light. For those excluded from this “luxuriant party” for some “250 guests from amongst the dhawat, a’yyan and kubur of our city” where “idle play was performed and reforms of the customs and morals and the revival of the city’s monuments was talked about”, Khalil Sarkis, de Freij’s neighbour, gave a guided tour in his Lisan al-Hal, similar to a celestial tower beaming gas lights and torches were glowing. The courtyard and the rooms were decorated with a variety of lights surrounded by aromatics and flowers.66

But, as with the port and railway companies, the early optimism quickly faded with the realisation that the income could not cover the expenses let alone generate profit. A week after staging his spectacle of light in Zuqaq al-Blat, Musa de Frayj met with Emile Coze and D. Stewart, to discuss ways to improve the company’s services and the payment of municipal arrears to the company with the municipal members, Bishara Araman and Muhi al-Din Hamada.67 In subsequent years, the gas company was unable to maintain even these standards. At a public hearing, the municipality complained that the light the gas company produced was too weak to light up the street and that at least 300 more lamp posts were

---

(Lyon: Etampes, 1922) and board member of a British-Egyptian trading company Thompson-Houston.
65 Musa de Frayj resigned in 1894 over an internal fall-out and proceeded to invest in coal exploitation near Sayda (s.a.). Thobie, Interêts Français, 321, fn. 84.
66 Lisan al-Hal, December 2, 1889.
needed.\textsuperscript{68} Over the next few years the company did install another one thousand lamps across the city, but tensions between the foreign investors and the municipality continued throughout the Ottoman period.

As with the previous investment companies in Beirut, the gas company saw no other way out of the crisis than to borrow money from the BIO. Between 1895 and 1903, the Beirut gas company was effectively run from the BIO head offices in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{69} Thus in the 1890s, the BIO assumed financial control over all French infrastructural investment projects. But in 1903, the gas company witnessed a significant change from the familiar pattern of BIO absorption. Ibrahim Sabbagh took over the company in a veritable financial coup. A Beirut banker and shareholder in both the BIO-controlled gas- and the railway companies, Sabbagh was also the president of the Ottoman Chamber of Commerce in Paris and executive member of a host of international banks.\textsuperscript{70} With the help of political allies in Istanbul, he took the BIO to court. He demanded a two million francs reimbursement for his stakes in the railway company on the pretext that the agreement was signed in Paris and not, as stipulated, in the Ottoman capital. The case was settled in Sabbagh’s favour and he received the BIO’s entire stock of gas company shares.\textsuperscript{71}

As the main shareholder in the company, Ibrahim Sabbagh dotted the company board with relatives and allies. Ibrahim’s brother Elias was made vice-president. His son Joseph, Nasrallah Misk, a brother-in-law, Albert Qashu‘ and Jirji Sursuq (replaced in 1909 by another Beirut merchant and banker in Istanbul, Jean Man’asha) all joined the executive board in the 1900s. Even the French members, Max Peter, Charles Blanc, and André Gautheron were close business associates of the Sabbaghs.

Until his death in 1909, Ibrahim Sabbagh was an extremely influential man in the political-economic triangle between Paris, Istanbul and Beirut. Just before his death, he and

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Ibid.}, December 16, 1889.
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{Thamarat al-Funun}, January 1, 1894.
\textsuperscript{69} M.A.E. Nantes, \textit{Consulat Beyrouth}, 330, Beirut, September 8, 1907. It obtained an extension of 35 years for the operation of the Beirut gas works.
his brother Elias took over the British-owned “Beirut Waterworks” which had supplied the city with water from the nearby Nahr al-Kalb since it bought the concession from the French capitalist Thévenin in 1871.\(^2\) Although the extent of his influence was exceptional, Sabbagh formed part of a growing group of Beiruti merchants who moved beyond the geographic boundaries of Eastern Mediterranean trade, and whose radius of activities can no longer be grasped in the familiar parameters of local merchants or urban notables to be discussed in the next chapter. Together with the Malhames who were involved in the next large-scale urban project for Beirut, the Sabbaghs constituted a new breed of what chapter four will be defined as supra-local notables.

2.1.4. Vehicles for the Mobilisation of Urban Space

On September 28 1905 the French journal *Stamboul* published an advertisement which must have raised eye brows in financial circles of Istanbul and Paris. A newly founded company, the “Société Anonyme Ottomane des Tramways et de l’Electricité de Beyrouth” tendered 20,000 shares at 100 francs each. The list of executive board members introduced the international world of finance to the Malhame family. Najib Pasha Malhame was named as the president, and his brothers, Philippe Effendi and Habib Effendi as well as Najib’s father-in-law Salim Ra’ad – the original concession holder – shared the board with old hats such as Victor Limoge, the vice president, and Eduard Denis, already executive member at the Beirut gas company.\(^3\)

The foundation of this new infrastructural investment company presents a new variation on the theme of a systematic European investment in the urban fabric of Beirut. As pashas and palace favorites, Salim and Najib Malhame had managed to place family members and loyal allies inside the Council of State. The main legislative body of the Ottoman state, the Council of State functioned as the arbitrator of provincial development projects. Investment projects from international companies depended on approval by the Council of State. Councillors of state thus became the investors’ best friends. In the 1900s, Philippe Malhame was appointed councillor of the state in the financial department where he

joined Salim Ra’ad, two Hashimite sharifs, and a number of retired high Ottoman bureaucrats. The novelty of the tramway project was that Salim Ra’ad passed his concession on to an in-law who founded and presided over the company himself before merging with the existing Beirut gas company at considerably more profit than Joseph Mutran’s sale of the railway concession as decade earlier. The Beiruti concession holders had become major international political and financial players in the quest for the ‘financial capitalisation’ of their city of origin.

The origins of the idea were probably the successful operation of the tramway of Tripoli initiated by Midhat Pasha in 1878. In Beirut action was only taken after the creation of the province of Beirut. In 1891, the provincial engineer Bishara Dib and the chief scribe of the Beirut municipality, Yusuf ‘Araman-Riashi asked the governor general, Isma’il Kemal Bey, to grant them a “tramway concession for the best suited throughways in the quarters of Beirut.” Despite the governor general’s approval, the plans evaporated between Istanbul and Beirut. Some fifteen years later, when Beirutis were much better placed at the sultan’s palace, an imperial concession was granted to Salim Effendi Ra’ad, a councillor of state at the Sublime Porte, Aleppine of origin but member of a wealthy Beiruti merchant family with considerable property in Beirut.

Salim Ra’ad immediately took two engineers, Jamolet and Jensen, to inspect the site and conduct a legal and practical feasibility study on Beirut. The engineer noted the difficult and uneven terrain, but figured that modern technology could overcome these problems. The prosperous business of horse-drawn cabs convinced them that there was a market for connecting the burgeoning outer-city quarters to the port and city centre. Although he estimated the construction costs in excess of twelve million francs, the project had every prospect of profit. The only problem they figured was the source of energy, whether to use water generation from the distant Nahr al-Kalb whose exploitation belonged to a British company, or through using coal, petrol or gas driven engines. The Malhames preferred a third option. They decided to expand their business into electric lighting for Beirut, an aggressive move against Sabbagh’s existing company that was probably a calculated

73 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, 330, “Stamboul” article enclosed.
74 Thamarat al-Funun, December 5, 1891; quoted in al-Wali, Bayrut, 186.
75 For example, the Khan Hani & Ra’ad.
76 P.R.O., FO. 195/2217, Beirut, September 11, 1905.
confrontation to up the price for an eventual take-over. Expectedly, their proposition to tie up
the tramway with an electric lighting venture was contested by the existing gas company
when the Sabbaghs launched a legal offensive claiming contravention of the stipulations of
their concession.\textsuperscript{77}

In court, it was decided that the letter of the existing gas concession did not prevent a
second energy venture in Beirut such as that of the Malhame clan. The speculation of driving
up the value of the company up worked. The existing gas and electricity company formed an
auxiliary company which was forced to buy out the Malhames and in-laws for the
considerable sum of one million French francs in March 1907.\textsuperscript{78} The Ottoman minister of
public works obliged the shareholders and the BIO to deal with the technological and
financial tasks of the project within three months. In return for a 99-year concession that was
granted half way through the construction in 1908, the Ottoman minister of public works
obliged to pay the municipality some 6,000 Napoleons (c. 6,000 lira) for the necessary
property expropriations and loans for street widening.\textsuperscript{79}

After an enthusiastic start, the works slowed down due to growing “prevarication” –
as the French consul called it – by the municipal members and the Beirut newspapers “that
have captured public opinion”.\textsuperscript{80} In fact, the population as a whole was discontented. The
expropriation loans turned out to be far from sufficient for the municipality to finance the
reparations for those inhabitants affected by the necessary destruction work. It became
necessary for the provincial council to intercede and write a memorandum to the ministry of
public works that pointed out the misfortunes that had befallen the city of Beirut at the hands
of ill-conducted engineering work. Ever the voice of the city, \textit{Lisan al-Hal} covered the
conflict in its local news section and argued that the root problem lay with the formulation of
the concession itself:

The provincial authorities have designated a commission of notables to examine the
negative effect of the Tramway lines on the inhabitants and passers-by. A petition signed
by 7,000 people of the town demanded that the provincial authorities deal with the
dangers which may result in the installation of this form of traffic, especially on double

\textsuperscript{77}M.A.E. Nantes, \textit{Consulat Beyrouth}, 330, Beirut, September 8, 1907.
\textsuperscript{78} P.R.O., FO, 195/2217, “Quarterly Report,” Beirut, August 10, 1906.
\textsuperscript{79} M.A.E., Paris, \textit{Nouvelle Série, Supplément, Turquie, Syrie-Liban}, Vol 46, (1902-1907), Beirut,
September 19, 1907.
\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Consulat Beyrouth}, 330, Beirut, November 18, 1908.
tracked streets and the narrow streets where walking is seriously impaired and a source of unforeseen dangers. ...

We have been wondering when the trenches and the banking on both sides of the tramway will be completed and whether the carriages will start running this season. We are worried that the stipulations of the company are too vague and that the inconsiderate conduct of the company regarding street enlargement and paving on both sides of the tracks remains unaddressed. It must be made clear that the company has the right to exploit the concession [as long as it is] based on these two conditions.81

The Tramway, whose construction had been inaugurated amidst great pomp on Abdulhamid’s birthday on September 1, 1907, was opened to the public only fifteen months later. The initial problems had been laid to rest and many streets had been aligned, paved and widened alongside the rails. Five lines were opened. One connected the pine forest, through the quarters of Bashura, Ra’s al-Naba’ past the military hospital with Khan Fakhri Bey in front of the port. Another ran from the lighthouse in Ras Beirut to the port. A third offered a fast way around the old city centre by running along the traces of the old city walls to distant Furn al-Shubbak. The fourth line ran from behind the Petit Serail through the old town to the former Bab Idriss and linked up there to the third line. The fifth line passed from Sahat al-Burj through the ‘aristocratic’ Christian quarters of Mudawwar and Rumayl to Beirut river.82

The tramway had far-reaching consequences for those outlying quarters and quasi-rural hamlets that it connected to the city centre. At the same time, that city centre was fast turning into “the old part of the town, which was a labyrinth of dark narrow alleys habitated by poor Muslims” encircled by modern transport.83 To the outskirts of Beirut the tramway produced what the port and the railway did to the city as a whole: it galvanized urban development along its tracks analogous to the way the port and the railway fixed international and regional trade to the city.84 When in the 1910s, Coze’s long-planned Tramway Libanais between Beirut and Sayda began to operate its regional network, the link it created between the villages of Sin al-Fil,85 Furn al-Shubak, Shiyah and Sahat al-Sur on the edge of the city centre played a catalyst role in the development of these settlements.

81 Ibid., July 9, 1907, enclosure: translation of undated Lisan al-Hal article.
82 PRO, FO, 195/2245, Beirut, September 19, 1907.
83 PRO, FO, 195/1761, Beirut, August 2, 1892.
84 Robert Ilbert observed similar effects of the tramway for Alexandria. See his Alexandrie, 1830-1930, (Cairo, 1996).
As urban-rural boundaries of physical geography became blurred – or, rather, came to be defined by vicinity to a tramway station – the gap between urban and rural self-perception widened. The advent of modern infra-structural technologies accelerated the exodus from the city centre to the outlying quarters during the provincial capital period of Beirut. For the wealthy merchants, the city centre and the port area became the place of work while the new quarters on the terraces around the centre became the places of residence.  

The tramway and the extra-mural construction boom also attracted land speculators from abroad. News of the construction of the tramway lines reached Cairo and in 1906 a British development company sent Wilcocks, a chief engineer of the first Aswan dam, to study the terrain. He identified “an area of vast sand dunes called al-Jinah” as the most profitable investment site on account of its location on the borderline which separates the territory of Mount Lebanon and the province of Beirut. Legally in the mountain district of Matn-Sahil, some of the plots of the area belonged to “rich personages” of Beirut. Wilcocks speculated that Beirut’s vast expansion was to push up land prices in this area where land was still cheap in the foreseeable future. His proposal for apartment blocks for Beirutis who would take advantage of the connecting tramway and the security of the area compared to the bustling city was taken up by the Cairo-based, Anglo-Belgian “Entreprise and Development company. But attempts at land purchases appear to have been thwarted by the ruling of Ottoman Land Law that emiriyya land (state-owned property) represented part of “local heritage that could not be sold en blocque to isolated investment companies.”

86 For this process, see May Davie, Beyrouth et ses Faubourgs (1840-1940): une Intégration Inachevée, (Beirut, 1996). The old part of town was to be erased by Michel Echouchard’s Etoile master plan in the 1930. See also Maha Yahya’s work in progress. In personal interviews, Myriam Da’aq and the late Malek Salam have confirmed this trend for the quarters of Musaytbeh and Ras Bayrut in late Ottoman times. Both, the Da’uqs and the Salams had their business offices in Suq Tawile, notably a bazaar area newly constructed in the 1880s between the ‘old town’ and the port.

87 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondance avec les echelles, 1894-1911, Beirut, January 7, 1907. On fin de siècle Beirut little information on the link between infra-structural development and land speculation exists. On the Jinah project, the British consul general reported that “The climate and air of this site is extremely good and water exists in abundance. The Anglo-Egyptian Land Allotment Company was to have come to an agreement with [Jacques] Tabet on sales operations at 20 paras per dirah. After allotting with liberal allowances for struts[?] spaces he was to fix the sale price at three piastres per dirah. The company was then to build houses according to the plans of their future owners, upon payment by them of 25% of the cost, the remaining 75% to be paid in installments for 20 years after which the complete ownership of the house would revert to the owner. The electric tramway would afford easy assess and communication.” PRO, FO/195/2217, “Quarterly Report, 10/8/1906.
On the edge of the ‘old city’, Sahat al-Sur and Sahat al-Burj became the main two traffic centres.\textsuperscript{88} For a two-to-three-hour journey from Beirut river, close to the eastern city border to Mount Lebanon, to the lighthouse in Ras Beirut the passengers would have to change lines on Sahat al-Sur. Inner city distances were passed more quickly and demanded less effort. Moreover, at least in theory, the introduction of scheduled transport service regulated the organisation of time in Beirut more rigidly. In practice, however, the system of time tables and stops was undermined by passengers who stopped the carriages midway and forced them to wait for them to embark and disembark. The new dimensions of geographical mobility of Beirut’s population caused considerable strains on public security in Beirut. For some older Beirutis the tramway gained the epithet satan’s wheels – “Dullab al-Shaytan.”\textsuperscript{89}

But superstition was much less the root cause of the anxiety of Beirutis than tangible unrest along the tramway tracks. There were incidents of high-jacking carriages and boycotts by passengers in the Mudawwar quarter and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{90} Occasionally, tramway passengers molested the passing pedestrians, or a passing tramway which consisted of one or two carriages – separated for women and men – was attacked by agitated coffee house guests along the lines.\textsuperscript{91} The tramway became a constant source of conflict over access to modern amenities. The French consul cabled an exasperated report to Paris in 1910 complaining that “for some time now, disputes and riots occur on the electric tramway in Beirut …. I myself have seen a passenger who was thrown out of the carriage for refusing to pay for his seat run after the tramway firing revolver shots.”\textsuperscript{92} Such incidences clearly threatened the technological achievement as much as urban security in general. They generated heavy criticism against the local police force and, indeed, led to a doubling of policemen to fifty officers.\textsuperscript{93} The very bourgeois order the tramway had heralded, appeared constantly under threat by malicious acts of deviance from that order and contributed to the general sense of unease amongst the well-to-do of Beirut.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{88} For a comparison of both squares, see Chapter 6.5.
\textsuperscript{89} al-Wali, \textit{Bayrut}, 187.
\textsuperscript{90} M.A.E., Nantes, \textit{Consulat Beyrouth} 253, 1905-1914, undated enclosure, “Rapport adressé à la direction par le service de l’exploitation des Tramway Libanais” [1908].
\textsuperscript{91} al-Wali, \textit{Bayrut}, 187.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} This aspect runs through the following chapters and is specifically addressed in the last chapter.
The tramway did indeed become an arena as well as an instrument of mobilising labour and of public protest. Soon the tramway became such a popular means of transportation in Beirut that the guild of coachers who until then had conducted the mainstay of public transportation in Beirut began to mobilise resistance against their new rivals.95 A decision in 1909 by the company to raise the fare was received by an organised boycott of passengers. Those Beirutis who chose to ignore the boycott were jeered by the crowd.96 Such popular unrest and civil disobedience also signified resistance against a sense of intrusion into the people’s organisation of private life by external agencies. Some families who happened to live on the tramway line suddenly found themselves exposed to journeying crowds, and as a passive form of protest against the imposition of an external rhythm by the tramway moved out of their houses towards infrastructurally more remote areas of the city.97

The everyday life of the city of Beirut was beginning to be shaped by its modern infrastructural investments. Until 1888, the municipality of Beirut and Ottoman authorities had struggled to optimise the port facilities for the city centre. With capitalist urbanisation, commerce, transport and communication was produced around and even against the original centre. The centre continued to exist as a place of small-scale commerce and dwelling, but that place was perceived of more as an obstacle to, rather than an object of, urban improvement. Wealthy merchants moved their offices to the edge of the city centre where new, aligned bazaars were being built. At the same time they moved their residences to the new, spacious quarters overlooking the city centre and the Beirut bay.

2.2. Challenging the ‘Financial Capitalisation’ of Beirut: “On the Waterfront” and Other Instances of Industrial Action

Space is fundamental in any exercise of power.98

The weak financial structure of international investment companies may account for their harsh bargaining course against the municipality and the harsh working conditions it imposed on its labour force. In both respects the executive board had the powerful support of

95 al-Wali, Bayrut, 188.
96 Ibid.
97 Ibid., 187.
98 Michel Foucault, “Questions of Geography,” in Power and Knowledge, Selected Interviews and other
the Quai d'Orsay. When the municipality took the gas company to court over the way it operated in Beirut, its board members went on the offensive and appealed to the French foreign minister to protect the interests of the company against what they considered the "brutal fashion" of the municipality's refusal to fulfill its obligations towards the company.

The municipality is obliged to provide, as its part of the agreement, the material, the provisioning, the workshops. It never used to protest before the transfer of the company. If the demands of the municipality are heeded, French capital is seriously at risk. You have to protect our interests against the municipality, to use all your power and legal and official representations by virtue of the prerogatives accorded by the capitulation regime.99

Although Beirut's courts judged against the gas and electricity company in this case, the municipality came under increasing pressure to bow to the exigencies of capitalist interests. But the international companies themselves faced mounting discontent from their European and local shareholders to declare dividends. The highly speculative nature of the public works projects that developed after the 'political capitalisation' of Beirut left both the municipality and the companies virtually paralysed. Capitalist intervention in Beirut's urban fabric was powerful but not triumphant. The urbanisation of Beirut after 1888 through infrastructural investment companies that developed key urban services such as transport, water and electricity also created its own forces of opposition.100

2.2.1. On the Waterfront

On the morning of June 18, 1893, Captain Phalix and his crew were in for a shock when they steered their richly-laden Messagiers Maritimes vessel, the "Yang Tse", into Beirut harbour. The new port was still not fully operational, but the "Yang Tse" was poised to enter the annals of the port company as the first ship to enjoy the services of the new customs office and the new haulage services of MM Estier et Frères, a Marseille-based subcontractor that de Perthuis had employed to improve the efficiency standards of his

---

100 No work of social history on Beirut or the Levant to date has mentioned the strikes. See, for example, Abdallah Hanna, *al-haraka al-‘ummaliyya fi Suriyya wa-Lubnan, 1900-1945*, (Damascus, 1973).
company. The company director seemed to have anticipated trouble but the chief of police rebuffed his request for an escort.\footnote{M.A.E., Paris, 
_Turquie-Beyrouth, Vol. 37 (1892-1893),_ Beirut, July 8, 1893.}

When a boat of Estier et Frères set out to unload the merchandise of the ship several hundreds of the local port workers took it as a signal for a synchronised, armed invasion of the French-held offices at the customs and the approaching ship. The furious protestors destroyed the furniture of the offices and threw the merchandise over board. Captain Phalix made for the port where the police finally intervened but could do little to quell the anger of the port workers. Instead the hapless captain was arrested and brought to the serail prison where he was to remain on charges of threatening the port workers with his pistol.\footnote{Ibid.}

Captain Phalix had become the unaware victim of a simmering conflict between the local authorities and the director of the port company that had grown intense in the run-up to the opening of the new port facilities. De Perthuis had incurred the wrath of a humiliated municipality when the new customs regime closed a small pier for regional and local boats which effectively deprived the municipal budget of revenues accrued from minor quantities of merchandise.\footnote{PRO, FO, 195/1683, Beirut, May 24, 1890.} In another act of managerial streamlining in May 1893, the efficient and generally liked head of Beirut customs, Vefik Bey, a son-in-law of the late Midhat Pasha, was sacked and replaced by a less experienced Ottoman official. His surprising dismissal generated speculations that de Perthuis’ middlemen in the capital had discredited him because of his criticism against the port company’s French ownership, the increased tariffs and the port workers’ pay which by 1907 was at \(\frac{3}{4}\) mecbidiye (3 fr 20c) per day.\footnote{PRO, FO, 195/1801, Beirut, May 18, 1893.}

The port company had also replaced local labour with that of other coastal towns in the Levant.\footnote{PRO, FO, 195/2245, Beirut, July 11, 1893.} These new migrant workers were probably more economically desperate than professionally qualified and had no choice but to subject to the depersonalising rules of conduct the company imposed on them. The sinister article 14 of the "Règlement du Port et des Quais de Beyrouth", for example, reads like the manuals of modern institutions that so mark Foucault’s work and determined their exact working order and behaviour:

"The port workers carrying out the transport of merchandise are to be lined in a row along the jetty. … They have to align themselves, one against the other, perpendicular to
the jetty in two rows if there is room; but in a way so as not to obstruct the circulation of goods. Disobedience will be punished with half a lira.\(^{106}\)

Unable and unqualified to exercise any other work, the local port workers who – unlike the imported labour – were organised in two guilds - the lighters and the porters - turned to the governor general for help.\(^{107}\) Khalid Bey rendered his full support to the cause of both the lighters and the porters and was prepared to risk his post.\(^{108}\) Khalid Bey justified his confrontation with de Perthuis by insisting that the council of state’s ruling of opening tender to workers applied only to local- and not to imported labour. He insisted the port company should not compete with the existing port workers’ guilds. In mid-June, he urged de Perthuis to reemploy all those porters who had worked under the previous customs regime in his company. It was after de Perthuis’ categorical refusal that the port workers attacked the unsuspecting crew members of the Yang Tse.

Supported by the governor general who demanded that the customs office allow all unemployed porters to enter its premises, an angry crowd occupied the port buildings shouting at the company: “You are not in France here, you are in Turkey. You are not the masters.”\(^{109}\) Commerce in the port of Beirut came to a halt. De Perthuis complained vehemently to the governor general against what he considered “acts of piracy” and against Khalid Bey’s irresponsible tolerance. But the governor general’s protection of the port workers earned him the backing of the sultan who had been visited by the port workers’ representative Fadlallah Bey Sayyur, a Greek Orthodox notable and agent of the Khedival lines. The sultan was persuaded and decreed that the port workers be reemployed by the port company.\(^{110}\)

New tariffs on anchorage and mooring, imposed by the port company and ratified by the council of state in Istanbul, had incensed local and foreign merchants alike. They forged an unlikely alliance of purpose with the strikers although – according to usually snobbish

\(^{106}\) M.A.E., Nantes, _Consulat Beyrouth_, carton 313 (1882-1912), undated enclosure.

\(^{107}\) In comparison to the port workers guilds in Istanbul and Egypt, the sources available on Beirut shed light little light on the numbers and organisation involved. One head of porterage was called al-Sayyid Sha’ban another was possibly Ahmad ‘Abd al-‘Al. Scattered British consular reports speak of a total of 400 hundred, mainly Muslim porters (possibly former Druze fishermen from nearby Ayn Mreisse), but also mention Maronites working in the port.


\(^{109}\) Ibid.

language of the British consul general – the latter “belong to the lower classes, blacksmiths, boatmen, porters, smugglers, port loafers, not to mention the scum and riffraff which are always to be found in seaports of the Levant.”\textsuperscript{111} When the port company started collecting higher taxes a year later the Beirut merchants took part of their goods – sugar, rice, and coffee – to Tripoli and Haifa.\textsuperscript{112} This de facto boycott of the port brought de Perthuis in conflict with his subcontractors, Estier et Frères. De Perthuis had lured them to Beirut promising them the lucrative business of a monopoly on loading and unloading. The opposition from the local authorities, the merchants and the guilds forced the company to leave Beirut after only a few lack-lustre months.\textsuperscript{113}

The port workers won an important victory through the backing of the Ottoman authorities and local merchants. But the British consul already anticipated in 1894 that once Beirut became \textit{tête de la ligne} of the railway line, the merchants would be forced to take their business back to Beirut. And, indeed, when the Beirut-Damascus railway opened its services, the embattled port company found the long awaited relief. De Perthuis may have been made to retire from active office by his financiers and the railway company was to run long years of losses but the port-railway combination saved the day for both works in the long run. At the same time, the leverage and margin of local protest against the effects of the infrastructural projects lay precisely in the immovability – or, in Harvey’s terminology, “the spatial fix” – of these capitalist projects.\textsuperscript{114} In contrast to trade based on free exchange of commodities, which was characteristically a much more ‘promiscuous’ business, the physical fixity of a port or a railway tied financial capital hook or crook to the city it was invested in. As long as the state was unwilling to surrender to the demands of finance capital, this would give some protection to the rights and job security of the workers.

Labour protests grew louder and more violent again after Abdulhamid II was ousted in 1908-9. Despite the different circumstances, the demands of the workers were very similar to the ones of the 1890s. In 1908, however, industrial action in Beirut had the support of a number of local journalists, some of whom had probably joined the recent, clandestine

\textsuperscript{111} P.R.O., \textit{FO}, 195/2140, Beirut, September 7, 1903.
\textsuperscript{114} David Harvey, \textit{The Limits to Capital}, (Oxford, 1982).
The workers knew how to use the medium of the newspaper to advance their aims. While the newspapers in Beirut were largely silent on the strike action in the 1890s, in the direct aftermath of the April revolution in Istanbul, the journalists came out in strong support for the workers’ cause.

In a public address to the governor general, the port workers appealed to Ottoman law to prevent their “eradication.” They published their complaints in Arabic and in French in al-\textit{Ayyam}:

\begin{quote}
We, the undersigned, Ottoman boatmen of Beirut have the honour to expose the following: 
The company of quays and warehouses of Beirut whose resources and powers are ever increasing is in a position to transform the slightest desire into reality. We unfortunate workers who earn just enough not to let our large families die of starvation are unable to defend ourselves. … A good number of us were arrested and thrown into prison and others had their boats confiscated and thrown out of the port to the open sea where they are exposed to great dangers. But all this is not enough. They have mobilised gangs who threaten to shoot at anyone who tries to salvage their belongings on the port premises. Such acts of aggression are far from approved by our laws and all principles of government condemn them. It is directed purely at eradicating us. …

As a consequence, we declare that if we do not obtain guarantees for our people and our rights and if the arbitrariness of the company is not put to a stop, we find ourselves obliged to defend ourselves to ensure the subsistence of our families who consist of over 20,000 people and to take all measures the law offers us to address higher places [in Istanbul].\footnote{116}
\end{quote}

The workers were using their growing number – 20,000 men, women and children – show the justice of their cause and to threaten the companies. In August 1908, they were joined by their comrades in the railway- and gas companies.\footnote{117} After the proclamation of the constitution, the port workers renewed their claims by adopting the very language of universal principles enshrined in the Ottoman constitution. Apart from previous demands for a pay rise, “with a violence unknown before” the strikers now refused to be made redundant based on age, rejected all outside interference in the operation of their guilds and “claimed the right to designate their own successors from amongst their family.” Moreover they now categorically objected to “the legitimacy of their foreman’s punishment.” Encouraged by the


\footnote{116 M.A.E., Nantes, \textit{Consulat Beyrouth}, 313, 1882-1912, undated enclosure.}
news that port workers in Istanbul, Izmir and Salonika had also gone on strike. The Beiruti strikers "appealed to the patriotism of the Beirutis to support them in their struggle against the increasing intervention of foreign elements in the affairs of the city." In *al-Ahwal*, they published the following statement:

The port workers of the customs office
In the name of justice and liberty... We have inherited our work from father to son. It has become ours over generations. Owing to lack of other knowledge we have no other way of earning our daily bread. Now we have fallen under the yoke of the port company. Ottoman in name but actually French and this in spite of us and the local merchants. The ways in which the company has obtained this concession are well known! We have suffered much: through the extra work we were forced to do, through the paucity of porters, and finally through the mediocrity of our salaries and the unbearable arbitrariness we are subjected to.

We are tired of this state of affairs, tired by our own complaints and our cries which we voice without ever being heard -- the reason is well-known!

Today, when the word liberty reverberates throughout the world, do our comrades have the good fortune to obtain something of this liberty? Encouraged by the apparent success of the port workers strike, the gas workers, too, staged a strike on October 2, 1908. They elected Mika'il Ghobril and Elias Trad, both Greek Orthodox members of the Ottoman commercial court, and involved in the Beirut Reform Committee in 1913, one Ahmad 'Abd al-'Al, and the company's engineer Elie Qaykanu, as their representatives to negotiate their demands. Their opening positions were a 50% increase in salary, a thirteenth salary payment at the end of the year and a bi-annual adjustment for inflation of 10%, cumulative 15 days holiday and rest days after nightwork, free medical care and continued payment three and a half months into the illness, payment of pensions identical to the railway workers, job security granted by law, ten-hour working days with double salary for extra hours, nightwork and on holidays, and a company loan scheme.

---

118 Ibid., enclosed letter to Istanbul, dated Beirut, August 17, 1908.
119 Ibid., enclosed *al-Ahwal*, August 12, 1908.
120 Ibrahim and 'Uthman 'Abd al-'Al, probably his brothers, were involved in a number of instances of street violence and "distinguished themselves by their courage" (Zaydan 146). In 1887 'Uthman was knived by a Maronite in a café in a smuggling brawl. See M.A.E., Paris, *Correspondance avec les Echelles*, 1886-88, 1887. 'Uthman, grandson of an Algerian, was "une espece de colosse chef de contrabandiers, M.A.E., Paris, *Correspondance Politique Consulaire, Turquie-Beyrouth*, Vol. 30, Beirut, March 2, 1887.
121 Isma'il, Vol. 18, 110-116; and Thobie, "Mouvement d'Affaires," 149.
They also demanded a replacement of the chief of staff in the city depot in the Qarantina factory.122

After four days of strikes that left the city dark at night, the general director of the gas and electricity company was willing to enter into negotiations. In a meeting with workers’ representatives he offered 20% increase for those whose salary was below 201 francs per month and conceded to those operating in the city on most other issues but refused to make concessions to those in production in the factory.

After the Young Turk revolution, the port workers lost their omnipotent ally, sultan Abdülhamid II, who had protected their rights in previous conflicts. The point here is not to argue that Abdülhamid was a socialistic sultan – in a playful mockery of his tag as “the red sultan.” In fact, at the end of his rule, in 1907 the Ottoman sultan issued a decree in favour of the foreign port companies in the empire.123 If he had supported the workers cause in Beirut and elsewhere in his domain, it was out of paternalist attitudes towards his Ottoman ‘flock’. The sultan’s legitimacy, based as Deringil argues on “the preservation of the state”124, had to be negotiated, as it was at stake both in the diplomatic and the domestic arenas. The local notables who traveled to Istanbul to represent the workers cause were acutely aware of this and played on it. Sultan Abdülhamid II did provide a last resort to a class of Ottoman subjects who, without his support, were exposed to the dictates of foreign companies, the ministry of commerce and public works and the council of state both institutions where members with financial stakes were represented.

By way of contrast to the paternalistic rule of Abdülhamid, the officers of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) had less personal indulgence for the fate of a few thousand workers who were seen as threatening precisely that Ottoman union and progress. In September 1908, the new Young Turk minister of public works outlawed all strike activities and trade unionism by workers employed in public service companies. The

language and the thinking behind the new (anti-) labour attitude of the Young Turk government is carried in an Istanbul newspaper article entitled “Contre les Grèves”:

I [the minister of commerce and public works, Gabriel Effendi] have the honour to inform you that for quite some time now, in perverse intentions and aims, [Ottoman] company employees and workers exposed to the excitations of certain individuals with absurd visions, raising superfluous and absurd claims, go on strike and, using force and violent means against those who do not associate themselves with their intentions and who want to continue working, inflict suffering on commerce and public security as well as to the financial creditors and the political situation of the entire Ottoman Empire.125

Strikes were never entirely rooted out, contrary to what Hanna has suggested.126 Between 1910 and 1914, numerous reports of industrial action by the Beirut workforce reached the European foreign ministries and again distinguished local lawyers and negotiators supported the strikers’ demands. Following the 1909 law, the CUP moved to protect more rigorously the interests of the European investment companies and – as Hanna has shown – abandoned the previous government’s concern for the Ottoman workers. At a more fundamental level, two notions of the production of space clashed: “projected space versus inherited space.”

As soon as internal and international evolution make it necessary, capitalist development assigns the state the role of controlling and encouraging the establishment of a new inter-regional division of labour. This ‘projected space’ comes into more or less violent conflict with ‘inherited space’. State intervention must therefore take the form of organising the substitution of projected for present space.”127

Conclusion

Lewis Farley, the lonely BIO accountant whom we have introduced in chapter one as the harbinger – or siren – of capitalist investment, would have felt vindicated at the end of the nineteenth century, had he not been forced to return to London in 1858. Not only did his successors push the ‘financial capitalisation’ he had called for in his memoirs, but also the BIO held a major share in all of Beirut’s capital investments.

126 Ibid., 19.
What of the Beirutis who had relentlessly petitioned for making their city a provincial capital? The way the Beirutis were “place making”\textsuperscript{128} – related to their city, struggled for a provincial capital and attempted to consolidate their city’s status and economic capacities under increasing pressures from encroaching investors and creeping colonialism – was arguably the single most important factor shaping the particular trajectory of Beirut in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. In this process, having an Ottoman governor general ‘at home’, so to speak, helped to avert becoming a ‘colonial bridgehead’ whose destiny was determined elsewhere.

What of industrial action by Beirut’s workforce and guilds? The Beirut port workers’ strike happened almost exactly a year to the day before the dockers of Istanbul went on strike.\textsuperscript{129} As in Istanbul, the casus belli was the arrival of one of the first ships after the new port regime was introduced. It signaled to the protestors the encroachment of an international company on the workers’ livelihood in the name of modernising port facilities. Although Quataert argues that in the Istanbul case, the struggle “contributed to the erosion of popular support for the government of sultan Abdülhamid II,” in the provincial capital the support of the sultan for the strikers made him a popular figure a year earlier. And while, like in Istanbul, the successful strike of 1893 in Beirut halted trade activity and thereby threatened the interests of finance capital, it far from “checked the commercial revival of the capital city.”\textsuperscript{130} The local merchants’ leverage to boycott the port company and temporarily take their trade to the inferior ports of Tripoli and Haifa consolidated – at least for the duration of the Hamidian regime – the local agency of merchants and port workers vis-à-vis the logic of finance capital.

Zachary Lockman and Joel Benin have made an appealing case for the formation of, and link between, working class- and nationalist consciousness as manifested in similar industrial action in Egypt.\textsuperscript{131} In Beirut of 1908-9, too, there was a strong sentiment against foreign investment companies expressed by the workers and – arguably with different...

\textsuperscript{128} The term is borrowed from Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson (eds.), *Culture, Power, Place, Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, (Duke, 1996), 6. Many contributions to this study focus on urban migrants, refugees and transnational communities. It is also relevant to this and the next chapter’s underlying theme that Beirut was not only a city of migrants but that these migrants became rooted very quickly and were instrumental in defending the city.

\textsuperscript{129} Quataert, *Social Disintegration*, 97.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 95.

\textsuperscript{131} Zachary Lockmann and Joel Benin, *Workers on the Nile: Nationalism, Communism, Islam, and the
motives – a considerable number of local merchants which was carried by certain journalists and a small group of early socialists.

For Beirut we lack any historical evidence confirming Lockman's and Benin's Althusserian thesis that “location in the system of production determines the range of courses of action and perspectives likely to be adopted by individuals who share the same objective relationship to the means of production”. But to search for and identify a coherent movement that approximates a constructed Western ideal-type of class relations ultimately amounts to denial of wage workers' historical subjectivity. It obscures a host of alternative motivations and cognitive processes in human protest as it is inevitably based on the assumption that only when these a priori categories are matched is the legitimacy of protest accorded and the right to historical recording granted.

The way the Beiruti workers expressed their grievances and the way sympathetic journalists structured their narrative on the pages of their newspapers, very much echoed the Beiruti notables’ struggle for the making of a provincial capital. The workers demanded “the right to the city” at the point in time when their social space was threatened. The city space of Beirut generated unified struggle for its regional ascendancy, but that space also began to generate physical and social boundaries inside the city itself. The effects of the tramway traced here were only one aspect of the development of socially differentiated, urban consciousness that related to access to urban, social space rather than to modes of production per se.

In the particular development of fin de siècle Beirut, actual class consciousness did not chrysalize through major social and political conflict and upheaval over access to means of production as Lockman and Benin argue for Egypt. Rather, in the relative political stability of late nineteenth-century Beirut, social consciousness was produced in incremental processes of urban reform that identified and ‘othered’ certain social spaces as miasmic and certain everyday practices as immoral. It is in these more subtle intra-urban, centre-periphery relations that we will now locate social differentiation along class lines. The strikers argued that the way of life which had characterized them for generations “from father to son” was


Ibid., 4.

Herein lies Lefebvre’s spatialist critique of the same structuralist Marxism that Lockman and Benin espoused. To Lefebvre, the Althusserian approach prioritises the transformative power of historical time
being undermined. These were not, it would appear. Marxist or nationalist statements of an objectively-measurable consciousness, but based on the defence of – and injustice committed against – their habitus and their social space.

and reduces space to a static obstacle preventing social change.
PART II: Urban Institutions and Notables between Beirut and Istanbul
Chapter 3: The Real-and-Imagined City: The Making of Municipal Beirut

Introduction

The establishment of the Beirut municipality after the civil war in Mount Lebanon of 1860 predated other municipalities in the Ottoman Empire. In Beirut as elsewhere, it was an ‘amphibious’ institution where quests for regulating a distinctly urban experience of modernity were played out between imperial and local domains. Far from constituting alien, western bodies of governance which were considered institutional failures, the Beirut municipality stood at the centre of public attention. Its day-to-day work was closely monitored by the local newspapers. They frequently published municipal announcements, but also criticised the institution when it was perceived to fail to live up to its legal and ideal mandate. In particular, the editors of Hadigat al-Akhbar, Thamarat al-Funun and Lisan al-Hal, Khalil al-Khuri, Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani and Khalil Sarkis respectively were powerful opinion makers. As such the Beirut newspapers are presented not as neutral founts of historical information but as active agents in the process of shaping the urban landscape and experience thereof.

The Imperial, Legal-Normative Framework of the Provincial Municipalities

The 1864 provincial law officially applied the model municipality from Istanbul to the provincial cities and towns of the empire - “her köy bir belediye dairesi sayılır.” While the 1864 law was more a declaration of intent, the 1867 law fine-tuned the workings of the municipality in a detailed fashion. These stipulations were reviewed and amended in 1877. The legally consecrated norms of the belediye qanunu became the overriding points of reference for the provincial, urban populations after the new and more comprehensive Municipal Law was ratified by the Ottoman Parliament on October 5, 1877. This law was

---


2 For brief biographies on these opinion makers, see the Annex.

3 “Each village shall have a municipality”, quoted in Ilber Ortayli, Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli Idaresi (1840-1878), (Ankara, 1974), 166.
translated into Arabic by Nawfal Efendi Na’matallah Nawfal and published in full length in Beirut’s press. The new Municipal Law excluded foreigners from membership on the council. It applied empire-wide to every city (şehir) and small town (kasaba). Cities exceeding a male and female population of 40,000 were to establish two municipal councils, as was attempted in Damascus on a number of occasions. Moreover, the municipalities were assigned clearly defined – if indiscriminately enumerated - duties which can be arranged into five categories:

1. Urban planning

   Public utilities, buildings and urban regulation took up most space in the first chapter of the law. It included the construction of all buildings and the enlargement and arrangement of all streets and throughways, pavements and sewers. The municipality was to maintain the urban water supply systems against a fee levied on residents. In the name of public utility the municipality was empowered to demolish and expropriate buildings. It was responsible for reimbursing property losses incurred by such measures. It was accountable for the maintenance of municipal buildings for urban embellishment and street-lighting. It was to conduct population and property censuses, and assess property values. The municipality was to find ways to enlarge ports, create open spaces and public gardens, to facilitate public transport and to establish and improve the bazaars “in appropriate places”.

2. Market control

   Article one of the law ends with the statement “the municipality takes over the affairs of the guilds (esnaf)”. Thus, the municipality formally took over many of the mechanisms of market control that had been the reserve of the guilds. The municipality was charged with
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4 For the original text of the 1877 “Belediye Qanunu”, see BBA, YEE, 37/302/47-112 (1293h).
5 al-Jinan 9 (1878), 44-8, 93-7, 131-134 and Thamarat al-Funun, on January 14, 1878. Na’matallah Nawfal was the official translator of the Ottoman constitution. Al-dustur, Beirut, 1883-4 [1301h]. Both Nawfal and Jirji Naqqash were awarded medals and money (300 lira) by the Porte for their services.
6 For the implementation of urban planning directives in Beirut, see Chapter 5 of this thesis.
7 The work of Gabriel Baer and Haim Gerber on guilds in the Middle East has been especially influential. See for example Baer’s “The Administrative, Economic and Social Functions of Turkish Guilds,” IJMES 1 (1970), 28-49 and Gerber’s “The guilds and Customary Law,” in his State, Society and Law in Islam, Ottoman Law in Comparative Perspective, (New York, 1994). See also Pascale Ghazaleh, “The Guilds between Tradition and Modernity,” in The State and its Servants, edited by Nelly Hanna, (Cairo, 1995), 60-74. Recently John Charcraft has challenged the conventional notion of the decline of the guilds by the forces of centralisation and modernization. See, for example, his “The Cab driver Strike in Cairo of 1907”
setting tariffs for rental coaches. It had the mandate to inspect the condition of animals and carriages and their proper parking. It was responsible to ensure that the local ships and building structures of port, as well as the conduct of the sailors and the number of passengers are regulated. An important aspect of market control was the supervision of weights and measures, the proper ingredients and especially the pricing of bread and meat.

3. Health

The municipality was responsible for maintaining the health standards of food preparation and punish heavily the sale of meat from sick animals. It was mandated to move slaughter houses to appropriate, designated areas and to check on sanitary rules for existing slaughter houses and for factories that emitted bad smells. The law prohibited the sale of harmful foodstuffs and was responsible for the construction of public toilets and their cleaning. Finally, a central aspect of the municipal health mandate, and one that proved one of the most ubiquitous state interventions in the everyday workings of the city, was street cleaning.

4. Public Morality

The surveillance of police matters and public morality was a particular government concern under sultan Abdülhamid II. The law specifically referred to restaurants, casinos, theatres, circuses and all places of public gathering, places of promenading and in the suqs, the beaches, including the prohibition of bathing in the sea naked and gambling houses as sites of intervention against potential immorality.

5. Public Welfare

The law outlined a number of duties and activities in which the municipality assumed functions of the emerging Ottoman welfare state. The municipality was to encourage the establishment of hospitals, orphanages and poorhouses, industrial schools and schools for the blind, and assist in tending to sick residents. The municipality was to take over existing establishments of public welfare.

---

in Jens Hanssen, Thomas Philipp and Stefan Weber, Empire in the City: Arab Provincial Capitals in the late Ottoman Empire, (Beirut, 2001).

8 For the social effects of the discourse of public morality on Beirut, see chapter 7 of this thesis.
Compared to the previous law of 1867, the 1877 legislation included a number of important regulations concerning the municipal staff. The new law professionalised the municipality. It guaranteed municipal salaries for the doctor, the engineer, the treasurer and the general secretary. The municipality also acquired its own policing agents, the qavush. As in the model municipality of Pera/Galata, qavushs became the municipal guardians of morality, orderly conduct and general respect for law on the streets of Beirut. They were entitled to check building- and entertainment permits, enter into public baths, coffeehouses, theatres, shops and khans. They were required to be literate, of good health and reputation. They tended to be recruited from amongst ex-soldiers and had to undergo examination prior to appointment. They were forbidden to smoke, carry an umbrella or a stick, strike up conversations in the streets or pass time in coffeehouses.

Taken together, I would argue, these competences provided a powerful mandate to intervene in the practices of daily life and revolutionise Ottoman towns and cities. On the other hand, the municipal mandate’s legal consecration established a normative order which constricted the daily practices of the municipality and exposed it to popular and foreign criticism. As a consequence of this intricate web of mandate, norm and practice the municipality became a prime site of the politics of urban space in Beirut after 1860.

3.1. A Comparison Between the Municipalities of Istanbul and Beirut

Le règlement organique du nouveau cercle municipal de Beyrouth [...] a été presque entièrement copié sur celui de Pera.10

Thus begins the first assessment of the newly created municipal council in Beirut in 1868. Its two authors, George Laurella and Edmond de Perthuis11, were to occupy municipal posts until the 1877 law on provincial municipalities restricted membership of the council to Ottoman subjects. The report of these two European businessmen – the former Austrian, the latter French – was full of praise for their local colleagues on the council, which was

---

11 For biographical information see footnotes in municipal list attached at the end of this chapter.
composed of enlightened and highly spirited men. They capture all that is good for this city and country in this new institution that represents a new step on the road to reform and progress. They expend time and efforts to ensure its success. 

Gabriel Baer’s work on the beginnings of Municipal government has been influential ever since its first publication in 1968. His analysis of the development of the Alexandria municipality in comparison with the Istanbul “models” of Pera and Galata (not in themselves object of research) was a yardstick in the urban history of the Middle East. Scholars of Ottoman municipalities have since referred back to Baer’s question “Why was a municipality feasible in Pera and Galata but not in Alexandria?”

Baer’s answers to “why not Alexandria” have partly been corroborated by the recent research of Cleveland, Kark, Rosenthal and Reimer. They share a common gauge of analysis of success and failure. They concur to varying degrees with Kark’s categorical statement that “municipal government did not have its roots in the Muslim Middle East [and therefore] was generally uncommon in the Islamic world.” The common sense implication being that for an institution to work, its idea necessarily had to have been grown indigenously and that the Christian or secular West had a patent due to its long history of municipal government with putative precursors in medieval if not Roman times.

While Istanbul was the model, as Rosenthal argued, for all subsequent provincial municipalities, viewed from the provincial perspective, the case of the municipality of Beirut conformed more to the municipal ideal-types constructed by scholars of the municipality in the Middle East than the examples they have chosen. The Ottoman provincial reforms created municipalities which defied the exceptionalisms of Istanbul or Alexandria.

Rosenthal convincingly argued that domestic politics determined the course and outcome of urban reform in Istanbul. The different municipal performances in the Sixth district of Pera/Galata and in Alexandria cannot be explained by different attitudes of their foreign communities who shared a policy of “systematic obstructionism”. Rosenthal’s and Reimer’s inquiries into what they considered ‘dual cities’ incorporated municipal reform into the framework of growing economic and cultural dependency and seeping colonialism.

---

12 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton 332, Beirut, May 26, 1868.
contrast to these two cases of foreign domination, the Ottoman provincial municipalities
generated what Anthony Leeds has defined as “locality power in relation to supralocal
institutions”.16 In Ottoman provincial towns like Beirut, European investment companies
may have easily obtained their concessions from individual local businessmen such as Joseph
Mutran and Hasan Bayhum, but these companies had a tougher run to achieve their financial
objectives against the municipality during the Hamidian era.

Cleveland’s study of the Tunis municipality represents a noteworthy departure from
Baer’s exclusively institutional approach. He pushes the argument for foreign obstructionism
and defence of the status quo against the threat of change further. He shows that the very
urban problems that led to consular complaints about alleged oriental squalor and felony
were caused by the influx of European residents. “As the presence of foreigners without
means of support increased, the crime rate, which in all North African cities had been quite
low, rose sharply, presenting the council with an easily identifiable problem. … The vast
majority of crimes were committed by Europeans whom the consuls did not properly control
despite their jurisdictional powers over them.”17

3.1.2. ‘Local Foreigners’ and the Municipal Council

In Beirut, de Perthuis himself reserved staunch criticism for his fellow foreign
residents who refused to pay their share of municipal taxes:

The first to complain about the ill-administration and the resulting insalubrity, the traffic
jams, the deficient regulations and policing – in one word the insufficiency of the public
services of the municipality they [the foreigners] forget that the services that benefit all
inhabitants regardless of their origins can only function, if they are well distributed and
equitable and if everybody in Turkey contributes like in other countries …. We cannot
maintain for long a mandate which brings us into a false and unacceptable situation vis à
vis our indigenous colleagues[in the council].18

As long-term residents of Beirut, de Perthuis and Laurella had a vested interest (and,
in the case of de Perthuis, a financial stake) in urban improvement. As council members they

15 Steven Rosenthal in Kedourie, Modern Egypt, 125.
18 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyouth, carton 332, Beirut, May 26, 1868.
took their new job seriously and accused their resident fellow countrymen of myopia and lack of public spirit. The powerful plea from de Perthuis quoted above that was sent to the foreign office in Paris uncut, hints at the fact that at least for the duration of foreign membership, the municipality incorporated or absorbed the interests of what were arguably the most influential foreign residents in Beirut in the second half of the nineteenth century. This did not ‘Europeanise’ the municipality but it suggests that, as an Ottoman institution, the municipality of Beirut was also an instrument of landed and commercial interests.

Reading between Perthuis’ lines, his anti-foreign accusations also impart an acute sense, indeed a fear, of the changes and challenges that this new local institution might bring about in relation to Beirut’s foreign community. The issue at stake was more complex than Baer’s simplistic municipal paradox in the case of Alexandria that held that the municipality was a European idea, yet was opposed by consuls.19 What was changing for the European communities in Ottoman cities through the introduction of regular municipal institutions by the Ottoman government was an eclipse of the extraordinary consular powers gained in the wake of the Crimean War.20

To de Perthuis, the success of this municipal institution, integrated into a modern bureaucratic hierarchy, meant a loss of political leverage by consuls and, by extension, rendered foreign intervention in urban matters more illegitimate. Echoing de Perthuis, who acknowledged that the municipality was an Ottoman institution, the British consul in Beirut concurred in 1871 that “the days when Governor Generals trembled before Consular Dragomans had passed - never it is hoped, to return ... no Governor General would submit to the subserviency of a Consul which was common twenty years ago.”21

In 1868, a report by the head of the consular corps reached the French foreign office. The Spanish consul Frederico Taque confirmed Perthuis’ assessment of the Ottoman origins of the Beirut municipality. In fact, his report includes a lengthy comparison between the municipalities of Pera/Galata and Beirut which is worth closer examination. Taque started by saying that the “reglement of the Pera municipality and the one that is put into practice in Beirut share a common point in establishing important and delicate municipal
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19 This ‘paradox’ has since been deconstructed by Rosenthal’s studies on the municipality in Istanbul.
characteristics.” Pera had been widely accepted as the municipal model in the Ottoman provinces in general and by Beirut’s consular staff in particular. Both institutions set about to implement its mandate to maintain financial, hygienic and moral order as well as water supply and other infra-structural facilities.

Nevertheless the rapporteur notes a list of differences. Both municipal councils consisted of twelve members which were in session every Thursday in Beirut and twice a week in Pera. Whereas in Pera, at least nine members were required to be present to pass legislation taken in absolute majority, in Beirut half the members decided mainly on the basis of an expressly secret absolute or simple majority. In Beirut the councillors were elected by a general assembly convoked by the local Ottoman authorities and confirmed by the Governor General, while in Pera the members were nominated by imperial decree (irade). In the capital, the councillors were nominated regardless of religion or social status and remained in office for three years. In Beirut, by contrast, they held office for two years. Election of half the members every year secured rotation and continuity. Moreover, a ratio of six Muslims and six non-Muslims was initially stipulated. For eligibility, each candidate was required to be paying municipal taxes on property worth at least 50,000 piasters, to have a fixed residence in Beirut and to belong to “the class of notables of the city.” This requirement was later dropped but already the Spanish consul conceded in his report that the character of ‘notable’ is not defined. Who determines it? What is the quality that distinguishes him? What is the demarcation line between a notable and a non-notable? Maybe the wealth of 50,000 piasters?

The head of the consular corps in Beirut at the time was struggling with the same questions that has haunted scholars for decades. Wealth was a necessary but not a sufficient criterion to be a representative and eligible member of “the class of notables of the city.” In other words, at least in terms of state recognition of one’s status as a notable, factors other than wealth were crucial for a bid to represent the interests of the city as a whole.

The Pera municipality was granted more staff than its provincial counterpart. It accommodated translators, assistants, a secretary general, a treasurer and an architect, while

23 Taque, ibid.
in Beirut the administrative duties rotated between its members. The Syrian Salnames made no mention of the positions of one scribe, one general secretary and one treasurer in Beirut until 1879. Only the municipal president – appointed by the Ottoman authorities – received a regular salary from Beirut’s municipal budget. In Beirut, the municipality opened an account at the local branch of the Ottoman Imperial Bank into which all revenues were to be paid.

The bank and the municipality entertained very close business ties that were based on the provision that the municipality was entitled to take out loans for public projects without the consent of the Ottoman government. In contrast to the Pera regulations, however, where the Porte was obliged to reimburse debts incurred if the municipal council were dissolved, the municipal council was held responsible. In effect, this meant that Beirut’s municipal fiscal autonomy ultimately also involved greater accountability than in the capital – an arrangement that was to contribute in considerable measure to the much commented-on chronic financial straits.

3.1.2. The Municipal Budget

Municipal revenues were a bone of contention from the outset and one of the main points of reform under the 1867 regulation. Perthuis summarized that under the old practice, the municipality of Beirut had collected an annual average of 79,000 piasters.24 This amount had proven to be insufficient in a city whose population had almost doubled in the preceding 10 years. The Ottoman government introduced a second category of municipal income and committed itself to a redistribution of a fixed sum of 150,000 piasters to cover new personnel and urban maintenance costs. In return, the municipality was obliged to clear any expenses exceeding 90,000 piasters with the Supreme Municipal Council in Istanbul.

But according to Laurella’s and Perthuis’ assessment, after all regular expenses, there remained only 30 to 40,000 piasters to “to cover unforeseen, expenses and new projects.”25 Urgent public construction was going to be delayed by the red-tape while in their estimate municipal expenses would amount to 250,000 piasters annually in the years to come. Under these conditions both foreign municipal members recommended to their foreign ministries

24 M.A.E. Consulat Beyrouth, 332, Beirut, May 26, 1868.
25 Ibid.
that the only way to meet the expenses in the future was that “foreigners should be held to pay the municipal taxes like the subjects of the Sublime Porte.”

The municipal budget increased steadily in the following years. For 1878 revenues were recorded at 833,585 piasters, the equivalent of c. £7,250. In 1883, the municipality retained as surplus half the 913,950 piasters of revenue. After the creation of the province, the balance began to turn negative. In 1899, receipts of 1,778,560 piasters were matched by expenses of 1,836,628 piasters. The overdraft was covered by loans from the Ottoman Imperial Bank. Although revenues exceeded the 2.5 million-piaster mark (the equivalent of over £20,000) in the 1900s, by 1913, the governor general of Beirut was forced to declare bankruptcy. The financial obligations of the municipality towards the public service companies and the population increase put growing strain on municipal efficacy causing its popular reputation to plummet before World War I.

3.2. Fuad Pasha, Rashid Pasha and the Origins of the Municipality in Beirut, 1860-1868

The story of the origins of the municipality is a subplot in the struggle for the creation of the province of Beirut traced in the first chapter. One of the unknown legacies of Fuad Pasha’s mission to war-torn Syria was his contribution to the creation of the Beirut municipality and the application of the Ottoman Land Code as a means to manage the challenges to the city’s urban capacities. Fuad Pasha had been an instrumental figure in the struggle for the first Ottoman municipality in Istanbul since 1856. Indeed, many of his duties as foreign minister in the late 1850s had consisted of negotiating with recalcitrant European embassies the outlines of a municipal government for Istanbul. As a staunch supporter of the municipal idea, he fought hard to ensure the survival of the first Ottoman municipal council of Galata and Pera against the machinations of the foreign powers. Thus, by the time he was dispatched to Syria to contain foreign, especially French, military intervention, Fuad

26 Ibid.
27 Thamarat al-Funun, January 27, 1879.
29 PRO, FO, 195/2075, “Quarterly Report, March, 1900.”
30 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton 332 (1868-1913), letter to the consular corps, dated December 10, 1913.
Pasha had already become a seasoned and internationally respected negotiator as well as – in contradistinction to his mentor, Mustafa Reshid Pasha – a perceptive and powerful champion of domestic affairs.

Fuad Pasha and other ‘men of the Tanzimat’ of his generation compare to French social reformers in the mid-nineteenth century whose oeuvre Paul Rabinow has examined in his study *French Modern*. Like their French counterparts to whose ideas and training many high Ottoman bureaucrats were exposed, these political and technocratic figures came to treat cities as social laboratories. They applied the combined fields of knowledge (hygienic or statistical, geographic or social), architectural and urban forms, and technologies of pacification (disciplinarian and welfare) to construct the norms and forms of the social environment of the Ottoman Empire.

Politically Fuad Pasha’s success in averting foreign intervention in Syria hinged on the Ottoman administration’s ability to follow up on his rhetoric of an Ottoman version of modernity that was able to ensure, and was held accountable for, the establishment of order and stability in the ‘unruly’ Syrian provinces. In the course of negotiations with the European powers the Ottoman government insisted on complete responsibility for everyday life, security, prosperity and planning in post-civil war Mount Lebanon, Damascus and Beirut. Fuad Pasha saw his mission in Beirut as a testing ground of the Tanzimat’s reform project that aimed to catapult the Ottoman Empire into the modern age. One of the most tangible and visible criteria for attainment of this ‘modern age’ in the nineteenth century was the state of cities. More than any other cultural artifact, cities had become the yardsticks of progress and modernity of society. Their effective management was deemed essential for the appearance of order and a prerequisite of public construction as well as the imposition of an Ottoman imperial language of architecture.

While Fuad Pasha’s experience in Istanbul may explain his proclivity towards implementing municipal government, the human misery he witnessed in Beirut made swift action mandatory. The population of Beirut had swollen between 1858 and 1863 from an estimated 50,000 to an estimated 70,000 inhabitants. The gargantuan task of emergency

34 For a compilation of the diverse contemporary population estimates, see May Davie, *Beyrouth et ses...*
relief for the thousands of refugees flooding into the safe haven of Beirut from Damascus and the embattled regions of Mount Lebanon was provided by an over-stretched body of international aid operations, benevolent societies and congregations that set up makeshift shelters across the city. Beirut itself was on the verge of sectarian violence in late June 1860 with vendetta squads roaming the streets barely contained by a miniature Ottoman military presence and a disempowered notable leadership. Having restored Ottoman law and order in Damascus by deterrence executions, Fuad Pasha returned to Beirut where the residence of the European general consulates required setting up his own headquarters for the duration of his eight months' stay in Syria. It was during Fuad Pasha's extended stay in Beirut that the idea of a permanent municipality as an Ottoman institution for urban management materialised.

Under the forceful governorship of Mehmet Rashid Pasha (1866-71), the municipal council was transformed into a locally elected rather than appointed body of privileged personalities, and it was raised to the administrative status of the Sixth District of Istanbul Pera/Galata. In fact, the first elections to the municipal council of Beirut were held only a few months after the Ottoman government decided to apply the municipal model of Pera and Galata to the rest of Istanbul. The councillors were elected by an assembly of local notables presided over by Rashid Pasha. Judging by the euphoric reception by the French consulate, it proved a success. Six Sunni Muslims, one Greek Orthodox (Habib Bustrus), one Greek Catholic (Nakhla Mudawwar), one Maronite (Yusuf Thabit), one Armenian Catholic (Nasrallah Khayyat) and two foreign entrepreneurs, Edmund de Perthuis and George Laurella were elected. Ahmad Pasha Abaza was appointed president of the first municipal council. Before his council was sworn in by Rashid Pasha, its members made their mandate conditional on being granted a larger degree of fiscal independence from the central authorities in Damascus which, they argued, "has no interest [ingérence] in affairs regarding the city of Beirut." After tough imperial-local negotiations, the municipality was guaranteed
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a budget of no less than 300,000 piasters of which 150,000 piasters annually were promised as imperial redistribution in return for local property revenue.41

3.2.2. The Municipality and the Application of the Land Code to Beirut

The restoration of Ottoman order in Syria, skillfully manoeuvred by Fuad Pasha had come at a huge fiscal price. In order to finance the sum of indemnities to the Christian victims, Fuad Pasha was forced to raise special taxes from the province of Damascus and the port of Beirut in the range of 6.5 million piasters.42 This raised protest from Beirutis as it was felt that none of the money was earmarked for the city of Beirut. The desperate need for revenue in postwar Beirut encouraged Fuad Pasha to apply the imperial Land Law of 1858 vigorously to the city. The arduous task of resettling and re-housing in the Mountain had given Fuad Pasha first hand experience with the necessity of a centralised land administration. Moreover, Beirut’s annual tax income of merely 150,000 to 160,000 piasters “ha[d] become incompatible with modern progress”.43 In the context of Ottoman imperialism, ‘closing the gap with modernity’ meant first devising a fiscal structure that would establish better knowledge and tighter control over Beirut’s property relations for the benefit of effective surplus extraction and distribution of resources. Second it meant more reliable planning of urban rehabilitation (“in’ ash al-madina”44).

Prior to the Tanzimat, the provincial governor decided over public work initiatives.45 At the same time, “particularly in port towns urban dwellers... were spared many types of taxes, paying instead the traditional market dues (ihtisab resmi) and customs duties imposed on goods imported and exported from the Empire.”46 While the Gülhane Rescript of 1839 introduced individual taxation through virgu (or per capita tax), the 1858 Land Law’s novelty was that urban property and buildings

41 Consulat Beyrouth, ibid.
43 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton 340, February 2, 1868.
44 “Urban rehabilitation became a central term in Hadiqat al-Akhbar after 1860.
45 Antoine Abdel Nour, Introduction à l’Histoire Urbaine de la Syrie Ottomane (XVIe-XVIIIe Siècles), (Beirut, 1982), 188.
(owned or rented) became subject to taxation in their own rights (as opposed to earlier modes that merely taxed the goods produced on or in them). In order to facilitate the new tax regime on the basis of this fiscal system, Fuad Pasha ordered the registration and evaluation of all property in and around Beirut in accordance with the new Land Law whose “primary aim...was to establish title and tax every piece of productive land...on a one-to-one correspondence between a given property and the person responsible for paying the taxes.”

The urgency of property administration was second only to the issue of indemnities. On the basis of Fuad Pasha’s imperial property survey, which according to a notice in Hadiqat al-Akhbar was “nearly completed” by October 1861, Beirut’s annual municipal revenue for subsequent years more than quadrupled to 750,000 piasters. Taxes on state land were raised in early 1861. Fuad Pasha had negotiated a 7% tax on property possessions (which rose to around 8.5% by the end of the decade) with the municipality on the condition that 150,000 piasters be reinvested into Beirut’s urban “rehabilitation” per year.

After Beirut was subordinated to the jurisdiction of Damascus in 1865, however, the municipality complained that the promised revenues were no longer redistributed to Beirut as previously agreed. The landowners and merchants of Beirut felt the economic repercussions of the abolition of the old Eyalet of Sayda immediately. Moreover, the outbreak of cholera in 1865 reduced Beirut’s trade to tatters. In Hadiqat al-Akhbar, editor-in-chief Khalil al-Khuri summed up the city’s plight as follows:

Last year Beirut was afflicted by severe financial setbacks leading to a suspension (ta‘til) of its trade. This is clearly a consequence of the abolition of the Eyalet of Sayda and the transfer of the centre of the province to Damascus. Foreigners cease to make station [and] it did not take long before houses and shops had no tenants, income was reduced and the prices for land plots dropped. There had been hope that the losses of the Beirutis in land revenue could be made up by profits in trade this year, but the economic depression and adverse conditions in the hinterland have tied up capital...Beirut shivers at the dangers for its future.

47 Eugene, L Rogan, Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire, (Cambridge, 1999), 83. The Land Law was translated by F. Ongley, The Ottoman Land Code, (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1892).
48 Hadiqat al-Akhbar, October 15, 1860.
49 Ibid., October 17, 1861.
50 M.A.E., Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton 340, Beirut, February 10, 1868.
51 Hadiqat al-Akhbar, March 7, 1861.
52 Consulat Beyrouth, carton 340, Beirut, February 10, 1868.
53 Hadiqat al-Akhbar, May 28, 1867.
The local application of the land reform in 1861 also allowed the development of a property market outside the city centre which for centuries had been too dangerous as a place of permanent settlement. Around a few strongly fortified outposts (eg. Burj al-Kashshaf, Burj al-Barajna, Burj Abu Haydar), most of the extramural land was legally considered *arazi emiriye*, or state land, often held as hereditary tax farms by Druze and Maronite *muqata' jis* of the adjacent mountain districts of Gharb al-Shuf and Kisrawan, such as the Talhuqs and the Khazins. Construction on these fields, groves and wild orchards had been prohibited by extant Ottoman law. Nevertheless, early settlement of urban notables on the outskirts of the city proper was tolerated by local Ottoman governors prior to the new Land Law.54

The application of the Ottoman Land Law in Beirut formalised – and arguably accelerated – the process of extramural urbanisation, as the legal framework provided security and exchangability of title. For the aspiring merchant-notables of Beirut, the summer heat and winter floods in the city centre were an inconvenience and a health hazard they could well afford to do without. With time, the legal protection and facilitation of extramural residence turned the large plots of land that had hitherto hindered the construction of streets to the few extant mansions around Beirut into smaller parcels as more wealthy families purchased and populated land in the outskirts. At the same time, the exodus of affluent families actually increased the intramural demographic density as the large courtyard houses left behind were rented out to multiple immigrant families:

The old city, with its narrow, tortuous streets, and native workshops, serves now as the residence of the poorer classes and as the business place of the merchants during the day. The new town which lies scattered around, with its modern built houses, carriage roads, and gardens, its churches, colleges, schools and hotels, has little or nothing of the oriental in its composition.55

The application of the Ottoman Land Code to Beirut not only facilitated the commercial exchange and use of extra- and intramural land but also reformulated the definitions of property relations *vis à vis* the changing nature of state power. Municipal practices of cadastral registration and property surveys (“*ilm wa khabr*”) signaled new

54 Indeed, contrary to Lewis Farley’s observation that wealth rested on the necks of the notables wives (see chapter one), already in the 1830s, the British consul reported that “[c]ity money came out of lock boxes and off women’s wrists and went into land.” William Polk, *The Opening of South Lebanon, 1788-1840: A Study of the Impact of the West on the Middle East*, (Cambridge Mass., 1963), 172.

modes of perception, conception and production of urban space. In the pervasive restructurings of late-nineteenth-century Beirut, the municipal councilors played a pivotal role as decision-makers backed by an imperial and a local mandate. But imperial registration, classification and surveying were not restricted to the realm of property. These practices were closely linked to the equally political realm of public health.

3.3. The Discursive Practice of Urban Cleansing and the Idea of the Municipality

3.3.1. Protecting the City: the Quarantine and the Cordon Sanitaire

Epidemics were a common occurrence and as much a constant threat in the nineteenth century as in earlier times. Yet, with the advent of the Tanzimat, the Ottoman sanitary techniques changed in ways not dissimilar to - and influenced by - those of European states discussed by Foucault and more recently by Rabinow and Fassin who insist on the uniquely global, historical experience of cholera.

The Ottoman struggle against cholera in the course of the nineteenth century proved very effective. Cholera did not involve theological debates, as did the plague. By setting up quarantines across the Ottoman Empire, it became a transcontinental, sanitary bulwark against the perceived and very real threat of disease germination in India. As in nineteenth-century France, the Ottoman fields of medicine and public hygiene became integrated into the political process of state centralisation. The very statistics and population censuses introduced in order to establish reliable data to plan the new systems of taxation and military conscription came to be used effectively for medical and demographic surveillance. In the

56 "An epidemic has a sort of historical individuality, hence the need to employ a complex method of observation when dealing with it. ... At the end of the eighteenth century, this form of experience was institutionalized." The scale of the undertaking made the central state the only viable coordinator of the operation. For "this experience could achieve full significance only if it was supplemented by constant, constricting intervention. A medicine of epidemics could exist only if supplemented by a police ... and a body of health inspectors." Michel Foucault. [1973]. The Birth of the Clinic, an Archaeology of Medical Knowledge. (London. 1986). 25, 26.

57 "The worldwide spread of cholera demolished one by one the criteria of the classical science of epidemics," Rabinow. French Modern, 34.


60 On the emergence of Ottoman state statistics, see Kemal Karpat, “The Ottoman Adoption of Statistics
Ottoman Empire as in France new approaches to public health were influenced by the devastating effects on cities of the first cholera pandemic which reached Aleppo in 1829. Istanbul in 1831 and Paris a year later in 1832. Daniel Panzac sums up the effect of cholera on the Ottoman empire thus: "The conjunction of insufficient demographic surveys, the realisation of the effects of epidemics – the plague and then cholera – are the origins of sanitary politics undertaken by the Ottoman state." \(^{61}\)

Ibrahim Pasha had first established the quarantine in the Ottoman Empire in Beirut in 1834/5 following the devastating effects of the 1831 pandemic. \(^{62}\) As a means to condition access to the city on medical inspection, and on isolation of the body from the environment, the quarantine was a highly tangible and contested sanitary measure at the centre of the discourse on hygiene in the nineteenth-century Mediterranean. The quarantine in Beirut was a passage into the city and regulated the human inflow. Together with the customs offices, the quarantine was the first instance the visitor to the city would come in contact with state authority, a very tangible reminder of who ruled the city. As such it was viewed as a nuisance to travelers both when implemented fully, because it sometimes meant uncomfortable, weeks-long incarcerations, and when it was applied half-heartedly, for this defeated its very purpose. \(^{63}\) As a sanitary institution, the quarantine may or may not have improved health conditions, but industrialisation, large-scale public works projects and related urban densification in Beirut clearly posed new challenges to the maintenance of public health.

Just as the quarantine was set up to curb sea-borne diseases, the cordon sanitaire came to be implemented to block land-borne threats to the maintenance of Beirut's health. In the summer of 1865 a cholera epidemic from Mecca swept the ill-prepared city and cost an estimated 3,000 lives, mainly poor inhabitants who had no place to flee. \(^{64}\) The more fortunate

---

63 Although most travel accounts complained about the quarantine it is important to insist that this Ottoman measure was very successful in preventing the spread of disease. Having said this, here we are more concerned with the ways the quarantine changed urban everyday practices and as such became an inseparable factor of state-city relations and the discourse of urban life.
64 Henry Jessup, Fifty-Three Years in Syria, 289. On cholera in Mecca, see S. Kuneralp, “Pilgrimage and
ones took refuge with relatives in the Mountain. But as the exigencies of international trade and political order forced both the imperial government and local merchants to protect Beirut from epidemics and from abandonment, both parties colluded to pave the way for effective implementation of a cordon sanitaire.

When in the summer of 1883, another outbreak of cholera visited Beirut from Egypt (the most recent in the summer of 1875, during which all but 15,000 poor inhabitants fled the city, caused deaths of up to 30 residents daily\(^65\), the municipal authorities were better prepared. They convened a medical meeting between the governor, the municipal doctor, Dr. Nakhla Mudawwar, the local practitioner Milhim Faris, a doctor at the Prussian hospital and professor at the Syrian Protestant College, Dr. Wortabet, and the long-term resident, French quarantine medic, Dr. Sucuet. The medical commission cabled a request for a cordon sanitaire to the imperial health directorate in Istanbul which was instantly granted.\(^66\)

Moreover the medical commission issued a detailed twelve-point plan that stressed the need for prophylactic measures, such as daily street-cleaning and inspection tours of places of sale and storage of food-stuffs, improvement of the quarantine’s hygienic architecture and containment of the sudden immigration of Egyptians. The medical commission implemented a cordon sanitaire around the border of the district of Beirut, at a four-kilometre distance from the port. In the event, Beirut’s urban expansion rendered a complete isolation difficult to maintain as Beirut’s outskirts and the surrounding villages already began to merge into one.\(^67\) Apart from the quarantine, where 1,800 detainees were reported to be crammed, no cases of cholera occurred in Beirut and the cordon could be lifted after a week.\(^68\)

The Ottoman correspondence between Beirut and Istanbul betrays a sense of urgency in the matter. Despite the destabilising effects on international commerce and French consular protests, isolationary measures were stepped up. The damage to trade and property was considerable. Abandoned shops and houses were looted and bread prices jumped as Beirut’s wheat market was running out of supplies.\(^69\) Rumours of an outbreak of cholera in


\(^{66}\) BBA, Istanbul, *YAHUS, 174/43*, Beirut, October 12, 1883 (1300).

\(^{67}\) Particularly as around 5,000 refugees from British-occupied Egypt camped in shelters on the mountain slopes overlooking the city.

\(^{68}\) M.A.E., Nantes, *Correspondances des Echelles, 1883-1885*, Beirut, August 14, 1883.

\(^{69}\) BBA, *YAHUS, 174/43*, Beirut, Shawwal 12, 1300 (1883).
Toulon compelled the imperial health directorate to close the ports of Izmir, Beirut and Trabulus Gharb. And when cholera raged in Tripoli and Lattakia in 1890 the *cordon sanitaire* around Beirut proved successful as no cholera cases were reported in Beirut. But again, the French consul showed little appreciation and considered the closure of the port indiscriminate, and the inspections of ships from France and Egypt excessive.

In the wake of new levels of human mobility in the region through improved lines of transport, the risks of fevers and diseases were deemed to be ever increasing and demanding routine surveillance inside the city. But it was only after the creation of the province of Beirut that a provincial health council was established to replace *ad hoc*, emergency committees with a regular service of sanitary measures.

As Beirut expanded closer to the parameter of the quarantine, consecutive Ottoman governors in Beirut appealed to the Sublime Porte to be allowed to move the quarantine away from the quarter of Rumayl. Proposed solutions to transfer the quarantine to off-shore islands near Tripoli or Tartus and the bay of Mersin were quickly dismissed by the local government since they would jeopardise Beirut’s central position as the dominant port-of-call on the Eastern Mediterranean. In the most comprehensive and by extension intrusive survey of Beirut’s sanitary conditions ever conducted in the Ottoman period, Boyer, a French doctor commissioned by the Ottoman governor, gave a detailed, scientific assessment of the quarantine after it was enlarged in 1892 following the occurrences of cholera in Tripoli and Lattakia. Predictably he deplored the quarantine’s insufficient surveillance and reiterated the necessity of a transfer from the current location. He suggested mobile, isolated camps (known at the time as the ‘Doecker-system’) as a solution.

---

70 BBA, *YAHUS*, 179/11, Beirut, Ramadan 7, 1301 (1884).
72 M.A.E., Nantes, *Correspondance des Echelles, Beyrouth, 1890-1891*, Beirut, November 18, 1890.
75 Benoît Boyer, *Conditions hygiéniques actuelles de Beyrouth et de ses environs immédiats*, (Lyon: Imprimerie Rey, 1897), 147-158. In 1891, the governor of Beirut, ‘Aziz Pasha, cabled Kamil Pasha for permission to transfer. Instead the imperial government set up a commission, consisting of one Deluciano, Nizam al-Din Bey, Adib Qadura and Bishara Dib. Their recommendation that the quarantine be invested with a thicker walls, a new hospital, jetty and a morgue was implemented a year later.
76 Boyer, *Conditions*, 156.
In contrast, a 1905 inquiry into the state of the quarantine was somewhat more realistic and concluded that of necessity, the lazaret is to stay in its present location. It is impossible to move it elsewhere and we need to make the terrain work in its favour. by improving its isolation from the immediate surroundings. If all our recommendations are heeded there will not be any risk to the nearby inhabitants and indeed the city of Beirut. However, given the continued expansion of the city, the government must make provisions to expropriate land to the east and south of the lazaret.

The commission of inquiry proposed a new quay, a clearer separation of the component areas, such as the cemetery, hospital and staff quarters, the demolition of dilapidated buildings, the introduction of gas-lighting and a series of modifications to the architecture. More cordons for pilgrims had to be erected and enclosed by barbed wire-fencing. The passage for first class passengers needed improvement and two more hospitals were suggested – one for infectious and one for ordinary diseases.

The functional requirements of spatial and social segregation were accepted as normative in Ottoman as in French reform discourse in the nineteenth century. The dilemma which the Ottoman government faced with regard to implementing public health was largely financial. This became apparent in an episode in 1910 when cholera cases occurred in the quarantine itself. It prompted the Ottoman governor to hold two meetings on the state of hygiene in Beirut. In the first one with his staff, the director of the Ottoman Bank declared that the treasury of the municipality was too depleted to take even the most urgent sanitary measures. He estimated that the municipality needed at least ten million piasters to improve conditions and complained about the difficulty of collecting dues from foreigners. The next day the governor invited the leading medical doctors and notables of Beirut and suggested to them that a new loan to step up sanitary measures was necessary and that the foreigners had to pay their share. A foreign representative intervened brusquely arguing that the 2,000 Europeans would not make a great difference in revenues in a city of 180,000 [sic]. The governor retorted that new regulations were urgently needed. No agreement was reached and the issue was assigned to a new committee. The governor was deeply disappointed with the

78 It consisted of Dr. de Brun, the dean of the French Medical Faculty and long-time advocate of moving the quarantine, Dr. Graham, a medical professor at the Syrian Protestant College, Nur al-Din Bey, the director of the Ottoman Bank and Percy Martindale, the director of the British water company.
resistance of the foreigners to any *ad hoc* measures. He had sought to find a way to increase the municipal budget and had hoped the threat of the cholera epidemic would release local investment or loans for the municipality.79

The inherently political nature of the sanitary discourse introduced public health, social hygiene and urban pathology as constantly elusive measures of modernity in the eyes of the authorities and the consuls. The very imposition of these urban boundaries set a norm they could never quite attain. Certain diseases like the plague were effectively rooted out. But the prevention of illness could never be complete. Urbanisation and industrial relations generated new conditions for diseases. And, of course, as we shall see, new scientific theories of contagion and the discovery of viruses and bacteria continued to change the urban reform discourse on the origins and the spread of diseases. Disease came to be located within the city.

### 3.3.2. Rotten from Within? The Municipality Takes Centre Stage

*Cordons sanitaires* and the *quarantine* were only two strategies, albeit the most conspicuous and symbolic, by which the Ottoman government addressed urban hygiene in Beirut. Following the experience of recurring cholera epidemics and the locust plague of 187880, Ottoman and local medical staff realised that *quarantine* tactics alone were insufficient. Gradually the latest scientific knowledge that healthy cities required free circulation of sunlight, air and water in its streets, houses and courtyards were applied to Beirut. Living conditions and population density came to be considered an indicator of health standards. As in Europe, cities in the Ottoman Empire emerged as new objects of social analysis and political intervention. A discourse of urban pathology that treated the city as a bodily structure prone to morphological aberration began to divide cities into different *milieux*.81 In the name of ‘public welfare’ state- and municipal planning measures aimed to separate the ‘healthy’ from the ‘foul’ and translated the idea of distinct urban *milieux* into physical differentiation of the urban quarters within the city.82 In Beirut, the leafy suburbs to

80 *Lisan al-Hal*, May 20, 1878.
81 On the discourse of urban pathology, see also Henri Lefebvre, *Le Droit à la Ville*, chapter six.
82 Rabinow, *French Modern*, 30-46.
which the affluent property owners moved in ever greater numbers after the application of the Ottoman Land Law also represented the healthy parts of town, while the journalists of the day began to identify the impoverished parts of the city centre as sources of health hazards.

Beirut was spared the ravages of the pandemic of the 1820s and 30s. Travelers to Beirut during this time concurred that the city compared favorably to other Syrian towns: “With the exception of dysentery and some pernicious fevers which develop during strong heat waves in the vicinity of rivers and stagnant water, there are few grave illnesses to worry about.” In Beirut, ideas and practices of urban pathology entered the public debate after the civil war of 1860 and, indeed, led to the establishment of the municipality under Fuad’s forceful Ottoman pacification. The presence of European missions in Beirut placed extra pressure on the Ottoman provincial government to offer modern urban services. Long-standing missionary schools and convents and the specially dispatched relief agencies excelled at providing medical facilities for their respective Christian communities while criticising inaction and inefficiency on the part of Beirut’s Ottoman authorities notwithstanding the fact that Ottoman hygienic measures had been instrumental in maintaining public health.

However much Fuad Pasha appreciated international relief efforts in Beirut, he realised these could not remedy the structural problems of urban management in the face of postwar reconstruction challenges. The governor of Sayda, Ahmad Pasha, set up a relief council (majlis al-i’ana) under the leadership of one Nazim Bey and Muhi al-Din Bayhum in 1860, probably even before Fuad Pasha’s arrival in Beirut. This council was responsible for coordinating the provision of shelter, food and medication to the refugees, for it had become clear that “that the accumulation of refugees in Beirut has become the reason for the occurrence and spread of many diseases.”

In postwar Beirut, the umbilical link between the Ottoman idea of the municipality, relief, welfare, health and the attainment of ‘modernity’ runs through the pages of Beirut’s first newspaper Hadiqat al-Akhbar. Health conditions and the general state of Beirut’s urban services, such as housing, street repair, law and order under the conditions of large-scale

---

83 Blondel, Deux ans, 46.
84 In May 1861, Nazim Bey proposed to found an asylum for widows and orphans in the old quarantine (dar al-shaqafa), Hadiqat al-Akhbar, May 16, 1861.
85 Ibid.
immigration were recurrent themes. In a strikingly euphoric article (given the recent massacres in the mountain) in late November 1860 about the opening of the new telegraph line between Beirut and Damascus, its editor, Khalil al-Khuri, also reported favourably on the recent establishment of a health council of (urban) cleansing \((\text{majlis al-sahha lil-tanzifat})\). The article also contains the first mention of the impending formation of a municipal council, or \(\text{majlis al-tanzimat al-baladiyya}\), as it was originally called, for Beirut which “was to be charged with establishing and executing all things pertaining to the public good of the city.”

In the absence of a legal ruling on the rights and duties of the municipality in the early years, most of the ‘cleansing’ measures were initiated by the governor of Sayda. However, the municipality seems to have fully endorsed these initiatives. Together the two councils were concerned with prophylactic sanitary and medical measures, such as fresh water supply, rain drainage, street alignment, construction of pavements, and child vaccination.

Underlying these projects of urban rehabilitation was the recurring formula of \(\text{al-tanzif}\), ‘cleaning’ or ‘cleansing’. Health and hygiene measures in their various manifestations (practical, metaphorical and discursive) played foundational roles in the new urban culture of the \(\text{Tanzimat}\) in general, and in the establishment of the Beirut municipality in particular.

With Fuad Pasha’s mission security returned but anxiety prevailed. In the 1850s, “life and property [had been] perfectly secure in Beyrout. Murder, robbery, and other crimes, so frequent in European cities, are here unknown.” After the war, however, reports of criminal

---

\(86\) The health council had been formed by three doctors in the service of the Ottoman health department, Dr. Roussiniyan, Ibrahim Bey and M. Colmant, “the principal medical officer of the French expedition,” \(\text{Hadiqat al-Akhbar}\,\text{November 29, 1860}\). There is a dearth of information on the early history of the Beirut municipal council. By February 1861, the municipality had its offices next to the hotel Brauneck and the Ottoman orchestra. See \(\text{Hadiqat al-Akhbar}\,\text{February 21, 1861}\).

\(87\) In early February 1861, the municipal council approved a proposal by the health council to carry out city-wide vaccination in Beirut. To this effect, public announcements were put up on street corners in Beirut notifying the public that they could vaccinate their children. A council of doctors met twice a week in government offices to vaccinate the children against small pox. After the vaccination, the children were given a health certificate. \(\text{Hadiqat al-Akhbar}\,\text{February 14, 1861}\).

\(88\) In her influential study, \(\text{The Remaking of Istanbul}\), Zeynep Celik translates \(\text{tanzif}\) as ‘regularization’. Semantically this is not entirely incorrect, since street cleaning and taxation was part of the larger picture of late Ottoman urban revival in much the same way, as Françoise Choay, whose work informs Celik’s study, treats 19\textsuperscript{th} century French urban planning. But strictly speaking, urban cleansing, in its literal sense, was a vital issue in its own right in a city that was already being molded in the literary imaginaire as a “city-beautiful.”

\(89\) Lewis Farley, \(\text{Two Years in Syria}\) (London, 1859), 59.
attacks on local and foreign residents punctuated the pages of *Hadiqat al-Akhbar* next to lists of exiled war criminals.\(^90\) Despite the editor's appreciation "that [governor] Ahmad Pasha has turned Beirut into a city of order and style, acts of crime still happen here and there at night."\(^91\) Intramural squares, like Sahat al-Samak and Sahat al-Qamh, were identified as particularly notorious spots. All along, the same discourse of social cleansing pervaded urban management:

> the rehabilitation and cleansing of the city of Beirut continues to concern us. We begin to see that its streets have been rid of squalor [*al-awsakh*] and that a better manner of order [*al-tartib*] than before has been achieved. The majority of streets in the bazaars that were not paved are now paved .... Likewise roads outside the city have been repaired. This raises our hopes that Beirut may prosper daily in terms of embellishment and organisation so that one day it may become the most beautiful resort on the Syrian coast.\(^92\)

Such commercial and aesthetic imperatives of the advent of the new age extended the semantics of cleanliness to the social milieu for the rest of the Ottoman period and beyond.\(^93\) In the tense atmosphere of postwar Beirut, the Ottoman governor developed a distinct paranoia against certain traditional pastimes and social activities and issued ad hoc rulings to prevent havoc and feuds (*ihtifaz min al-gha 'ila wa al-hussam*). For fear of violent escalation, the popular javelin game in the pine forest was forbidden. Moreover, the governor forbade gambling in 'social places'. He threatened to arrest and to publish the names of the culprits, if caught red-handed gambling "in such an ugly abode."\(^94\) Nor would foreigners be exempt from social cleansing. Echoing the complaint of Fuad Pasha's lieutenant in Beirut, Abro Efendi, in March 1861 that there were too many foreigners in Beirut, the governor of Beirut, Ahmad Pasha, publicly pledged to act to cleanse the city of unwanted guests:

> Considering the amount of base scum [*al-asafil wa al-ajlaf*] who arrive at Beirut, the *Vali* has issued a decree that allows the authorities to search foreign ships, to inspect passports of every inbound passenger and to prevent entry to anyone with insufficient documentation, in order to cleanse Beirut from the human rabble [*lil-tanzif min al-awbash*].\(^95\)

\(^{90}\) *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, March 21, 1861.
\(^{91}\) *Ibid.*, August 8, 1861.
\(^{92}\) *Ibid.*, April 4, 1861.
\(^{93}\) This issue will be treated separately in chapter seven.
\(^{94}\) *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, January 24, 1861.
\(^{95}\) *Ibid.*, January 17, 1861.
Such representations were to pave the way for a new discourse of public morality in fin de siècle Beirut. In this context, the discourse sketched out above bears the medical and political antecedents of a planned, open city whose ‘public good’ was assumed to be visual for tourism, commercial for the local and international merchant community and ultimately fiscal for imperial coffers. The city centre in particular became identified as a site of danger and insecurity in the newspaper articles whose editors employed hygienic metaphors to define the problem. Public health not only provided new vocabulary to describe, identify and tackle social problems, it appeared to form “the last language of the social.”

As sanitary concerns became concerns of salubrity, the healthy city became the main concern of urban planning and the main task of Beirut’s municipality. As early as the 1830s, some Christian cemeteries had been moved outside the city. In the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, the municipality systematically moved cemeteries, slaughterhouses and tanneries out of the old city into the vicinity of the quarantine in Rumayl. Sewage ditches were dug out to manage seasonal flooding. Even ambulant merchants were banned from bartering in public passages. Later, Boyer’s study on a typhoid outbreak in 1895 also concluded that impurity of water caused the death of 105 inhabitants after torrential November rains caught an unprepared population and a hazardous inner-city sewage system by surprise.

The Ottoman administration in Beirut realised after the 1883 cordon against cholera that routine urban surveys were necessary to identify health hazards. The administrative yearbook for Syria in 1302h (1885), for example, included for the first time a detailed list of all occurrences of diseases and illnesses by kind and location in the province. A few years later during the next outbreak of cholera in Syrian cities a municipal hospital for “women and the poor” was set up in Beirut: “a hospital with a capacity of 25 beds which was opened in June 1308 (1890/1) is now in a position to have instruments and medication to carry out surgery for women’s illnesses.”

96 Fassin, Les Figures Urbaines, 39-40
97 Davie, Beyrouth et ses Faubourgs, 34.
98 Lisan al-Hal, February 26, 1883.
99 Ibid., November 21, 1878.
100 Ibid., October 25, 1878.
101 Ibid., December 26, 1878.
102 Salname Suriye Vilayeti, 1302 (1885), 258ff.
103 Salname, Bayrut Vilayeti, 1310 (1893), 144.
Urban dwellers required hygienic education and discipline in their social behaviour and public health services in the city required improvement. Prophylactic sanitary intervention against endogenously generated urban disease became ever more accepted by the Ottoman government. Following the third international sanitary conference in Istanbul in 1886, which concluded that air, not water, spread cholera, a Pasteur Institute was opened in Istanbul. Located inside the Yildiz palace complex, and directed by the Beirut-born Dr. Celal Muhtar Zoreos, it was one of the first institutes in the world to treat rabies and other bacterial diseases using Pasteur’s scientific method.

In sum, the cleansing discourse and hygienic measures did not create a clean city, but a stream of municipal intervention backed by imperial legislation in the everyday life of the city. In Didier Fassin’s words “it is remarkable, in fact, that it is not the normalisation of behaviours and processes, as a Foucauldian analysis would claim, but rather the manner in which social problems find not their solution, but their most authoritative expression in the language of public health.”

106 The Sultanic Medical Law was published in Arabic in al-Jinan 3 (1872), 406-408. The imperial quarantine regulations (Nizamat Karantina) were translated by Na matallah Nawfal in al-Dustur and later published in an abridged version in al-Jinan 13 (1882), 752-703. In 1876 the municipality announced that it destroyed the old quarantine premises near the port and was looking for a new, larger area outside the city. Thamarat al-Funun, July 13, 1876.
107 Fassin, Les Figures Urbaines, 40.
3.4. al-Akhbar al-Baladiyyat: Read all about it: City News

Beirut’s first newspaper, Hadiqat al-Akhbar, dedicated a prominent part of its news coverage to local affairs and, as we have seen above, was instrumental in lobbying for the establishment of a municipal council in the early years. Newspapers continued to be at the heart of the blossoming of literary activity in Beirut in the following decades. Bi-weekly newspapers mushroomed in the 1870s, such as Thamarat al-Fumm (1875)108, Lisan al-Hal (1877)109 and al-Bashir (1878)110, and vociferously continued the cleansing crusade of their journalistic predecessor Hadiqat al-Akhbar towards a healthy city. As a medium of mass communication through mass circulation they contributed to raising political awareness of local as well as international events. By way of public readings and discussions of daily issues this awareness reached beyond the literate elite to anybody who frequented places of banter and gossip, be it while chatting at the barber’s shop, in coffeehouses or on the tramway.111

3.4.1. Readers and Writers of Municipal Beirut

Most likely, local events sparked more passionate debate than news of distant political affairs, although clearly global news such as the Dreyfuss affair in Paris in the late 1890s or the military victory of Japan over Russia in 1905 made frontline news. The local sections of Beirut’s newspapers were bound to attract the same, if not more, attention as international news. It was the journalistic institution of al-akhbar al-baladiyyat (“city news”) or al-mahalliyyat (“domestic news”) – the local sections on pages one and two – that structured the imagined public sphere most fundamentally. However insignificant the particular events covered in the baladiyyat may appear to the historian, Lefebvre reminds us that “[m]an must be everyday, or he will not be at all.”112

---

108 Owners by the Muslim Jam’iya al-Funun and financed by shareholding of urban notables, edited by ’Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani.
109 Owned by the Adabiyya Press of Khalil and Salim Sarkis.
110 Jesuit publication.
111 Little is known about readership numbers. Suffice it for our purposes to rely on Philippe de Tarrazi’s and Ayalon’s vague estimates of 400 subscriptions for Hadiqat al-Akhbar (est. 1858), (plus copies sold on the streets) and up to 2,000 copies of issues of Lisan al-Hal sold Tarazi, Philippe, Tarikh al-sahafa al-’arabiyya, Vol. 2, (Beirut, 1913-33). Ami Ayalon, The Press in the Arab Middle East: A History, (Oxford, 1995).
Arrivals of notables to Beirut for council meetings, local delegations sent to represent Beirut in Istanbul and abroad, medal awards for notables, transport schedules, public vaccination campaigns, election results, openings of new shops and companies, parties and weddings, long lists of private donations for the construction of religious and public buildings\(^{113}\), strike proclamations, summer-burglaries, drink-driving accidents, children abandoned on the streets and heinious child murders. Newspaper coverage of all these events combined to shape that universe of discourse that Barthes called "the structures of fait-divers".\(^{114}\) Every trifle fragment of news mediated the built city in all its versatile urban rituals and diverse human activities.\(^{115}\) In sum, the city news constituted a common way of 'reading municipal Beirut'.\(^{116}\) In a routine manner, Beirut-as-text represented and shaped Beirut-as-reality as an imagined municipal community.

Every urban dweller had an interest in matters on their doorstep and, unlike international news, everybody's opinion potentially carried some weight in street cafés, neighbourhoods or in the offices. There were myriad ways of gaining access to municipal news, of verifying, expanding or knowing better than the newspaper reporters who broke the stories. The newspapers provided the "broad strokes of narrational order" by determining the topics of the day which would be discussed and disseminated amongst the urban population.\(^{117}\) Municipal laws and urban measures were not only published in official announcements, but were also fervently postulated in front-page, city news sections. While newspapers acted as staunch defenders of the new municipal law of 1877, its publication effectively provided the public with a guide to its rights and duties vis à vis municipal authority and familiarised the inhabitants with legal procedures. If censorship on wider political issues increased under Abdülhamid II\(^{118}\), local news sections developed into at times uncomfortably pugnacious guardians of the municipal idea and critical commentators of Ottoman government performances.

---

\(^{113}\) The largest donation campaign since the establishment of the press in Beirut was arguably the public collection for Cornelius van Dyck's golden jubilee in Beirut raising well over 50,000 piasters.


\(^{116}\) The idea is borrowed from Peter Frietszche, *Reading Berlin 1900*, (Cambridge, 1998).

\(^{117}\) Frietszche, *Reading Berlin 1900*, 4-5.

\(^{118}\) Donald Cioeta, “Ottoman Censorship in Lebanon and Syria, 1876-1908,” in *IJMES*, 10 (1979), 167-186.
Thamarat al-Funun called for municipal works in the name of the common good. When municipal action was in what the newspapers considered 'the public interest', like the decision to construct a municipal department on the Hamidiyya Garden, "complete with reading rooms to promote the arts and knowledge", the local papers showered the municipality with compliments. Such news snippets raised the chances of the municipal council members’ re-election, but they also bound the members to comply and follow through what was public knowledge and demand. The journalists who scrutinized the municipality’s compliance with the legal and ideal norms adopted the very language of Ottoman modernisation that the imperial government used to legitimate its reforms. They reminded the urban authorities of their responsibility to provide education, welfare and security.

In an address to the Ottoman government in June 1877, Thamarat al-Funun demanded new premises for the municipality because the previous offices in Suq Sursuq proved insufficient. Although shortly afterwards, the municipal president, Ibrahim Fakhri Bey, built the Petit Serail to accommodate municipal offices, most of the issues raised and demands vented in the 1870s and 80s furnished no immediate results. Like the larger public works projects discussed in the previous chapter, municipal projects began to be implemented more widely only after the capitalisation of Beirut in 1888 and will be treated in chapters five and six. Nevertheless, with the collusion of the local newspapers, the effect of municipal activity was considerable. The daily work of the municipality was observed, commented upon, and manipulated by an array of regular newspapers checking each other as much as the municipal objectives.

This urban idea was also a powerful metonym for modern society and good urban government and came to be considered an indicator of ‘national maturity’. In the words of Niquula Baz in al-Mahabba,

119 Thamarat al-Funun, August 12, 1878.
120 Ibid., January 22, 1894.
121 Ibid., October 25, 1893.
122 Selim Deringil, The Well-Protected Domains.
123 For example in Thamarat al-Funun, August 5, 1878.
124 Thamarat al-Funun, June 21, 1877.
125 See chapter five.
The municipalities were established to execute major public works which are indispensable in a modern society. It was founded to transform the cities into cheerful gardens, and the suburbs into orchards; it was founded to preserve public health, to see security of the citizens and to provide for economic development.\textsuperscript{126}

Ibrahim J. Tabet, who published an article on the state of Beirut in 1909, went one step further and linked knowledge of the condition of the city to incipient nationalism: “one of the most interesting laws of sociology is certainly that of good administration of one’s place of residence, or the milieu where one lives, that is to say one’s city and one’s homeland.”\textsuperscript{127}

High expectations of the municipality were often thwarted by financial difficulties. Nevertheless in the newspapers of the day, the municipality was represented and identified as the most important institution in Beirut. The members of the municipal council derived their legitimacy through the institution’s local mandate, its imperial origins, and its \textit{Zeitgeist} objectives. While the newspapers often contested the council’s efficacy to enforce and implement its imperatives - urban planning, market control, health, public morality and public welfare, this kind of coverage only served the contagion of the municipal idea.

In sum, the \textit{baladiyyat} sections in the local newspapers kindled a sense of urban participation in the formation of public opinions and policies. They created a tentative but unmistakable unity, and an urban identity in a shifting environment that generated an unpremeditated contagion of the urban idea among Beirut’s political and literary elites.

\textbf{3.5. The Municipal Council and the Politics of Urban Notables}

Far from being a closed-door institution, much less a world onto itself, the municipality was a channel through which urban notables consolidated their control over the affairs of the city and the province. Frequent publishing of long lists of private donations for educational and urban improvement projects not only informed the public of the rerouting of traffic in their expanding city, but also contributed quite consciously to enhancing the status of those urban notables involved in such munificence. Since the first elections in 1868, 

municipal members were active in raising funds for projects of public works, such as schools and hospitals, and port and railway construction, safe in the knowledge that their names and exact financial contributions would be published on the pages of Beirut’s press.

3.5.1. The Composition of the Municipal Council

Urban philanthropy and public office were powerful modes of enhancing one’s respectability in the city beyond the confines of kinship and confession. In the registry of Ottoman state nomenclature, local newspapers and popular opinion, the combination of these two strategic activities turned somebody from amongst the merchants or land-owners into someone “from the respectable class” (mu’tebir) and transformed a member of the religious estate (‘ulema) into a member “of the notables” (wujuh). Whether popularly titled shaykh, hajj or khawaja, the imperial efendi nomenclature incorporated appointed employees in the Ottoman administration and elected council members into urban and urbanised society. In Ottoman Beirut, the efendiyya nomenclature designated commitment to the imperial reform project of urban society.

One of the most striking features of the efendis on the municipal council was the conspicuous absence of scions of Druze and Maronite muqata’acis – or rural overlords – who had dominated Beirut from the surrounding mountain districts of Kisrawan, Matn and Gharb al-Shuf during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Strict legal residence and tax requirements may account for the lack of their involvement in municipal politics. Those Maronites who were active in the municipal council were young professionals, lawyers, merchants and journalists of non-feudal genealogy whose parents or grandparents had settled in Beirut as scribes and merchants. They had championed the Franco-Maronite alliance for a Maronite Mountain in the 1850s and 60s and were collectively known as the “Young Maronite League” which was formed by the bishop of Beirut during the civil war. Catalysed by the defeat of Yusuf Karam Bey in 1866, this group dissolved and its members acquiesced to Ottoman rule. They began to identify with and actively promote what Albert Hourani defined as “the ideology of the city”.

128 See Chapter 1.
129 See next chapter.
The complete absence of any Druze member in forty years of municipal history is striking. Likewise, they were not represented on the 1912 mukhtar list. Sunni imams and mukhtars in their local stronghold of 'Ayn Mreisse appear to have represented them. As we have seen, in the first half of the nineteenth century, Druze landowners were systematically expropriated. The Druze who remained or who arrived anew may not have fulfilled the tax requirement or if, indeed, they ever stood for office – we have only traces of the successful candidates – they may simply not have been able to muster sufficient votes. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Druze constituted the most underrepresented and politically marginalised community in Beirut – a social position they passed on to the Shi’a growing community after the establishment of the Lebanese nation state.

The institutions such as the municipality did not ‘modernise away’ confessional politics or rationalise an ‘inherently inefficient’ traditional administration. To the extent that municipal members functioned as patrons to the confessional and residential constituencies that voted for them, promoting clientelist agendas had to be squared with the general Ottoman reform discourse and the letter and spirit of the municipal law in particular. As we shall see below, sporadic communal violence was commonplace in Beirut. Nevertheless such outbreaks should not be treated as a rule. They were, in fact, viewed by Ottoman governors, local journalists and municipal members alike as dangerous instances of deviance and as obstinate remnants of a backward past. These outbreaks were considered to undermine the ‘enlightened’ municipal project of modernisation and urban reform.

It is in this sense that the institution of the municipality transcended urban millet politics. Although millets were organised as political communities and although their leaders tended to agree on candidates for the municipal council before the election, the municipal council was more than the sum of its composite confessions. Confessional block voting for the municipal council was checked, if not explicitly by law, by an in-built mixture of confessional- and residency requirements in the electoral procedures and geography. This led to a surprising degree of fluctuation of the confessional quotas on the council – an

---

130 As argued by modernisationists, such as John Armstrong, “Administrative Elites in Multiethnic Polities,” IPSR, 1 (1980), 107-128.
132 May Davie, La Millat grecque-orthodoxe et la ville de Beyrouth, 1800-1940: structuration interne et
argument corroborated by the high degree of oscillation shown in the municipal graph at the end of this chapter.

Moral indignation by municipal members and local journalists as well as *ad hoc* intervention by Ottoman governors worked to prevent rare cases of adulteration of the municipal law in Beirut. When the first municipal election under sultan Abdülhamid’s rule were held in the spring of 1878, ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani emerged as the moral guardian of the secular nature of the municipality. In his newspaper, *Thamarat al-Funun*, he published a number of lengthy, pedagogical articles on the virtues of municipal government which included the printing of the Municipal Law of 1877.133 Qabbani accused the *mufti* of Beirut, ‘Abd al-Basit Fakhuri, of using his religious network to encourage Sunni block voting. Qabbani’s accusations against this most senior *’alim* of Beirut were presented in no uncertain binary terms between his adversary’s “age of tyranny” and his own age of “free people’s choice”.134

This conflict between two powerful representatives of the religious’ and ‘secular’ camps in Beirut politics confirms another conspicuous absence from the list of municipal members: the urban Sunni group of *’ulama*. After 1888, *muftis*, *faqih* and *naqib al-ashraf* were guaranteed permanent positions on the provincial council, and some of them played an important role in the electoral college for the municipal council. But families from Beirut’s religious estate, like Fakhuri, al-Kasti, al-Nahhas, al-Khalid, Nabhani, al-Mahdub, al-Rifa’i, Najja, Abbas, al-Unsi, al-Ahdab, Hibri and al-Hut did not enter the municipal council.135 Those members in the early decades of the municipality who hailed from important *’ulama* families of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, like Ahmad Bakri ‘Ariss and ‘Abd al-Qadir Barbir, were eligible for their own credentials but owed their status to that of their forefathers. Christian religious dignitaries - patriarchs, priests and clergymen - were equally absent from the municipal council.

---

133 *Thamarat al-Funun*, January 14, 1878.
135 On Beirut’s *’ulama*, see, for example, Kamal Da’uq, *’Ulama’una*, (Beirut, 1970).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Mukhtars and Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 4) al-Shaykh Raslan al-Fakhuri, al-Dabbagh (intra muros)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Salim Ef. Tabbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 5) 1. and 2. Da’ira (central) and their dependencies. (intra muros)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Habib al-Shami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 10) Ras al-Naba’, and dependencies (Maronite)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Muhi al-Din Ef. Baydun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15) Minet al-Husn, ‘Ain Mreisse, (Greek Orthodox)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Majid Ma’rabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 16) Al-Sayfi and al-Balda (city centre), (Greek Orthodox)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Elias Roubas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 18) Ashrafiyya and dependencies (Maronite)</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Fadhlul Sabbagh, Elias Kurm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 19) Protestant community</td>
<td>Mukhtar: Salim Darwish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

136 Dalil Bayrut, 117-8.
3.5.2. Municipal Elections

Arguably the most important specification in the municipal law of 1877 was the election process. The municipal members were chosen in a long, highly public and indeed, publicised process that merits a detailed analysis.

Voting was restricted to male Beirut residents above 25 years of age who paid a minimum of 50 piasters of (unspecified) tax and held no criminal record. Candidates for municipal office had to be thirty years of age, Ottoman residents in Beirut of at least ten years standing, fluent in Ottoman and hold no criminal record or parallel employment in foreign institutions. Although the phrase “notable of the city” was dropped, eligibility still hinged on payment of a property tax of 100 piasters, the equivalent of c. one pound sterling per month. Clearly, the number of eligible candidates was limited as this was not a system of universal suffrage but of conservation of elite power. For 1880, Henry Jessup estimated that 461 Christians of varied denominations and 263 (Sunni) Muslims were eligible to stand for municipal elections.

Before the residents voted for the candidates, an elaborate selection process that generally lasted from December to February took place. An Electoral College was set up. It was led by the municipal president who asked the imams, priests and mukhtars of the quarters and neighbourhoods to nominate two candidates to form the Electoral College. This assembly then proceeded to draw up two lists of residents, one for the eligible voters and one for candidates. Within 15 days these lists were required to be posted at public places where they remained for eight days. During this time, the public was entitled to challenge the list for names omitted or ineligible candidates. By February 1, the candidates of the respective quarters were required to present themselves to the electorate. The voting was to take place from February 1 to 10, and was cast by “secret ballot into one urn, the keys to which were kept by the municipal president and the oldest member of the Electoral College.” After the election, the votes were counted and recorded by the members of the Electoral College.

137 This financial criterion as well as the ten-years residence were dropped in the new municipal regulation of March 10, 1922. See W. Ritsher, Municipal Government, (Beirut, 1934), 6.

results were handed over to the local authorities in a report (mazbata). Upon official verification, the results were announced in an official notification (tezkere).  

No systematic data exists on election results and those results that were published by the local press normally only contained the votes for the winners. In the 1893 elections, Thamarat al-Funun reported that 8,892 votes were cast for the twelve successful candidates. Two years later, the newspaper announced that a total of 10,473 votes were cast for six municipal posts. As a rule, half the council was up for election annually, but some members managed to get reelected up to five times. On at least three occasions, in 1878/9, 1892/3 and 1898, the governor dissolved the municipal council. In the 1878/9 election, of the twelve successful candidates, Bishara Effendi Hani received most votes (672) and Hanna Effendi Trad fewest (318). Despite Hani’s victory, Ibrahim Bey Fakhri was appointed president with the second highest score as the president had to be a Sunni Muslim. In the 1892/3 general election, Muhammad Effendi al-Khawja received 1,113 votes, closely followed by Nakhla Jirjis Effendi Tuwayni with 1,033. This time round, Bishara Effendi Hani only just scraped through with 612, the lowest score of all elected members. Although Muhi al-Din Effendi Hamada achieved a meagre 675 votes, the council members reelected him as president in an internal vote. Hamada had held this position since 1882 (with a two-year interruption between 1888-1890), when he had become Beirut’s first elected municipal president. Elections were clearly very competitive and a matter of a few votes could decide the success or failure of a candidacy.  

In the general election of spring 1898, the votes cast of the winners went up once more with the lowest score of 685 by Niqula Effendi ‘Ajuri exceeding the winners score of 1878/9. ‘Abd al-Qadir Effendi al-Qabbani emerged as the clear winner with 1,005 votes in an otherwise tightly fought race and the council members entrusted him with a second term of municipal presidency. It appears that municipal elections were a contentious business with ever more votes cast, as Beirut’s population increased. Generally, however, in the routine annual elections of half the municipal council, more people went to the polls. Al-Qabbani’s

---

139 Young, Corps de Droit Ottomane, 73.
140 Thamarat al-Funun, January 2, 1893.
141 Ibid., February 25, 1895.
142 Lisan al-Hal, July 18, 1878.
143 Thamarat al-Funun, January 21, 1893. Compare with the municipal list at the end of this chapter.
144 Lisan al-Hal, April 5, 1898.
predecessor, Muhammad Effendi Bayhum, was able to mobilise a record 2,086 votes in the regular election of 1895.\textsuperscript{145}

In another landmark election in 1888, the first in the age of the province of Beirut, \textit{Lisan al-Hal} congratulated the chief returning officer Muhi al-Din Bayhum for the smooth running of the elections.\textsuperscript{146} Although it is impossible to establish a systematic electoral geography of Beirut’s municipality from the scant municipal sources available so far we can infer from an article in \textit{Thamarat al-Funun} on March 18, 1902 what electoral boundaries were drawn in Beirut. Voting started in the central quarters of al-Tuba, al-Dabbaghah, al-Shaykh Raslan, al-Khudru and Hammam al-Saghir, and in the intramural quarters of Gharbiyya, Sharqiyia, al-Derka, Rijjal al-Arba’in and al-Fakhura on a Wednesday and a Thursday respectively. On Friday the ballot boxes were opened in the peri-central quarters, first al-Bashura to the south of the centre, then, on Saturday in Rumayl and Qirat in the immediate east and south-east. On Sunday, the residents on the south-western quarters of Musaytbeh and Mazra’a went to the polling stations. On Monday voting started in the poorer quarters further afield the centre, in Ras al-Naba` on both sides of the Beirut-Damascus road and on Tuesday in the coastal quarters Rumayli and Sayfi between the port of Beirut and the Gas works and the new quarantine. The wealthy quarters of Zukak al-Blat (including Qantari) and Gemayze al-Yamin on the western slopes voted on Wednesday. The western quarters in Dar al-Mreisse, Minet al-Husn and Ras Bayrut as well as in Ashrafiyya on the south-eastern slopes concluded the election process for the year 1902.\textsuperscript{147}

The electoral geography of Beirut was determined by the distribution of local \textit{mukhtars} (Christian or Muslim ‘majors’ depending on the quarter) and Sunni \textit{imams} in the city. These \textit{mukhtars} and \textit{imams} played a pivotal role in the municipal affairs of \textit{fin de siècle} Beirut.\textsuperscript{148} They not only staffed the Electoral College once every two years, but were also

\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{145} \textit{Thamarat al-Funun}, February 25, 1895.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{146} \textit{Lisan al-Hal}, February 27, 1888.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{147} \textit{Thamarat al-Funun}, March 18, 1902.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{148} The \textit{mukhtar} in late Ottoman Beirut evolved out of - and held similar functions as - the \textit{shaykh al-hara} in pre-Tanzimat times. See Abdel Nour, \textit{Introduction à l’Histoire Urbaine}, 163. In the literature on the Tanzimat, \textit{mukhtars} are regarded as village headmen. Indeed, the Ottoman Law, mentions the \textit{mukhtar} only in this rural context (e.g. Baer, Gabriel, \textit{Fellah and Townsmen in the Middle East}, (London 1982). In Beirut’s urban context, the \textit{mukhtars} were the lowest officials in the Ottoman administrative hierarchy. But owing to their intimacy with the neighbourhoods they served, they were a very important link between urban society and Ottoman government. Their radius of responsibility and activity extented only to the unit of the quarter. See \textit{Loi sur les Moukhtars}, (Beirut: Imp. Des Lettres, 1928).
people’s representatives in dealing with state authorities and arbitrators in quarter affairs. At the same time, the mukhtars held a tacit policing role in their respective quarters. Most quarters had a Sunni and a Christian mukhtar, evidence of the general prevalence of confessionally mixed quarters in the late Ottoman period. Only two eastern districts, Ashrāfiyya (Maronite) and Rumayl/Jumayze (Greek Orthodox), had one mukhtar. The Protestants – fewest in number and probably most scattered – formed the only community which had a confessional mukhtar for the entire city.

The list of quarter majors shows a number of unexpected features of urban politics at grass-root level which we have hinted at before and which are pertinent to the further development of this study. Fifteen electoral quarters and nineteen confessional representatives are a reflection of mixed quarters. This suggests that municipal elections were based on an in-built, joined residency-confession requirement in the Electoral College conventions and may explain the varying confessional ratios in the council over the forty years examined.149

Ottoman Beirut’s electoral procedures varied from those of the municipality of Alexandria where, according to Robert Ilbert’s recent study, 14 officials were appointed by the government and three electoral colleges – one for import merchants, one for export merchants and one for large landowners – decided over the remaining 15 seats.150 Although Ilbert insists that by 1900 the municipal council in Alexandria was a “local affair”, foreign members were the rule. By comparison, in Beirut after the municipal law of 1877, foreign nationals as well as Ottoman subjects employed in foreign representations were barred from election. But like in Alexandria, the political system of the municipality of Beirut ensured that access to the municipal council was limited to established social elites. Late Ottoman ‘institutionalism’ was as much a representation of class as of community – the legal consecration of the former perpetuating the hierarchy within the latter.

3.5.3. The Temporary Partition of the Municipal Council into Eastern and Western Sectors in 1909

Although the Ottoman municipal law of 1877 had stipulated that cities with a population of over 40,000 should be granted two municipalities, in practice few large cities

---

149 See the graph at the end of this chapter.
made use of this article. The authorities in Damascus experimented on a number of occasions with multiple municipal authorities as a way to improve urban services. Between 1884 and 1886, 1895 and 1897 and between 1905 and 1909 up to four municipal councils existed in Damascus. In Beirut, too, there were suggestions, notably from the Maronite weekly newspaper, al-Bashir, to divide the municipality into two. Reporting on a previous article in al-Bashir, Thamarat al-Fumun informed its readership that

the municipal department has refrained from implementing some reforms in favour of dividing the municipality in two parts and to charge the department as a whole with the affairs. This is a subject that needs investigation because the municipal law permits stipulations for a city’s size and Beirut has started to grow, increase its constructions and expand its roads. The precedent had been an attempt to divide Damascus municipality into four sectors, then two but now it is going to stay as was.

When the Beirut municipality did get divided into an Eastern and Western sector, it did not happen as the consequence of Maronite machination but had its roots in an intra-Suni power struggle between the municipal inspector, Munih Ramadan and the president of the municipal council, ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Dana. The latter had been elected to the presidency in 1906 “owing to his popularity with Muslims and Christians.” But when “the sultan allocated funds from the imperial municipal departments in Istanbul to be spent on construction and improvement,” Munih Ramadan submitted a report to the Ottoman government in Istanbul alleging

that a large part of the money procured for public construction and decoration was actually used by ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Dana for personal gain and stolen from the municipal treasury.

This was a serious accusation against one of the local favourites of the Ottoman authorities. Although it was never confirmed that al-Dana did commit embezzlement, his reputation was tarred. Al-Dana died soon afterwards, but Ramadan’s career took a step up the Ottoman ladder. When the Young Turk governor general saw no other way out of the general malaise of the municipality of Beirut than to divide it into two sectors, he appointed Munih

---

152 Thamarat al-Fumun, March 30, 1896.
154 BBA, Giden 274, vesika 250447, June 5, 1906.
Ramadan as the president of the Eastern sector. For a brief period, East Beirut was thus administered by a Sunni president and the Western part by the Greek Orthodox Butrus al-Daghir. The experiment did not work as “the two municipalities rivaled against each other in the worst fashion.” When a new governor general arrived, he immediately reverted to the old scheme. Despite “vehement protest led by those who lost their municipal seat as a consequence to Istanbul, the Council of State approved of the decision.”

3.5.4. Some Observations on the Members of the Municipal Council, 1868-1908

The proliferation of bureaucratic positions in the Ottoman provinces opened a universe of employment and an empire of career choices to long-established families and individuals of lesser prominence. State employees in the provincial departments of justice, finance, awqaft, or other, were prone to multiple job switches in different cities and towns of the empire throughout their careers. Locally elected bodies, like the municipal, the educational, or the commercial councils, on the other hand, tended to be manned by established members of a given locality, rather than itinerant career bureaucrats. Their election processes ruled out all but local residents.

The councillors of the Beirut municipality shared a measure of Mediterranean cosmopolitanism with wealthy inhabitants of other trading centres in the Levant often through marriage, business ties and exchange of ideas. But the municipal members’ public and intellectual involvement in every-day activities – political, but also social and, above all, cultural – is a measure of their rootedness in – and identification with – the city of Beirut. Although many of the merchant council members spent much of their time abroad, in Istanbul, Egypt or Europe, they needed to be registered in Beirut during their absence to be eligible, and naturally had to be ‘in residence’ during their term of office (muwattan as opposed to the status of muqim).

Membership on the municipal council may not have yielded much in the way of pecuniary reward, but as we have seen above, financial hardship was hardly an incentive to be elected. The council members maintained autonomous sources of income. Definitionally

155 M.A.E., Nantes, Correspondances avec les Echelles, 1894-1911, Beirut, January 28, 1911.
156 Ibid.
157 Robert Ilbert “Alexandrie, Cosmopolite?,” in Villes Ottomanes à la Fin de l’Empire, edited by P.
closer to Weber’s notion of *Honoratioren* ("local dignitaries") than Hourani’s use of Weber’s “patriciate”\(^{138}\), the Beirut’s municipal members were “individuals whose economic situation allowed them to be publicly active … and whose social esteem and respect among the people they are to represent evokes sufficient integrity to be trusted with authority … . They have the means to live for politics without living from it.”\(^{159}\)

Who was related to whom, who socialized with whom, who supported whose policies in the municipal council? The local archives that exist tend to reiterate the social organisation along confessional lines since they are the repositories of their respective communities.\(^{160}\) But on the basis of these profiles biographical origins and common career patterns may serve as keys to understand underlying group identities, structures and political relations of Beirut’s elite society, but they need to be treated with caution.\(^{161}\) Despite the relative wealth of data accumulated thus far, we cannot treat geographical, confessional or occupational similarity as automatic indicators of common social identities or political agendas on the municipal council. As Dawn’s *From Ottomanism to Arabism* has shown, alliances, even within given families from one generation to the next, are likely to change over time.

Nevertheless, the high degree of genealogical continuity (grandfather, father, brother, son) on the municipal council is matched by an equally high degree of councillors’ membership in the highly influential political lobby groups and literary organisations. These observations allow us to infer that certain Beiruti families held a ‘corporate’ identification with the city through the municipality which was reproduced over generations. Generally, we can extrapolate from the one hundred biographies attached to the list of municipal members that socio-political allegiances appeared to be organised around clusters of families linked by marriage and inheritance, neighbourhood and professional ties.

Normally, the council consisted of twelve members. From 1868 to 1874, however only eleven members where registered in the *Salnames*. In 1875, the *Salname* recorded thirteen members. I was unable to establish the reason for this inconsistency in the early years of the municipal council. It may well have been a copying error by the *Salname* editor.

---


\(^{160}\) The municipal archive of Beirut was flooded in 1983 and the remaining documents are not available to the public.
Apart from three lacunae in the data from 1886-7 (where names of two councillors are missing), 1889-1890 (where the names of three councillors are missing) and 1901-1903 (where the names of six councillors are missing), the list is complete. I considered those members who appear on either side of the three two-year archival gaps as spanning the lacunae because it appears from the general election patterns uncommon throughout the period for members to be immediately reelected after sitting out for one legislature. A slight inaccuracy exists also in the presentation of the end of members’ terms since the election dates did not concur with the calendar years. Nevertheless, the biographies compiled for these one hundred members allows us to establish personal and family information about a cross section of Beirut society who despite their different lives, affiliations and agendas share membership on the municipal council.

In forty years of municipal councils, 40 Sunnis (26 families), 28 Greek Orthodox (15 families), 23 Maronites (19 families), three Roman Catholics (two foreigners before the 1877 law abolished foreign membership), two Greek Catholics (one family), two Protestants, one Armenian Catholic and one Jew ruled over Beirut’s municipal affairs. The ratio largely represents the confessional distribution with a slight over-representation of Sunnis. What is interesting in the relationship between individual- and family prominence is the high concentration of family clusters amongst the Sunnis and the Greek Orthodox. Maronite council members, by comparison, were largely individuals, with the exception, perhaps, of the Thabit family.162

Of the 100 municipal biographies studied, at least 17 members (or first degree relatives; father, brother or son) were involved in the Beirut Reform Committee of 1912-3. They demanded a greater degree of decentralisation from the Ottoman government and were instrumental in organising the Arab Congress in Paris in 1913.163 During the Grand Vizierate of Kamil Pasha (1911-1913) who was a former governor of Beirut and personal friend of many Beirut notables, calls for decentralisation were on the increase. In two articles in Ittihad Osmani in December 1912, the long-serving municipal members Ahmad Mukhtar Bayhum and Salim Ali Salam publicly called for greater autonomy for the province of

162 Chapter three contextualises this phenomenon.
163 Fawaz Sa’adun, Al-haraka al-islahiyya fi Bayrut fi awakhir al-’asr al-’uthmani, (Beirut, 1994).
Beirut, in particular in waqf-*, fiscal and municipal administration. In February 1913, the French-language, Beirut-based *Le Reveil* printed the manifesto of the Beirut Reform Committee on its front page. After the Unionist coup d'etat in Istanbul in early 1913, the municipal council dissolved itself as a mark of protest against the new government both in Istanbul and in Beirut and the governor’s decision to close down the Beirut Reform Committee.

The municipality in the Young Turk period and especially under the powerful presidencies of Salim `Ali Salam and later `Umar Da`uq assumed a highly political mantle. The link between municipal council members and the emerging political ideologies of nationalism deserves closer examination. However, owing to the lack of systematic documentation on the members of the municipal council during the Young Turk period, the non-nationalist line of this inquiry and the different political climate under Hamidian rule, this study avoids these issues important though they are.

*Only “Merchants and Migrants”? Rooting an itinerant population*

Since Leila Fawaz’s landmark study on “Merchant and Migrants in Nineteenth Century Beirut”, the cooperation between foreign and local entrepreneurs has been regarded as the lynch-pin of social change in Beirut. Although “European merchants had been amongst the first beneficiaries of Beirut’s economic expansion” Fawaz concedes that “an increasing number of factories were in local hands”. Local entrepreneurs, she argues, “were often the ‘agents of change’… [who] filled that role by first of all securing Western consular protection.”

First, it is clear that, in the context of an ever increasing volume of Mediterranean trade, local merchants with foreign language abilities served as intermediaries between European wholesalers and the local retailers in part also because of their growing money-lending capabilities at the expense of traditional landowning elites. However, where Fawaz

---


167 On the role of money-lending in the case of Nablus, see Doumani, Beshara, *Rediscovering Palestine*.
prioritises the upward mobility of Beirut’s new social group of merchants-cum-dragomans and local consular protegés as agents of change. She denies the role of those individuals and groups who actually affected the urban fabric and structure of Beirut and identified the interests of the city as their own.

Second, Fawaz convincingly demonstrates how nineteenth-century Beirut consisted in the main of immigrants from the surrounding mountains and Damascus. Indeed, the geographical origins of the council members confirm this trend. Inter-urban migration since the 1820s from declining port-cities such as Acre and Sayda to the commercial magnet Beirut applied to at least a dozen families who featured prominently on the municipal council. The Naqqashs, the Qabbanis, the Sabbaghs, the Yarids and the Tuwaynis had been close associates of Ahmad al-Jazzar and his successors. The families of 23 members moved to Beirut from towns and villages in Mount Lebanon since the late eighteenth century. Families followed the shifting geographies of political power and economic opportunity. Ancestors or grandparents of other council members had previously settled in the Hawran (13), Tripoli (8), al-`Aqra (6), the Biqa’ a (3), Aleppo (5), Albania (1), Anatolia (7), Abkhazia/Caucasus (2), Maghreb (14), Istanbul (3), Egypt (6), the Hijaz (3), Greece (4), and, of course, Damascus (9). As chapter one has shown, the demographic and particularly the political growth of the city of Beirut was exceptional. The speed with which the community of migrants became rooted and with which these families came to assume public authority is even more remarkable.

Of the one hundred municipal members, 41% had either petitioned personally for the creation of Beirut as a provincial capital in 1865, or their immediate, paternal relatives - brothers, fathers or grandfathers. The municipality formed a nucleus in the struggle for the political capitalisation Beirut. Identification with Beirut and promotion of the city’s interest vis à vis Damascus and other coastal cities were two sides of the same coin. Both positions promised to launch and/or perpetuate their elite position in the city and the empire.

Economically speaking, the gros of the members were merchants bankers or real estate owners. The Bayhums were easily the most active family force on the municipal

council. Out of eight municipal presidents between 1860 and 1908, two were Bayhums – Muhi al-Din and Muhammad. The Egyptian traveler Shaykh Muhammad 'Abd al-Jawwad al-Qayyati’s description of the Bayhums’ wealth as consisting of “lofty villas [qusur] and houses [buyut], vast properties and plots of land, caravansarays [khanat] and shops [khanawat]” is both exceptional and representative of other member families. The leading families on the council possessed regional - in the case of the Bayhums, the Da’uqs and the Ghandurs - and international trading networks - like the Sursuqs or the Trads, for example.

Others owned banking houses – like Tabib Jabbur or Albert Bassul. Significantly, a few members even were concessionaires and executive members of international investment companies themselves, like Bishara Sabbagh. Several members were also active in Beirut’s chamber of commerce. But the vast majority of council members were general traders in and of Beirut. Often merchant members benefited privately after their terms in public office expired. Al-Qayyati noticed on his visit to Beirut in 1882 that “Muhi al-Din Bayhum, formerly a municipal president, has now expanded his textile business basking in great wealth and affluence.”

A small but significant number of councillors were what I would consider career bureaucrats in the Ottoman administration. These bureaucrats did not necessarily depend financially on the Ottoman administration – Ottoman salaries were a fraction of what successful merchant would earn. Nevertheless, working for al-dawla, the Ottoman state, endowed individuals with social status and – potentially – transformative power. ‘Umar Ramadan’s father, ‘Abd al-Ghani Efendi, reportedly had ten notable sons most of them in the Ottoman civil service according to our Egyptian traveler in the 1880s. Amin Agha Ramadan had been in the Egyptian urban council for Beirut under Ibrahim Pasha in the 1830s, while his son ‘Umar Agha became member of the advisory council in the province of Syria a generation later. ‘Arif Bey Ramadan was a clerk in the grand vezir’s office and Munih Bey was a long-serving municipal inspector in Beirut. As the only municipal member with a direct family background in the military estate, ‘Umar Ramadan

168 For the names of the petitioners, see annex.
constituted a noteworthy exception to the general profile of the municipal council. But with all of Beirut’s notables active in municipal politics, his family’s sources of social status were multiple. His father ‘Abd al-Ghani signed the 1865 petition for the creation of the province of Beirut as a sayyid, designating a family with an authoritative – if not necessarily traceable – lineage to the prophet Muhammad. Other Beiruti career bureaucrats also owed their status to albeit humbler religious backgrounds. In many cases, careers in the burgeoning Ottoman bureaucracy catalysed social status into social action and – in the case of the Beirut Reform Committee of 1913 – political action. The high concentration of municipal members on provincial education councils and departments of justice is a pertinent indicator of a trend to use state positions in order to take responsibility and influence the running of the city (fig 6).

Although the Russian resident Kremski observed in 1896 that “the Trads are in ascendancy, while the elder family members care only about trade, the younger ones are keen to get education,” the transition from merchant- to literary elites often came via employment with the Ottoman state. A cousin of Jirji Trad, the journalist Najib Ibrahim Trad (1859–1911) moved to Alexandria where he worked for al-Ahram under the fellow Beiruti emigrés Bishara Pasha and Salim Bey Taqla. He became editor of al-Taqaddum and al-Saffa in Beirut and founded al-Raqib and al-Basir in Alexandria. Before the 1881 ‘Urabi revolt in Egypt, he was a translator for Ahmad ‘Urabi. Najib Ibrahim Trad wrote a books on Roman and Macedonian history and translated one of Eugene Sue’s popular and anti-clerical novels, Le Juif Errant, into Arabic (al-yahudi al-ta‘ih). One of the most numerous and best organised family network in fin de siècle Beirut, the Trads who worked on various councils and in a number of provincial government departments were in close contact with their relatives in Egypt and Europe.172

Over four generations, the Yarids ‘metamorphosed’ from advisory positions in al-Jazzar’s Acre, to merchants in Beirut, to service in the Ottoman bureaucracy and finally – in the fourth generation – to journalistic activity in Cairo’s press. Municipal president between in the 1900s, ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani combined all these metamorphoses in

171 al-Qayyati, ibid.
his own lifetime. Educated at al-Bustani’s Madrasa al-Wataniyya. Qabbani became a popular official in various departments of the provincial administration before his Hamidian proclivities caused a temporary demise during the Young Turk era. Parallel to his bureaucratic career, Qabbani co-founded modern schools, wrote text books, arts associations and newspapers.

The council members’ privileged status generally preceded their election while a successful candidacy promised to turn social status into urban impact. The municipality perpetuated their own vision for Beirut as ‘public good’ and ‘public interest’. The municipal system allowed them to shape Beirut as ‘their’ space while it excluded or marginalised others from that spatial vision – the Druze community, the guilds, menial and industrial labourers, or coffeehouse dwellers and public women. The families of the council members held considerable urban waqf properties and/or were owners of large wikalas, streets and entire suqs. They also started to invest their fortunes in land outside the city of Beirut. However, so far an automatic difference between landowner and merchant in the politics of the municipal members cannot be discerned from the prosopographical data available. It appears that the boundaries between different modes of wealth accumulation were too blurred to be significant in the politics of Beirut’s municipal council particularly since land could be bought freely on the market after the application of the Land Law to Beirut. More significant was the tendency amongst municipal members to cultivate the new quarters by founding schools, hospitals, mosques, churches, printing houses and benevolent organisations.

Thus, one unexpected discovery accrued from the profiles of municipal members is the significant overlap of Beirut’s literary elites and council members. Three municipal members had been personally involved in Beirut’s first “Oriental Society” between 1847 and 1852 (and seven close relatives). Fourteen municipal councillors were also members of al-Jam’iya al-‘Ilmiyya al-Suriyya, 1867-68. In its twelve meetings between January 15, 1868 and May 25, 1869, the Syrian Scientific Society discussed Syrian and Arab history and geography, grammar, the nature of human society, progress and civilisation, human rights,

174 Many studies of the social history of Bilad al-Sham rest on this dichotomy. See, for example, Philipp Khoury, Urban Notables and Arab Nationalism; the Politics of Damascus, 1860-1920, (Cambridge: CUP, 1983).
Greek philosophy, and good governance. The Jamʿiyyat al-Funun (beg. 1875) of Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani, Abd al-Rahim Barbir, and Saʿd Hamada was a Muslim shareholding that cooperated with the Jamʿiyyat al-Maqasid al-Khayriyya (beg. 1878) to promote modern schools for Muslim boys and girls. Finally, eight original Maqasid members were – or after its dissolution in 1880/1 became – municipal councillors.

Likewise, the link between Beirut journalists and the council members is striking. Over a dozen families of owners, editors, publishers, and correspondents of local newspapers such as Hadiqat al-Akhbar, Thamarat al-Funun, Lisan al-Hal, al-Jinan and al-Mahabba. Moreover, brothers and paternal relatives of Beirut’s municipal members were influential in Istanbul’s and Egypt’s press. Their articles in Ittihad-i Osmani and Faris al-Shidyaq’s al-Jawa’ib in Istanbul, or al-Nakhla, al-Islah, and al-Ahram in Cairo speak of an incipient network of intellectuals around the eastern Mediterranean. Frequently, editorials in Cairo treated the urban condition of Beirut critically. In Beirut and connected cities, articles on the duties of modern municipal government invoke subtle campaign tactics by journalists with political ambitions. In the absence of foreigners, compared to the municipalities of Alexandria and Istanbul, it was this second generation of literary elites, born into the Ottoman age of reforms, who used the municipality to translate their social ideas and urban concepts into practical application: through the municipality’s implementation of urban planning and regulations, through the construction of public utilities or through personal funding of parks and local schools.

Like many municipal members, Ibrahim Bey al Aswad (1851-1940) learnt Ottoman at Butrus al-Bustani’s madrasa al-wataniyya. He started his career in the Ottoman administration of Mount Lebanon before he opened the Lubnan Printing press in 1891. Later he became the editor of the journal al-Lubnan, the author of the directories Dalil Lubnan, and published the influential history book Tanwir al-Azhan fi Tarikh Lubnan in 1925. Other municipal members and been celebrated poets in the Arab world prior to their election, such


176 Intellectuals and literati were not comparable to their counterparts in Europe who, to make a living, “held minor posts in public offices.” See Stefan Zweig [1944], Die Welt von Gestern, Erinnerungen eines Europäers, (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1998), 160. In nineteenth century Beirut, journalism was rarely a means of subsistence. Most journalists had other means of income, either through family endowments (al-Qabbani), or involvement in fathers’, brothers’ or cousins’ businesses (the Trads, or Thabits for example).
as Husayn Bayhum (1833-81), others went on to become notable authors after their term of office, such as his son Ahmad Mukhtar Bayhum (1878-1922). In 1886, *wataniyya* graduate 'Abd al-Qadir al-Dana (1844-1910) established the *Bayrut* printing press in Suq Sursuq where he and his brothers published the official Ottoman *Bayrut Gazetesi* whose editor-in-chief Taha Nasuli became later. 'Abd al-Qadir was awarded imperial medals for his Arabic translation of Ahmet Cevdet Pasha’s famous historical opus *Tarih Devlet-i Osmani* in 1891. The Mudawwars – among many other literary activities – funded and co-edited the newspaper *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, while Rizqallah Khadra was the owner of Beirut’s *al-Matba’al-‘Umumiyya*. By far the most influential literary member of the Beirut municipality was Salim al-Bustani. A polymath like his father, Salim made his widely read editorials in *al-Jinan* powerful tools of shaping public opinion. Elsewhere I have argued that that three of his editorials on Beirut’s urban conditions not only reflected but also shaped social change.177 He was arguably the most important socio-political thinker in Beirut in the 1870s and the 1880s, treating such topics as Human Rights, the ‘Urabi Revolt in Egypt, the Franco-Prussian War, Religion, Education and the Spirit of the Age. Salim Bustani is considered the founder of the Arabic historical fiction and thus predates Jirji Zaydan in this role.178 Although fictional, Salim’s novels contain digressions into pressing contemporary issues, such as social fragmentation, religious zealotry and insufficient provisions of schools in the country.

Conclusion

In Beirut as in Damascus, the most attractive channels were the municipal and the provincial councils as their members wielded a high degree of decision-making power over the allocation of taxes, public construction and planning procedures. This arrangement brought along important modifications of existing patterns in the politics of notables, in power-sharing, compromise and cooperative decision-making for the sake of public welfare. The *Tanzimat* reforms were a monumental attempt to homogenise imperial administration. As we have seen in chapter one, the Beirutis successfully twisted this development in their favour by lobbying to become urban notables of a provincial capital, akin to their much more entrenched and much longer established neighbours in Damascus.

177 Hanssen, *Fin de Siècle Beirut.*
The collective urban strategies of Beiruti notables not only reacted to changing conditions in the political economy of the Ottoman-Mediterranean world but they ultimately produced perceptions of modern urbanity and discourses of progress and prosperity around the municipality that sustained the capitalisation of Beirut. It was around these discourses in fin de siècle Beirut that urban spaces were contested and class notions produced.

With the exception of a recent historiographical overview, these tendencies have not been the subject of in-depth, historical consideration. Quilty rightly discovered that scholars “have been more interested in explaining the social basis of a political phenomenon, the rise of secular Arab nationalism, than examining Syrian society for itself.” In order to change this dominant perspective, Quilty suggests bridging the gap between studies on Beirut’s and Damascus and “comparing the development of the two cities in terms of the consolidation of a notable class and the alienation of the urban masses from this consolidating class.”

Although in Urban Notables and Arab Nationalism Philip Khoury attempts a ‘sociological’ class analysis, measuring class and property in relation to the formation of a political movement such as Arab Nationalism overly subordinates his analysis to the same political categories he tried to move beyond. This brings him closer to Ernest Dawn’s thesis of a politically significant shift from Ottomanism to Arabism amongst the urban notables than he might have intended, given that Dawn’s analysis boils the difference between Ottomanists and nationalists down to inter- and intra-family rivalries for positions in the imperial bureaucracy. Clearly, Khoury’s conceptual framework of class consolidation and political factionalism intends to mark itself off against Dawn’s logic of elite self-interest. But based as it is on the late Hanna Batatu’s “economically-based” assumptions of static, a priori class boundaries, Khoury’s study fails to account for the social dynamics during the phase in question. In a recent reappraisal of the study of urban notables, Philip Khoury concedes that

180 Quilty, Bridging the Dichotomy, 9.
181 Quilty, Bridging the Dichotomy, 13.
182 “‘Class’ is, in essence, an economically based formation.” Hanna Batatu, Old Social Classes and the Revolutionary Movement of Iraq, (New Jersey, 1978), 5. Zubaida rightly points out that “[i]t is not clear whether for Batatu class relations and sentiments were non-existent under these conditions [of pre-British
Greater attention must be paid to the role of the notables in the cultural life of the towns, in particular in education and literary activities in this period of profound intellectual change.\footnote{183 Philipp Khoury, “Urban Notables Paradigm Revisited,” \textit{RMMM} 55-56, in \textit{Villes au Levant: Hommage a André Raymond}, edited by P. Baudel et al., 226.}

Khoury’s previous approach did not allow for such vital considerations of nineteenth-century developments in Middle East history because of his attempt to square the origins of Arab Nationalism with an objectively measurable notion of class. What needs to be taken into account, in the celebrated words of E. P. Thompson, is how class “was present at its own making.”\footnote{184 E. P. Thompson, \textit{Making History: Writings on History and Culture}, (New York, 1994), 8.} A specifically normative, urban discourse on what a city should look like, how and by whom it should be governed, and what end it should serve also created notions of ‘class’ through what Raymond called “the relations of society and the space in which it expands”.\footnote{185 Raymond, “Islamic City, Arab City: Orientalist Myths and Recent Views”, \textit{BJMES} 21:1 (1994), 17.} Thousands of men and women acted daily in this social space that is the city and left their mark on its rhythm and appearance. It is in this socio-spatial process that individuals and social groups - or ‘classes’ - determine on a day to day basis their sense of place in the world they inhabit.

The municipal council of Beirut developed into the main arena of the late nineteenth century variation of the politics of notables. It contributed to the survival and indeed institutional entrenchment of elite politics into the twentieth century. This elite politics was not merely driven by merchants’ or landowners’ interests, but significantly by intellectuals who implemented the idea of their city, as manifested in their newspaper writings, in and through the institution of the municipality. The language in which the journalists described the social condition was replete with metaphors of hygiene that created the beginnings of a discourse of spatial and social segregation. As such, the production of urban space and material culture was closely shaped by an ideal definition of that space and culture.
Confessional distribution in Beirut’s municipal council, 1868-1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Sunni</th>
<th>Maronite</th>
<th>Gr. Orth</th>
<th>Gr. Cath</th>
<th>R. Cath</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Foreigner</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Jew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868-73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884-88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-98</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-03</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beirut's Municipal Members, 1868-1908

Abaza Pasha, Ahmad
Abu Shand, Zion
'Ajuri, Nikula
'Aris, Ahmad Bakri
'Aris, Abd al-Qadir
'Araman, Yusuf
Arqash, Bishara
al-Aswad, Ibrahim
Ayyas, Muhammad
Ayyas, Muhammad Khayri
Badran, Abd al-Rahim
Barbir, Abd al-Qadir
Bassul, Albert
Bawwab, Salim
Baydun, Abd al-Rahman
Bayhum, Muhi al-Din
Bayhum, Hussain
Bayhum, Muhammad
Bayhum, Hassan
Bayhum, Mustafa
Bayhum, Ahmad Mukhtar
Bayhum, Muh. Mustafa
Bashbash, Nikula
Bashbash, Najib
Buiri, Habib
Bustani, Salim
Bustrus, Habib
Bustrus, Jirji Habib
Bustrus, Nakhla
Butrus, Jibran
AI-Dana, 'Abd al-Qadir
Al-Da’uq, Muh. Abu Umar
Al-Da’uq, Salim Bey
Al-Da’uq, Umar
Dabbas, Elias, Jirjis
Dimashqiyya, Arslan

[Diagram of Municipal Members, 1868-1908]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Members</th>
<th>1868-1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fakhri, Ibrahim Bey</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakhuri, Banayut</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayyad, Milhim</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayyad, Wadi'</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freije, Musa</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghabril, Ibrahim</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghandur, Mustafa</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghandur, Misbah</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghandur, Muhi al-Din</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamada, Muhi al-Din</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hani, Bishara</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hani, Yusuf</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Itani, 'Abd al-Rahman</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadday, Yusuf</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubayli, Misbah</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayyat, Nasrallah</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurella, George</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudawar, Mikail</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudawar, Nakhla</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naffa', Nakhla Bey</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naqqash, Jirji Habib</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na'um</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Qadi, Mahmud</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhayish, Muh Sa'id Bey</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naffa', Abd al-Quddus</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Na'um</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qayqani, Yusuf</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quyumci, Yusuf</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthuis, Edmond</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadhan, Umar</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizzallah, Jirji Bey</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbagh, Bishara</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbagh, Sa’id</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salam, Zayn Kamil</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shaj’an, Khudr</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuwayri, Jirji Na’ma</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sursuq, Iskandar</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sursuq, As’ad</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sursuq, Nakhila Khalil</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabbara, ‘Abd al-Hafiz</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabib, Jabbur</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayyara, Ibrahim</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayyara, Muhammad</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thabit, Yusuf</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thabit, Philippe</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad, Hanna</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad, Jirji</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad, Habib (ibn Nikula)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad, Najib Na’ma</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuweini, Jirjis</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuweini, Elias (i. Lutfallah)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuweini, Nakhla (ibn Jirjis)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuweini, Jibran (i. Andraus)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarid, Bishara</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarid, George</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakhariyya, Na’ma</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zand, Bishara</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zantut, Muhammad</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: The Empire as a Career: The Case of the Malhame Brothers

Let them say whatever they want about Abdul Hamid. He has elevated two [members, Najib and Salim Malhameh] of my community and has shown a particular affection for me; for all his faults and qualities, we see naught but his qualities.¹

Plus pernicieux encore … à Constantinople, c’est la dynastie des Malhames.²

In the early morning of July 31, 1908, Najib Pasha Malhame – erstwhile chief spy for sultan Abdülhamid II – was rudely awakened by CUP officials who put him under house arrest in his luxurious Yeniköy mansion. Unlike Najib Pasha, his older brother and neighbour in Yeniköy, Salim Pasha, and the Damascene notable Izzet Pasha who were tipped off about imminent government plans to arrest the favourites of Abdülhamid’s “old regime” and managed to sneak out of the city in the thick of the night,³ Najib Pasha had not read the writing of the Young Turk revolution on Istanbul’s walls. A failed bomb attack on his life a year earlier had generated little pity in the capital’s press. On the contrary, popular protest against his political machinations grew louder the more his imperial benefactor was forced to make concessions to the rebelling Young Turk officers in Salonika.

When the Ottoman government grudgingly reinstated the Ottoman constitution on July 24, almost the entire population of Istanbul took to the streets in celebration. A popular song to the tune of the “Cadet-Roussel” was intoned that blasted the wicked power that ‘Hamid’s Arabs’ were perceived to have wielded over the affairs of the empire:

“Ceux qu’on ne doit pas oublier,
Que sans pitié il faut chatier,
Ce sont les Mélimés, mes braves,
Qui au pays mir’nt des entraves,
Allons, les nouveau-nés,
Crions à bas les Mélimés!

Tous ces crapauds de Mélimés,
Seront de suite consués,

So much had Abdülhamid II’s rule become associated with his Arab clientele in Istanbul that, to a significant extent, the Young Turk Revolution was also understood at the time as a revolt against the Arab provinces’ assumed control over the empire’s centre of power. For how ever comprehensive and effective the institutionalisation of center and periphery had become during the Tanzimat period, communications between Istanbul and the provinces continued to be shaped by myriads of informal and semi-formal, ever changing and uncontrollable channels and human networks. These individuals made a career out of the opportunities the new bureaucratic structures offered.

Within the rapidly unfolding network of Syrian notables, Abdülhamid’s “Arabs” – Izzet Pasha al-‘Abid from Damascus, al-Sayyed Abu al-Huda from Aleppo and Najib and Salim Malhame from Beirut – had managed to attain prestigious posts as ministers and personal confidants of the sultan. These notables were able to amass vast fortunes through the pivotal positions held in the fields of waqf administration, public works and concessions. As such, their personalised access to power was not representative of a political constituency back home but obeyed the rules of intisap (patronage) in the politics of the Ottoman capital. Moreover it had become popular lore that Arabs featured prominently in the sultan’s espionage circles, with Najib Malhame as the secret director of the growing army of secret informants – or jurnalcis. The involvement of “Hamid’s Arabs” in Ottoman imperial politics was underlying tenet of the Young Turk opposition, which significantly also contained large numbers of Arab intellectuals.6

---

4 Hercule Diamantopulo, Le Réveil de la Turquie, (Alexandria 1908), 109. This source has kindly been put at the disposal of the author by Joseph Mouawad.
6 Şukri Hanioglu, The Young Turks in Opposition, (Oxford 1995). Hanioglu argues that the main tenet of
The Ottoman bureaucracy constituted a systematic framework for centre-periphery communications in which civil officials were the most pervasive human element of the imperial project of Ottomanising the provinces. Since the early years of the Tanzimat, the bureaucrats were targeted by a number of sultanic decrees that entrenched their role and function in the empire. Bureaucrats’ property and life were protected by a law in 1838 and promotion incentives were offered through an elaborately staggered system of salary, rank and award. Between 1880 and 1896, the living standards of bureaucrats improved as their daily expenditure decreased in relation to their salaries. While regular salaries were silent means of subsistence, medals and rank provided the social distinction required for political and economic advancement. The proliferation of ranks and medals in the civil service, especially during Abdülhamid II’s long reign, instituted non-hereditary distinctions, and as such were a pervasive function of state power that manufactured loyalty among the sultan’s personnel.

When the protagonist of this chapter, Salim Malhame, was appointed minister of the newly combined Ministry of Agriculture, Mines and Forests minister in 1892/3 (1310), he became the most highly decorated official in coastal Syria. But Salim Pasha Malhame, like many Muslim high bureaucrats, transcended this ‘decorade’ as Ottoman medals were matched by a whole host of international decorations. In the 1880s, the French ambassador awarded Salim Pasha with the prestigious medal of the légion d’honneur and in the 1890s he received Italian, Austrian and Russian medals of achievement.

the Young Turks opposition coalesced against Abdülhamid’s systematic undermining of the legal-rational order initiated by the Tanzimat reforms.

8 Ibid., 196-7.
9 *Salname Bayru Vilayeti*, 1892, 225, Ahmad Pasha al-Sulh Pasha was the second highest.
Descendants of Emir Ghayth

- Emir Ghayth
  - Malik Abu Ghayth
  - Emir Harfith
  - Emir Hannush
  - Emir Mashlu
  - Jabbar Ghayth al-Malhami 1034–1700
  - As-ad
  - Fadhil
  - Su-ad
  - Shaida

- Michel Malhami 1480–1725
  - Mutam Fakhr
  - Marun Malhami 1810–

- Jejo Malhami 1701–1772
  - Warda Shaifan

- Iskander Jabbar Malhami 1741–1764
  - Adel Arab
  - Marun Malhami

- Bartras Malhami
  - As-ad Malhami 1827–1880
  - Rose Khaleda
  - Ibrahim Malhami

- Yuhama Malhami
  - Khidir Malhami 1830–

- Ibrahim Malhami 1795–1825
  - Marie Misk

- Youssef Malhami 1877–1975
  - Marie Malhami 1885–1970

- Wildner von Furstenberg 1881–1963

- Suzan Malhami 1909–

- Youssef Malhami 1915–

- Marie Malhami 1917–

- Ros Ila Malhami 1928–
Where did the Malhames come from? What accounted for the powerful positions of these provincial Christians at the court of the Ottoman sultan and caliph of the Muslims? Salim Pasha’s generation of Malhames does not neatly fit the ideal-typical definition of the politics of urban notables in the Arab provinces. Compared to the preceding Malhame generation who participated in the struggle for capital Beirut and in the municipal council, the political and economic radius of Salim and his four brothers transcended the local dimension of the politics of notables during sultan Abdülhamid’s rule. Because Hourani’s criteria apply partly – community-based personal dependence and “some freedom of action” as socio-political intermediaries in a specifically urban context – the Malhames were, I would argue, ‘supra-local’ notables. They combined family politics and local patronage with a political position that scholarship has so far reserved for Ottoman high bureaucrats and a socio-economic position reserved for European entrepreneurs, concessionaires and bankers.

4.1. A Syrian Odyssey: From Rural Druze Warlords to Urban Maronite Merchants

Family lore of the Malhames claims their origins to the mythical tribe of the qahtan in Yemen. The first relatively reliable historical sources, however, begin in the town of ’Aqura in the northern mountain above Tripoli. The family claimed descent from the seventeenth-century warlord Malik ibn Abu Ghayth al-Yamani. These roots not only placed the Malhame’s ancestors in the Yamani camp and against the contemporary ruler of the

---

12 See chapter three, and municipal list.
14 Fürstenberg Family Archives, Westfälisches Archivamt, Münster – FFA hereafter. The Malhame’s genealogical record was included in the files of the FFA because Wilderich von Fürstenberg – member of the German officer corps seconded to the Ottoman ministry of war – married Marie, Salim Pasha Malhame’s eldest daughter, in Istanbul in 1908. The FFA contains two sets of correspondences relevant to this thesis. The first set contains private letters between Marie, her father and Wilderich before and after the marriage between 1907 and 1910. The second set contained official documents, birth certificates and genealogical trees compiled by Jean Malhame in 1934 and by the Maronite patriarch of Beirut, Pierre Aridha, between 1939 and 1944 in order to prove to the Nazi inquiry of Aryan racial purity that von Fürstenberg’s Maronite wife was free of Jewish ancestry. The latters’ claims were based on manuscripts and liturgical books of the Maronite clergy in the 16th and 17th century, such as Duwayne’s History (1523), p. 203, 56, Jean Dahdah’s (1575), al-Tashmakha. I was unable to check these original sources.
Qaysi faction, recent scholarship has insisted that the Qaysi-Yamani division in Lebanese history has been exaggerated. See, for example, Kamal Salibi, A House of Many Mansions, (Los Angeles, 1988).

As with many family histories in Mount Lebanon, the genealogical picture is blurred before the middle of the 18th century.


Ibid., and Pierre Aridha, \textit{FFA}. On Kassab-Malhame branch, see also \textquoteleft Isa Iskander Ma\textquoteright{luf, Diwan al-

Little is known of the Malhames whereabouts during Shihabi rule after the battle of 'Ayn Dara in 1711. In all likelihood, the Malhames followed their defeated Druze masters to the Hawran where Michel’s son, Jirjis Malhame (1701-1772), was born. After the political demise of the 'Alam al-Dins, the Malhames allied themselves to the Qaysi Abi Lama\textquoteleft clan. When both the Sunni Shihabs and the Druze Abu Lama\textquoteleft converted to Maronite Christianity
around the 1770s, the Maronite feudal lords gained political preponderance over Mount Lebanon for the first time. The Malhames returned from the Hawran to the province of Tripoli in the mid-eighteenth century before Jirjis Malhame’s son, Iskander Jabbur (1741-1794), and his wife Adele ‘Arab moved to Beirut at the end of the eighteenth century. His two sons, Ibrahim (1793-1825) and Butrus were probably the first of the family to have been born in Beirut. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Malhame family had branches in Jubayl and Zuq Mikha’il north of Beirut.

While the Malhames were prominent in Mount Lebanon and Bilad al-Sham in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they did not possess any institutionally recognised position of power. They were neither emirs like the Ma’ans, the Shihabis or the Abu Lama’s, nor landed shaykhs or muqata’ajis like the Khazins or Hubayshs. But during Egyptian rule over Syria and Mount Lebanon (1831-40), the Malhames began to partake in the economic windfall of their city. Like the Tyans, the Farajallahs and the Najjars, with whom they had family and business links, they traded with the hinterland and advanced French interests in Beirut, Mount Lebanon and Syria during the unsettled period after the withdrawal of the Egyptian forces. As’ad Efendi Malhame, Butrus’ son (1827-1880), and his business partner and neighbour Nasrallah Tarrazi provided credit to ailing feudal estates. In the larger socio-economic transformation of Mount Lebanon from subsistence to an export-oriented market economy local, urban merchants with ties to both the feudal lords of the hinterland and the European trade community emerged as pivotal and privileged intermediaries. Financial partnerships such as the Jabbur Tabib & Ibrahim Malhame and the Khadra brothers, began to manage the financial affairs of the landed notability and the growing French community in Beirut during the 1860s and 70s.

---

22 Philippe de Tarrazi, Asdaq ma Kanafi Tarikh Lubnan wa Safha min Tarikh al-Siryan, Vol 2. (Beirut, 1948), 44.
4.2. The Ideology of the Mountain: “Young Maronites” in Pursuit of Mount Lebanon

The political involvement of As’ad’s generation of Malhames in the “ideology of the mountain” was in full swing by the time of the build-up to the civil war between 1858 and 1860. The war-mongering, Maronite bishop of Beirut, Tubiyya ‘Awn, encouraged young Maronite professionals and friends of As’ad - such as Mansur Tyan, Na’um Qayqanu, Ya’qub Thabit, Nikula Naqqash, Habib Qashura, Bishara Fara’un and Yusuf al-Shantiri - to form “the Maronite League” (or “the Beirut Committee of Young Maronites”) in order to fight against the Druze. Meanwhile in Zuq Mikha’il, Kisrawan, Yuhanna Malhame was actively inciting “insurrection and disturbances.”

After the civil war, the Malhames continued to entertain the Franco-Maronite dream for Mount Lebanon. Like many Beirut-based Maronite merchants, the Malhames were sympathisers of Yusuf Karam Bey in his rejection of the establishment of the Mutasarrifiyya of Mount Lebanon under an Ottoman governor. Ibrahim Malhame was Yusuf Karam’s trusted treasurer and property administrator. As’ad Malhame was a childhood friend of Karam Bey and was considered “as one of the most fervent partisans of the Shaykh [Karam Bey].” During French-Ottoman deliberations on Karam Bey’s revolt of 1866, As’ad functioned as the rebel’s representative in urban Beirut, in whose house the French consul extended his short-lived commitment to Karam Bey on behalf of the emperor. Also amongst Yusuf Karam’s loyal band of men were the Khadras who, like the Malhames, were urban-based, Maronite merchants and who had powerful connections to French Catholic circles. As’ad’s marriage to Rizqallah Khadra’s sister Rose institutionalised the powerful family alliance between the Malhames and the Khadras. This alliance also included Ibrahim

24 The distinction between city and Mountain is adopted from Albert Hourani, “Ideology of the Mountain and the City: Reflections on the Lebanese Civil War,” in his Emergence of the Modern Middle East, (Los Angeles, 1981), 172-181.
26 Habib Zind to Tanyus Shatin, February 9, 1860 in Malcolm Kerr, Lebanon in the last years of Feudalism, 1840-1868; a Contemporary Account by Antun Dahir al-Aqiqi and other Documents, (Beirut, 1959), 139.
27 Tawfic Touma, Paysans et Institutions Féodales au Liban, (Beirut, 1971), 319.
29 al-Jarida, October 24, 1964.
Malhame’s powerful banking associate Jabbur Tabib who was married to another sister of Rizqallah Khadra.\textsuperscript{31}

Yusuf Karam Bey’s revolt of 1866 which, as Carol Hakim recently argued, despite its time lag, “was in fact directly linked to developments in 1860-1” and as such constituted a continuation of the ideology of the mountain. Its crushing defeat was the end of the “Franco-Maronite dream” to establish Mount Lebanon as a Maronite entity.\textsuperscript{32} The emerging Maronite urban bourgeoisie shared with – or projected onto – Yusuf Karam Bey a certain idealism, a political utopia, that pitted them against Ottoman assertion in Mount Lebanon and that was to reemerge only after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I.\textsuperscript{33}

4.3. The Ideology of the City: Municipal Maronites and Ottoman Beirut

With the failure of the Karam revolt and Yusuf Bey’s exile, these urban actors abandoned the Franco-Maronite dream for Mount Lebanon and acquiesced to Ottoman rule in the Mutasarrifiyya. If their influence over the politics of the mountain decreased temporarily, it was to resurge on a grander scale under Na’um Pasha’s governorship (1892-1902) and Salim Pasha Malhame’s term as imperial minister and confident of sultan Abdülhamid.

Meanwhile, Jabbur Tabib, Rizqallah Khadra, As’ad Malhame, Na’um Qayqanu and other ‘Young Maronites’ in Beirut turned their attention to the development of the city and featured prominently on consecutive municipal councils. Moreover, As’ad Malhame, Bishara Farajallah, Nikula Naqqash and Ya’qub Tabit had signed the 1865 petition for the elevation of Beirut to the status of an Ottoman provincial capital. The seemingly contradictory attitude of these Young Maronites toward mountain and city was also a question of the limits of the politically possible. As a historically mixed, coastal city, Beirut was immune to the Maronite claims over the mountain. After initial euphoria at the arrival of the French expedition troops in 1860, which prompted As’ad Malhame to host a lavish dinner for the naval officer corps,\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{30} On Khadra’s connections, see Spagnolo, France and Ottoman Lebanon, 60, 78, 202.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{32} Hakim, Origins, 157.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Al-Jarida, October 24, 1964.
the lewd behaviour of the French soldiers soon aroused contempt amongst Beirut’s population.35

Khawaja As’ad Efendi Malhame died before completing his second term of office on the municipal council in 1880. Voted onto the council two years previously in a by-election following his predecessor’s election to the Ottoman Parliament, he participated in one of the most euphoric and active periods of the municipality. His term coincided with the Syrian governorship of Ahmad Midhat Pasha who encouraged local communities to invest in the improvement of their cities.36 Indeed, As’ad Malhame’s generous financial contributions to the ultimately unsuccessful local bid to finance the port enlargement and the urban development plans on Sahat al-Burj were publicised in a series of articles in *Lisan al-Hal* and identified As’ad as a leading urban notable.37

For Asa’d Malhame, election to the municipal council really constituted the culmination of his political career. He influenced Maronite and Ottoman politics from his grand residences in East Beirut and off the Damascus road in Ghalghul. Through business partnerships with powerful urban actors and a network of informal, family and confessional ties, he emerged as a central figure in Beirut. In the process, he was an agent as much as a product of the city’s political and financial ascendance over the mountain that crystallized during his adult lifetime. His shift from brokering politics of the mountain to acquiescence to Ottoman rule and indeed entering the local Ottoman administration represented a general shift in the Young Maronites’ attitude towards Ottoman and urban supremacy over the mountain.

If municipal Beirut was the limit of As’a’d’s own social and institutional ascendance, a generous endowment of “three fortunes”38 towards the education of the sons and daughters of the Malhame family was to catapult the next generation of Malhames out of the confines of Beirut and Mount Lebanon and into the throes of imperial politics in the Ottoman capital. The first beneficiary of As’ad’s generosity appears to have been Salim Pasha Malhame. Although the evidence is circumstantial, we can assume that the endowment must have supported Salim’s education in his early years in Istanbul. With Salim and Najib Pasha, as

35 See chapter seven.
36 See previous two chapters.
37 *Lisan al-Hal*, March 7, May 1, 10, 14, 1879.
38 Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kana*, 44.
well as their brothers, Philippe, Habib, Iskander and Shukri. The politics of notables in general and the Malhames in particular entered a new, imperial dimension. Their success in Istanbul’s palace politics under Abdülhamid II owed less to genealogical lineage than to education and personality nurtured through their uncle’s patronage.

4.4. The Malhame Brothers: The formation of a Generation of Ottoman Bureaucrats

4.4.1. Salim Pasha Malhame (1851-1937): The Making of an Imperial Minister

Details about Salim Malhame’s early life are not entirely certain, and the scarce and incomplete sources that exist occasionally contradict each other. It is relatively certain, however, that he was baptised on October 15, 1851 in St. George church in Beirut and died on December 10, 1937.\(^39\) He was the oldest son of an unlicensed lawyer, Bishara ibn Jabbur Malhame, the cousin of As‘ad, with spoken and written fluency in Arabic, Turkish, French and Italian.\(^40\) Having spent his early education in the Lazarist school of ‘Aynutra in Mount Lebanon, he left Beirut sometime after the Karam revolt, probably in 1867. His sicill-i ahval entry gives 1284 (1867/8) as the date of his first assignment in the imperial bureaucracy when he became a part-time scribe in the archives of the Ottoman Council of State. During his first residence in Istanbul, he was rumoured to have been a student in the prestigious Galataserai Lycee,\(^41\) probably on a stipend from his uncle’s endowment. According to Young Turk investigations into his early life in 1908, he was

a remarkable student, he learnt French and Turkish very quickly [and] became a part-time supervisor at the school for 50 franc per month when he turned 17. Well-built, rosy-faced, unpredictable and curious, he possessed all the physical advantages for an impressive career in the Ottoman service. His cultural refinement attracted him to Haji Ali Bey, [a dean of school and] the first chamberlain at the palace. [The latter] trained him to spy on the students and had many of them expelled.\(^42\)

---

\(^{39}\) Pierre ‘Arida, *FFA*. His baptism’s witnesses were Khalil Malhame, Parrain Maraine and Rajum al-Khuri (née Malhame?).


\(^{41}\) Diamantopulo, *Le Réveil de la Turquie*, 106. However, Salim does not feature on the alumni list of the school, according to François Georges – private correspondence with this author.

\(^{42}\) Diamantopulo, *Le Réveil de la Turquie*, 106. Hajj Ali was also the political patron of Ahmad Izzet and Beirut’s 1891-2 governor general Aziz Pasha.
His next entry in the *sicill-i ahval* is in 1287 (1870/1) when he returned to Syria for a post “with responsibility” (*hamaluq*) as scribe to the governor general of Syria. 'Abd al-Latif Subhi Pasha. Subhi Pasha appears to have taken Salim under his wing and assumed his patronage. Salim’s resignation from his Syrian assignment coincided with his mentor’s dismissal in February 1873, and it is likely that he followed Subhi Pasha to Istanbul where he quickly found employment in the scribal unit of the Foreign Ministry’s language office. He volunteered for the Ottoman army during the Serbian crisis in 1876, which brought him his first of many promotions. This somewhat surprising and risky career move must have dispelled all potential reservations hedged against a Christian Arab in emergency task forces for the Ottoman state. The move certainly paid off after the war, for he was quickly appointed to highly sensitive and high profile assignments; first as French translator on the Eastern Rumelian boundary commission and soon afterwards as inspector on the Bulgarian commission.

In 1878 he was promoted councillor in the tax administration (*rusum idare*) – the predecessor of the Public Debt Administration. In late 1881 (1299), the *sicill-i ahval* records a transfer from an “assignment with Russia” to assistant directorship of the Special Income Administration (*varidat-i mahsusus*). A fall-out with Calliard, a director at the Public Debt Administration, threatened to end Salim Malhame’s young career in the Ottoman bureaucracy. But his support in the sultan’s entourage - probably the first Chamberlain Haji Ali - gained him quick reinstatement and by the end of that year, he was decorated with the order of the *Mecidiye*, third class, “for his achievements for the sultanate and a pay rise to 7,500 piasters monthly.” He was made sub-director of the bureau of expenditures (*Muhassibet atika Muhassibesi*) before he was promoted to councillor in the central administration of the Six-Nation Council of the Special Income Administration. In 1885 (1303) he became director of the revenues conceded to the PDA where he stayed for six years, before the sultan appointed him to the newly created ministry of agriculture, mines and forestry in 1893 at a vizierial salary of 20,833 piasters.

---

43 See annex for a biography of Subhi Pasha.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 *Devlet Aliye Salnamesi*, 1883/4, (1301), 442.
4.4.2. Najib Pasha Malhame (ca. 1854-1927): In His Majesty’s Secret Service

Najib Pasha Malhame was an even more enigmatic figure in the sultan’s entourage than his older brother. It is partly a testimony to his successful career as special envoy and secret agent under Abdülhamid that he remained in the shadow of historical sources. In part, also the limited insight into his public, let alone his private life is due to the fact that he was constantly on the move in the sultan’s secret service. He must have arrived in Istanbul sometime in the mid-1880s. Najib was connected to the Tunisian community in Istanbul through his services as secretary to Mustafa Ibn Isma’îl, a disillusioned former Prime Minister of Tunisia (1878-82) and naturalised French citizen (editor of _al-Shams_ in Paris) who settled in Istanbul in 1889. Probably encouraged and inspired by his former Tunisian employer, Najib went to Tunis as a merchant, legal advisor and journalist after his mentor’s death in 1892. After an incident of battery and verbal assault on French officials, the French authorities suspended him. He then turned to journalism and founded _al-Basira_ with his fellow Beiruti Maronite Farajallah Nammur. The tone of this weekly newspaper was markedly pro-Ottoman and perceived as anti-French and anti-British by those in the respective foreign services. Najib stayed on in Tunis until 1897 when he had to leave “under delicate circumstances”.

Against the explicit protest of the French Foreign Minister, Hanotaux, Najib arrived in France as attaché to the Ottoman embassy in 1897. Najib had been able to convince the sultan that he should entrust him with breaking up the Young Turk opposition circles in Paris and Geneva. Najib’s negotiations with the Arab _emigré_ intelligentsia temporarily defused tensions with the palace and planted dissent between different ethnic elements of the opposition. He was able to convince certain members of the Turkish-Arab opposition to take advantage of Abdülhamid’s new policy to improve relations with the elites in the Syrian provinces. Within months of Najib’s arrival in Paris, the leading constitutionalist activist,
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49 Significantly, no _sicill-i ahval_ records exist for Najib Malhame.
50 Tunger-Zanetti, _Province et Métropole_, 209.
51 The paper ran from April 14, 1893 to January 7, 1897; see Tarrazi, _Tarikh_. According to _al-Jarida_, November 3, 1964, the Nammurs were Maronites who came to Beirut from Saida who lived in Zuqaq al-Blat and were related to the Malhames. We have already encountered Bishara Nammur as a lawyer in chapter one.
52 Tunger-Zanetti, _Province et Métropole_, 209.
53 Hanioglu, _The Young Turks in Opposition_, 117, 123, 125.
54 Engin Akarli, “Abdulhamid II’s Attempt to Integrate Arabs into the Ottoman System,” in _Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period_, edited by David Kushner. (Leiden, 1986), 74-89.
Salim Faris al-Shidyaq, accepted the sultan's offer of the concession for the water distribution in Beirut in return for agreeing to cease publication of his journal *Huriyet*.\(^{55}\)

When the French government finally forced Najib to leave Paris a year later, he took over the role of tracking CUP activities as Ottoman commissioner to Bulgaria. Upon arrival in Sophia in October 1898, the diplomatic community and Prince Ferdinand boycotted Najib's lavish official receptions.\(^{56}\) Najib quickly set up a network of informants to survey the growing violence in the Balkans. Under the threat of Russian expansion, Prince Ferdinand held secret meetings with Najib Pasha on the Orient Express in an attempt to convince the sultan of his government's pro-Ottoman position. The meetings proved futile as Ferdinand accused Najib and the Ottoman government of sustaining Greek bands against Bulgarians in Macedonia.\(^{57}\)

Najib Pasha Malhame held immensely important and prestigious posts abroad but the Porte never promoted him higher than undersecretary of the Ministry of Public Works. In fact Tevfik Pasha, the minister of foreign affairs, blocked Najib's demand for a post in his ministry.\(^{58}\) Denied the appreciation he thought he deserved from the Porte, he was desperate for official recognition and remuneration. Sa‘id Na‘um Duhani remembers Najib, in contrast to his brother Salim, as someone who was constantly in need of money.\(^{59}\) In the memoirs of Grand Vizier Küçük Sa‘id Pasha, on at least one occasion the author grew impatient with Najib's haggling over his salaries:

> Shortly after his return from Bulgaria Najib was appointed by imperial decree as councillor to the Ministry of Public Works at a salary of 10,000 piasters. Several times Najib came to me to complain that the salary was insufficient in his opinion. I dismissed his proposal in each respect but in his last advance I refused to answer him because of his improper urging. Because of that Najib went off saying “I will make it happen!”\(^{60}\)

Clearly someone in the Palace overruled Sa‘id’s refusal, as a little later the sultan granted him “an additional 200 lira on account of extraordinary expenditures incurred during

---

\(^{55}\) Hanioglu, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, 43.


\(^{60}\) Sa‘it, *Memoirs*, 102.
his commissarship [in Bulgaria]."61 Abdülhamid recalled Najib to Istanbul in 1902 under increasing international pressure. Back in Istanbul he became the unofficial head of the Hamidian surveillance system. His specific job description, and his privileged position with the sultan, turned parts of Istanbul into hostile territory for him. Even within the walls and corridors of the Yildiz palace, Najib and Salim Malhame were objects of rivalry. By the time Najib came back to reside in Istanbul, he had fallen out with the Aleppine Abu-1-Huda, the sultan’s most trusted confidant, over a religious dispute between the Rifa’i and the Kadriyya orders back in Tunis.62

What went on behind the walls of the Yildiz palace was a constant source of gossip in Istanbul – among diplomats and journalists alike. In 1902, Salim mysteriously disappeared for several days after the editor of Servet-i Funun threatened him with a revolver inside Yildiz palace.63 Episodes like these gave rise to speculation in the international press and on the streets of Istanbul about the balance of power inside the Yildiz palace. Within the Yildiz camarilla, rivalry was enormous, especially when it came to securing concessions and projects in the provinces. The goings-on at Yildiz palace were also closely monitored in distant cities like Damascus and Beirut. In 1894, the British consul in Beirut received a list of notables who were alleged to “interfere with the Sultan in the interest of France”, including the names of Beirutis among them that of Yusuf al-Mutan and Salim Pasha Malhame and Damascenes, such as Ahmad Izzet Pasha.64 Although such reports were rarely accurate, they kept the Malhames in a precarious position throughout their political career in Istanbul.

Whereas Izzet Pasha made himself indispensable to the sultan’s political plans by masterminding the grandiose Hijaz Railway project, Najib’s crowning opportunity to solidify his position in the palace came when he investigated the bomb threat at Yildiz palace.65 Subsequently, Najib Malhame attracted international media attention when he successfully led the inquiry into a second assassination attempt on the sultan in Sofia in 1905 and in the process averted an indiscriminate clamp down on suspects as demanded by the hard-liners. He was given credit from the unlikely source of the British “men on the spot” for the way he dealt with the investigations. British intelligence reports credit Najib with “diverting

61 Ibid.
62 Tunger Zanetti, Province et Métropole, 133
63 Berliner Tageblatt, February 22, 1901. Thanks to Stefan Weber who shared this document with me.
64 PRO, FO/195/1843, Beirut, March 8, 1894.
suspicion from innocent persons and opening the sultan’s eyes to the unreliable nature of the
great majority of their complaints.”

In another delicate diplomatic incident involving Najib Pasha, British intelligence
proved less charitable towards his politics. In May 1906, the Ottoman army tore down the
disputed British border post of Rafeh in northern Sinai claiming that it was a violation of
Ottoman suzerainty over Egypt. In this incident, Najib appears as a kind of shadow foreign
minister to Tevfik Pasha. When the Ottoman Foreign Minister’s representations at the British
embassy in Istanbul threatened to fail, Najib visited the ambassador and reiterated Ottoman
demands for the evacuation of Taba and the establishment of the status quo without
borders.

Back in Istanbul he pursued his office duties as supreme spy. Najib was rewarded
with the rank of vizier, and appointment as *gidish me 'muru*, which made him directly
responsible for the safety of Istanbul on the three occasions of the sultan’s annual customary
exits from the precinct of the palace. For a sultan whose obsession with personal security was
proverbial, this appointment arguably turned Najib into one of Abdülhamid’s most trusted
servants.

In 20 years, Najib Pasha Malhame had turned from a ‘Levantine adventurer’ into an
indispensable element in Abdülhamid’s system of rule. In 1908, the Young Turk revolution
put an end to the career advancement of both Salim and Najib. Through his close relationship
with the Italian ambassador, Salim Pasha was warned of the events early enough to escape to
Florence on board an Italian steamship. He retired to San Remo never again to take an active
part in politics. He pursued his business brokerage and maintained his wealth. He frequently
traveled to Germany, Austria and France to visit his children who had married into European
aristocratic families. His son Habib Bey came back to Beirut after completing a doctoral
thesis in Freiburg and Oxford to become the general director of the Beirut port company after
Lebanese independence. Najib Pasha, in contrast, maintained closer and more long-lasting
ties to Lebanese politics under the Young Turks and the French mandate owing in part to his
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65 According to Duhani (131), the case was called “Affaire de la Bombe de Joris.”
67 *British Documents on the Origins of the War*, 191.
68 Habib Melhame, *Der Libanon*, (Freiburg: Hochreuther, 1915).
marriage to Caroline Ra'ad, the daughter of the Beiruti concessionaire and member of the Ottoman Council of State Salim Ra'ad.

When the Young Turks passed a general amnesty for the former members of Abdülhamid’s camarilla, Najib tried to get back into favour with the new government. He returned to Istanbul in 1911 where Enver Pasha befriended him through the offices of Shakib Arslan. Enver realized the value of Najib’s experience and knowledge and secretly put him on a retainer. When the world war started, Najib volunteered to go to Syria to “advise the Christians on their political loyalty to the state.” Arrived in Damascus, Najib asked Arslan to arrange an interview with Jamal Pasha in a Damascus Hotel, though his request was rejected despite Arslan’s contacts with the Ottoman minister.69

Much less is known about the other Malhame brothers and cousins in Istanbul. Habib, Iskander and Shukri Malhame and a host of cousins and in-laws owed their prominent positions inside the Ottoman Council of State, the international Public Debt Administration and the Tobacco Régie to the positions of the two elder brothers. After the Young Turk revolution, Habib formed a financial partnership with Michel Tuweini, dragoman at the French consulate in Beirut to form an estate and agricultural credit bank with Anglo-Syrian financing.70 Their cousin, Antun Bey Malhame and E. Crespin – a father-in-law of Salim Pasha – were long-serving provincial inspector generals.71

4.5. Bankers, Pashas and Families in Imperial Politics: The Malhames between Beirut, Mount Lebanon and Istanbul

As a generation before in Beirut, the Malhame’s dynamics on the property market in Istanbul reflect their larger social and political rise to power. The residential patterns of the Malhames in Istanbul suggests that the family remained the same closely knit social unit they had been a generation earlier in Beirut. For much of their careers, the family members sought each others’ neighbourly proximity. As their salaries and status improved they moved from the backstreets of Galata to near Taksim square and then to into the vicinity of diplomatic circles along the Bosporus. Back in native Beirut, the “Sadat Malhame” (probably the Salim
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70 MAE, Nantes, *Fonds Damas consulat 42*, Damascus, July 8, 1910. Thank you to Frank Peter for sharing this document.
71 *Anuaire Constantinopolitaine*, (Istanbul, 1901), 60.
branch of the family) maintained a residential presence for their frequent return visits and settled in a large mansion in the “consuls’ quarter” west of the city centre.

4.6.1. The Province in the Centre; the Malhames in Istanbul

In provincial Beirut, we have seen how central the role of family ties was in urban politics. In the capital of the empire, family solidarity and networks were arguably even more important given the relative anonymity of the big city. When Salim arrived in Istanbul, he was adopted by the Levantine community that consisted of Syrians, Armenians, Catholics and bureaucrats from the Arab provinces. Some of them had already welcomed Yusuf Karam Bey in his Istanbul exile: the Aleppine Armenian Catholic Patriarch, Antonius Butrus Hassun, priest Istefan Masabki, the envoy of the Maronite patriarch and Avrupa Tuccari, Bulaki Elias Hawwa72, Ahmad Faris al-Shidyaq, ’Abdallah al-Saqqal, Antun Gharu, Yusuf Assaf and Ibrahim ‘Anjuri. Camille Eddé, son of the director of foreign affairs for the province of Beirut, was employed in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.73 Yusuf Kana’an Bey was imperial inspector of roads and throughways, Elias Matar had arrived in 1878 for an appointment at the imperial hospital,74 Sa’adallah Bustani, a translator at the Ministry of Public Works75, and Sa’ad Shuqayr, the chief librarian at the Yildiz palace.76

None of these members of the Syrian community, however, was in any position to advance Salim Malhame’s career. What catapulted him to Istanbul’s high finance and banking circles was his marriage to Aimée Crespin around 1883 or 1884.77 Her pedigree meant upward mobility for young Salim. Her ancestral families, the Crespins78, the Glavans79, and the Lorandos80 were established in the Levant since the mid-eighteenth

72 Like the Mudawwars, the Hawwas are mentioned as “the sultans merchants” in Masters, B., “The Sultans Merchants: The Avrupa Tuccaris and the Hayriye Tuccaris in Syria,” IJMES 24 (1992), 579-597.
73 Findley, Ottoman Civil Officialdom, 92.
74 In 1874, still in Damascus, he had written al-’Uqud al-Durriyya fi-l-mamlakat al-Suriyya.
75 Annuaire Constantinopolitaine, (Istanbul, 1905), 404.
76 Sabine Praetor, Der Arabische Faktor in der jungtürkischen Politik: Eine Studie zum Osmanischen Parlament der II. Konstitution (1909-1918), (Berlin, 1993), 256.
77 Aimée Crespin was baptised in St. Antoine in Istanbul on May 2, 1855 and died in Florence on December 24, 1944. Pierre ‘Arda, FFA.
78 Annuaire Constantinopolitaine, (Istanbul, 1892), 640, the Crespins have a street in Pera (near Rue de Theatre) named after them. 1895, 35. E. Crespin was a provincial inspector to the PDA.
79 Her mother’s side, Gaspard Guillian Glavani. The Glavani family owned the Hotel de Londres on a street that bore their name. Like Camondo Glavani and Lorando were old banking houses in Istanbul.
80 Her paternal grandmother’s side was Lorando. Rue Lorando was a street off La Grande Rue de Pera.
century. They were French catholic families with considerable property-holdings in Istanbul. On a number of occasions in his later career, his in-laws provided him with an edge in Istanbul’s delicate fin-de-siècle politics.

The Ottoman government at the Sublime Porte on the other side of the Golden Horn, however, tended to look down on the Syrian provincial upstart. The grand vezir Kuiğük Sa’it Pasha – formerly most sympathetic to the Malhames, called his former protegé Salim a self-seeking individual (“menfaat perestliği”) in his memoirs.81 At the turn of the century, his position as minister of Agriculture, Forests and Mines, allowed him an important edge over rivals in the concessions game as he secured, for example, the silk concession of Bursa.82

Under Salim Pasha’s forceful leadership and powerful connections, the newly created ministry was able to secure funds to increase professional expertise.83 Salim took over and recruited many Armenians who belonged to the extended circle of the Malhames’ allies. As director of the imperial schools, Salim Pasha encouraged industrial and agricultural education across the empire, and in 1903 founded a department of veterinary medicine. His office on Sultan Ahmet Square in old Istanbul processed a large quantity of applications to exploit the empire’s natural resources and energy supplies. European concession hunters would pass through Salim Pasha’s doors to obtain favourable terms from the Ottoman state.84

Salim Pasha was successful in brokering state loans with foreign banks. During the renegotiations of the Muharram Agreement between the PDA and the Ottoman government in 1903, the grand vezir, Kuiğük Sa’it Pasha, called on Salim, who refused the new terms and instead arranged a loan with the controversial banking house Tubini and Lorando.85 It was these kinds of business brokerages that led to Salim Pasha’s enemies’ most vitriolic attacks. After the Young Turk revolution of 1908, he was accused of abusing his position as by the granting of mining and forestry concessions that led to a depletion of natural resources by

81 Sa’it, Memoirs, 183. Sa’it Pasha had taken young Salim under his wing after Subhi Pasha retired and had entrusted him with a post on the PDA and the Eastern Rumelian Boundary Commission.
84 BBA, YMTV, 221/48-51, 8.C. 1319 (1900). A deforestation concession was granted to one M. Carbone by the Ministry of Mines, Forests and Agriculture.
85 Sa’it, Memoirs, 185. For the controversy that severely shook Franco Ottoman diplomatic relations, see William Shorrock, French Imperialism in the Middle East: The Failure of Policy in Syria and Lebanon, 1900-1914, (Madison, 1975), 23ff.
forcing the Ottoman government into contracts with investment companies that offered him as much as 50% of the cost of the concession.86

The net profit of Salim’s concession brokerage was (over-) estimated at 15 million lira, or c. £150,000. The Ottoman Imperial Bank provides some realistic statistical insight into Salim Pasha’s personal assets deposited in his Istanbul bank account. From these scarce sources we can deduce that as Salim Pasha’s world-wide share holdings flourished, it more than outmatched his monthly ministerial salary of 20,833 piasters (ca. £230 Sterling).87

Salim Pasha Malhame’s shareholdings taken from his private bank account at the Ottoman Imperial Bank88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1896 shares owned</th>
<th>1898 shares sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cassaba I</td>
<td>185 shares Dercos, kept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 obligations Cassaba II</td>
<td>135 Soc Gen d’Assurances Ottomanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 obl. Saloniki – Cple</td>
<td>500 Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 Shares Cigarettes B[eur?]</td>
<td>100 Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 shares New Africa</td>
<td>1,100 Cigarettes B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 shares BIO</td>
<td>500 Anglo-French Exploration Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Chimes West</td>
<td>800 Nourse Deep Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 South West Africa</td>
<td>500 Chimes West Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Lydenburg Goldfields</td>
<td>750 South West Africa Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 shares Nourse Deep</td>
<td>200 East Rand Property Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 Eastern Investment Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 Transvaal Gold Mining Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 Fraser River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total credit of 45,175 Ottoman Lira</td>
<td>13,963 lira against a debt of 23,770.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salim’s debt with BIO is TL 85,000 of which ca. 30,000 lira were covered by his assets. In May he also held 600 shares of Beirut-Damascus railway at 7,920 francs. Sold to balance his debt with BIO. But he kept 185 shares of Dercos, 636 of the B-D railway, 23 Istanbul Water company, 30 Ottoman Insurances.

86 Diamantopoplu, Le Reveil, 107.
87 OBA, OD-007, file no. 10301; RC-001, “Règlements de Comptes Sélim Pasha Melhamé,” and AD-003, “Dossier d’Avances sur Garanties Diverses, S.E. Sélim Pasha Melhamé.”
88 OBA, RC-001, “Règlements de Comptes Sélim Pasha Melhamé.”
By the time Salim Pasha Malhame’s generation took control over family affairs, the conditions and sources of power in Mount Lebanon had changed considerably from the previous generation of Young Maronites. Competition for powerful and prestigious administrative positions in the bureaucracy increased dramatically with the emergence of young professionals, scions of lesser lineage, urban notables and social upstarts—such as Mustafa Arslan, Habib Sa’ad, Iskander Tuweini, Dahir Kanq’an or Jirji Zuwain. They were able to bypass the traditional families’ grip on offices through the patronage of supra-local notables in Istanbul such as the Malhames and Izzet Pasha. As this process unfolded, rivalry for public office in the mutasarrifiyya was controlled by a system of highly politicised patron-client relationships between Istanbul and Mount Lebanon.

Yusuf Karam Bey’s failure in 1866 signaled international as well as local acquiescence to Ottoman sovereignty in Mount Lebanon. Expansion of French economic interests in the Eastern Mediterranean tended to override the desire to champion the Maronite cause for an independent Christian mountain. Instead, as Akarli states, “Ottoman authority as such had become a convenient tool for France and other major powers to perpetuate their interests.” As material and economic stakes in Syria took precedence, however, Ottoman men on the spot and certain supra-local notables maintained and even widened the scope of their influence. At the same time, as the Maronite church emerged as a powerful force in the struggle to modify the existing regulations and push for better confessional representation inside the provincial administration, they, too, sought the patronage of the Malhames in Istanbul.

Supra-local notables like the Malhames emerged in the cracks of international diplomacy over the government of the Mount Lebanon. The appointment of Salim Pasha Malhame as minister of Agriculture, Mines and Forests, ushered in the golden age of “the Malhame dynasty” in the ‘politics of the mountain’, which came to be dominated by the five Malhame brothers:
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89 Akarli, The Long Peace, 78.
One should not forget that we are in the province here. All the relatives, allies or friends of this [Malhame] family have been showered with official decorations and medals and want to convert their distinctions in more solid money.\textsuperscript{90}

As a director of the Beirut port company and share holder of the Beirut-Damascus railway, Salim Malhame’s first major political involvement in the gambit of Mount Lebanon came in 1892. When the popular governor of Mount Lebanon, Wasa Pasha, died in office, a veritable battle for his succession as Governor General of the mutasarrif\texti{\texti{\texti{iyya}}\texti{\texti{\texti{a}}}} ensued. Significantly, as the first serious Maronite contender since Karam Bey, Salim Pasha Malhame was endorsed, not by France, but by the Ottoman sultan. On the contrary, Salim Malhame’s candidacy was blocked by the French ambassador because “he was considered ‘less than trustworthy’, even though Malhamah was prepared to commit himself in writing to the French Embassy.”\textsuperscript{91} But the British, Italian and Austrian governments as well as Cevdet Pasha at the Porte all objected to Salim Malhame’s nomination on the grounds of his local Maronite origin.\textsuperscript{92}

Instead, it was Na’um Tutunji who was eventually given the governorship by the international committee on Lebanon and the sultan duly promoted him to the rank of Pasha. Born to a Catholic doctor with roots in Aleppo, his appointment meant a return to the pro-Maronite Kusa faction as he had family ties to Franko Pasha Kusa, the second Ottoman governor in Mount Lebanon. But at the beginning of his rule, Na’um Pasha’s successful efforts to manage the mountain depended heavily on support from Istanbul. It was during his term of office that Salim Pasha Malhame emerged as one of the main power brokers in the new politics of the Mountain. The Malhames were able to allay recriminations against the governor by the European consuls and masterminded a second term for Na’um Pasha.\textsuperscript{93}

It would be over-simplified to assume that the Malhames in Istanbul turned Na’um Pasha into a lackey of their politics. Na’um Pasha astutely counter-balanced the overarching influence of Najib and Salim Pasha on affairs in the mountain by making their declared enemy, Iskander Bey Tuwaini, his personal advisor and by appointing him to the vice-presidency of the Administrative Council. In the event, Na’um’s reliance on an advisor

\textsuperscript{90} Ismail, \textit{Documents Diplomatiques}, Vol. 17, Beirut, September 27, 1900, 112.
\textsuperscript{91} Spagnolo, \textit{France and Ottoman Lebanon}, 191.
\textsuperscript{92} AA, \textit{Acta betreffend den Libanon, Türkei, no. 177}, July 25, 1892; Isma’\texti{\texti{\texti{i}}}l, \textit{Documents Diplomatiques}, Vol. 17, March 12, 1902.
considered corrupt by the international committee did much to discredit his governorship. By the end of Na‘um Pasha’s second term of office, the political weight of his Syrian lobby in the palace, “Izzet Pasha and the Malhame family”, was unable and less willing to push for a renewal of his term.

A suspicious French consul in Beirut was convinced that “Na‘um Pasha had, in fact, become a protegé of the Malhames without realising that they are keen to have him out of Mount Lebanon and be replaced by Salim Pasha [in 1902]. They tend to circumvent the authority of the mutasarrif while encouraging him to assume higher offices after his term expires, such as ambassador.”\(^9^4\) Salim Pasha was indeed at the forefront of the 1902 election again. But as the campaign unfolded, Salim Pasha did not stand himself, as anticipated by the increasingly hostile French diplomatic corps. Rather, he pushed for two Armenian candidates from his entourage, Aram Bey, his loyal deputee at the ministry, and Ohannes Bey Quyumjian, the son of Salim’s landlord in Yeniköy and his predecessor at the Directorate of Forests and Mines.\(^9^5\)

Malhame patronage in Mount Lebanon included the Maronite patriarch, Elias Huwayyik and Habib Bey Sa‘ad both of whom owed their decorations and promotions to Salim and Najib’s influence. Joseph Malhame, As‘ad’s son, and Habib Bey Sa‘ad, a wealthy landowner in the mountain, were both involved in charity work of Young Maronite League, over which they presided. In 1897-8, they organised exhibitions and collected almost 140,000 lira in donations for the urban poor in the name of the sultan.\(^9^6\) Through the brinkmanship of the Malhames, Habib Bey Sa‘ad soon became Pasha and was decorated with Ottoman medals of achievement. Under the government of Muzaffer Pasha, Habib Pasha Sa‘ad emerged as the most powerful bureaucrat on the Administrative Council. After Muzaffer Pasha’s death in 1907 and the return of the Kusa faction through the election of Yusuf Pasha, he temporarily fell out of favour before being re-appointed as vice president of the Administrative Council under the next governor and long-term friend of Salim Pasha Malhame, Ohannes Pasha Quyumjian.\(^9^7\)

\(^9^4\) Ibid.
\(^9^5\) Ohannes Bey was connected to the Christian Syrian community in Istanbul through his marriage to a Maronite from the Hawwa family.
\(^9^6\) *Lisan al-Hal*, February 7, 1898.
In 1905, a much publicized visit of the Maronite patriarch of Beirut, Elias Huwayyik, to the sultan in Istanbul was brokered by the Malhames despite the opposition of Muzaffer Pasha. Commenting on the visit and the Malhame’s help, Huwayyik declared

Let them say whatever they want about Abdul Hamid. He has elevated two [members, Najib and Salim Malhameh] of my community and has shown a particular affection for me; for all his faults and qualities, we see naught but his qualities.

In the end, the interests of the Malhame family became so intertwined with the Hamidian regime, that once the Hamidian opposition took over power in Istanbul in 1908. Salim and Najib Pasha were forced to take flight from the city whose political events they had shaped for almost two decades.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has traced the family history of the Malhames from the town of ‘Aqura in northern Mount Lebanon in the seventeenth century, their move to Beirut in the late eighteenth century and their involvement in the ‘politics of the Mountain’ in the mid-nineteenth century, before they became urban merchants-cum-notables of Beirut. This family’s socio-economic trajectory thus far very much represented a case study of the migration patterns of many Beirutis who became involved in municipal politics and regional commerce in the second half of the nineteenth century. As’ad Malhame’s colleagues brought with them long family histories and passages prior to their settlement in Beirut. The variety of their origins and heterogeneous socio-religious backgrounds converged on the absorbing city and the urban institutions they represented to provide diversity within a unified urban framework.

Against this backdrop, the Ottoman career lines of Salim Pasha Malhame and his four brothers represented both a break with previous generations and a conscious adoption of the new opportunities presented to provincial notables by the Hamidian system. The genealogy and biography of the Malhame family constituted a case study of the changing relations between Mount Lebanon and Beirut, the imperial centre in Istanbul and the provincial capital.
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98 al-Khuri, *Haqa’iq Lubnaniyya*, 51. Ultimately the meeting paved the way for the controversial rapprochement between patriarch Huwayyik and Jamal Pasha in 1915.

99 Harfush, *Dala’il al-‘Inayat alsamadaniyyah*, 494.
Part 3) Perception and Conception of Space and the Structures of Everyday Life
Chapter 5: Spatial Imagination, Regularisation and Representation: “Your Beirut is on my desk”

The image of the modern city was central to the two main strands of cultural revival (tajdid) of the Arabic literary movement (al-nahda) of the late nineteenth century, Christian secularism and Muslim reformism.1 The Tripoli-born journalist and essayist Farah Antun (b. 1874-1922) who is most well-known for his religious dispute with Muhammad ‘Abduh over the interpretation of the philosophy of Ibn Rushd,2 incorporated both these strands into his 1904 novel Urushalim al-jadida aw fath al-‘Arab Bayt al-Maqdis to produce a critical commentary on modern Arab society. The enigmatic title New Jerusalem or the Conquest of the Holy City [Jerusalem] conjures up images of the celestial “New Jerusalem” and the modern Jerusalem of historical renewal, al-tajdid, “the former being the archetype of the latter”.3 This consecutive and temporal intertwining of the absolute space of the sacred city and the historical space of the political city corresponds to Henri Lefebvre’s phases of urban revolutions.4

Such critical thought differed fundamentally from the eighteenth and nineteenth-century urban biographies by Mikha’il Brayk and Ahmad Budayri on sixteenth- and eighteenth-century Damascus respectively, or Fadlallah Halabi on early nineteenth-century Baghdad and Aleppo.5 Where these accounts had been chronicles of proud, urban histories, Farah Antun projects his ideal city into the future. To him this ideal city of Jerusalem was not founded by God, but it was characterised by “eternity and perfection which he wishe[d] to bestow upon his modern city.”6

Antun ascribed four golden ages, cycles of degradation and historical renovators to Jerusalem:7 first, the absolute space of Solomon’s city, dismantled by the Jewish Jerusalem of the Pharisees and Jesus the renovator; second, the historical space of the Christian new
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1 See and Hisham Sharabi, Arab Intellectuals and the West: the Formative Year, 1875-1914, (Baltimore, 1970).
5 See chapter one, fn 3.
6 Ben Lagha, “New Jerusalem by Farah Antun,” 564.
7 Ibid., 559-61.
Jerusalem, followed by Byzantine fragmentation and decay, and Muhammad the second renovator; third the historical space of the Muslim new Jerusalem, followed by the degradation that is “inherent in all doctrines and religions” and the renovating salvation by scientists and intellectuals; finally, the abstract space of the modern city based on science that “spans far beyond the limits of the real, terrestrial Jerusalem to encompass the whole of humanity.” As with Lefebvre’s periodisation in *La Révolution Urbaine*, in Antun’s novel the rupture in historical and abstract space between the first three golden ages and the fourth, is accompanied by a temporal rupture between cyclical time of religion to linear time of modernity and progress. Thus, in the modern city, the old cycles of degradation and renovation were replaced by notions of continuous perfection.

The urban imagination of Beirut’s literati was not merely a fantasy – Moore’s *Utopia*, Bacon’s *New Atlantis* or, indeed Antun’s *New Jerusalem* – that remained in the abstract sphere of contemplation. Nor was this kind of urban imagination merely a reflection of the banality of lived reality. Rather, through poems, essays and editorials, literary imagination actively intervened in the process of the production of urban space. By demanding the implementation of urban measures in newspapers, they rendered legible the urban environment. Furthermore, the production of Beirut as a real-and-imagined modern city was maintained by the city’s literary elite, particularly by those professional journalists, publishers and educators who were municipal council members. They consciously vested urban space with a distinct purpose, value, and mission. In the 1870s and 80s Beirut became both the physical embodiment and the vision of urban modernity upon which the city authorities based the physical transformation of provincial capital urbanism in the 1890s and 1900s. Crucially, a case is made for the transformative power of the literary imagination to shape the particular regularisation of the physical environment. Thus the urban development of Beirut emerges not only as the effect of Ottoman rule, but also fundamentally as the concerted effect of local, cultural production.

Whereas the *baladiyyat* columns of the Beirut press discussed in chapter three shaped the urban discourses and practices through their daily recurrence and the ‘readerly’ activity of the literate inhabitants, this chapter shifts to the ‘writerly’ activity of a limited number of editorials in the Beirut press and, as a counter-position, a short story by Khalil Gibran in order
to show the extent to which the literary elite shaped the form and function of the city of Beirut.

5.1. **Markazuna: The Transformation of Beirut in the Perception of the Nahda**

[It was the unspoken assumption of the great middle class in the nineteenth century that the city was the productive centre of man’s most valued activities: industry and higher education.]

In the course of the nineteenth century the burgeoning city of Beirut inspired poets in Beirut, Istanbul and Cairo. *Hadiqat al-Akhbar, al-Jawa’ib and al-Muqtataf* intermittently published homages to Beirut. Internationally the most famous epithet is probably Emperor William II’s expression: “The jewel in the crown of the Padisha.” But local *qasidas* with ornamental epithets, like “the cherished” (*al-mahrusa*) or the “bride of the sea” (*’arus al-bahr*) suggest not only an emotional identification with the city – a particular pride of place – but also that Beirut was very much present in the ‘writerly’ imagination. Such ‘urban *madihs*’ that extol the Beirut’s “blessed geography”, “the splendid views”, and “the rich history”, constitute, in the terms of Raymond Williams, an essential ingredient of the production of difference between city and countryside. The city was viewed as the product of enlightened spatial practices. In the urban meta-philosophy of Henri Lefebvre, in this local literary production of Beirut resided borderlines between the perceived spaces and, as normative projections into the future, the conceived spaces of the city.

In 1869, al-Bustani gave a passionate speech in Beirut entitled *al-hay’at al-ijtima’iya*, which literally translates into “on social structure”, or according to Hans Wehr’s dictionary “on human society” but it could equally be interpreted, in today’s parlance, as an early treatise “on civil society”. The author lays out what he calls “the needs of civil society” as follows:

---

10 Khalil Sarkis, *al-Sham qabl mi’at ‘am; riha al-Impratur Guillaume II al-Almani ila Filastin wa Suriyya ‘am 1898*, (Damascus, 1997).
11 The fact that other cities in the nineteenth-century Middle East were also given such epithets by their inhabitants does not detract from the argument. On the contrary, mahrusa was also the adjective used for the Ottoman empire, *memalik-i mahruse*.
Beirut is the place of our residence and our nation \textit{[watan]}. It is one of the links in that great chain [of harmony amongst the human race] and as the centre of this chain it is vital for us – for Syria, our country – because it is the connecting element between our country’s soul, between itself and foreign countries. ... 

What is the state of civil society of Beirut? The principles of civil society that determine the degree of urbanisation are based on the satisfaction of needs and the removal of fear. ...

First: The majority of the people in Beirut cherish welfare and public spirit. They uphold shared values and they are composed of industrial- and merchant notables, of owners of property and power. The number of riff raff is very small if compared to other cities.

Second: There are individuals from different countries and races in Beirut. Most of these races can be subsumed by the distinction between Easterners and Westerners. Even though they may differ in race and taste they share the same values, especially commercial, urban and cultural. They all wish to be able to live together in safety, at ease and in happiness.

Yes, there appear at times some riff raff. They slander the cleanliness of their country or the streets of their city, because some of the riff raff of our country may actually participate in undermining and removing comfort and general safety. We see that the healthy ties and harmony between the rest of the fellow countrymen and the foreigners share the concern that the situation could evolve into harm for our country and should be improved or prevented.

Third: The majority of Beirut’s population are civilised and their affection is entirely directed and inclined towards civilisation. They have a strong interest to widen its sphere in their country, and to spread their achievements in other directions. Hence their needs are the needs to establish civilised people.\footnote{Butrus al-Bustani, “Khittab fi-l-al-hay’at al-ijtima’iyya”, excerpted in Yusuf Quzma Khuri (ed.), \textit{al-A ‘mal al-jamiyyat al-ilmiyya al-suriyya}, 1868-1869, (Beirut, 1990), 206-7.}

The idea of urban society as bearing a normative, civilising mission was reinforced in Bustani’s 1870 Arabic dictionary \textit{Muhit al-Muhit}. The entry of the verb \textit{tamaddun} – to urbanise, from the root \textit{m-d-n}, (inhabit, settle, dwell), is defined as the process whereby man is molded into people of cities [\textit{ahl al-mudun}] by morals [\textit{akhlaq}] and [the cities] move them [the people] from a state of barbarity and ignorance to a state of human sociality and refined learning.\footnote{See my discussion of Lefebvre’s \textit{The Production of Space} in the Introduction.}

Such ‘Khaldunian’ urban self-perception was to set the tone for thinking about \textit{fin de siècle} Beirut. In the 1870s the Bustanis’ introduced a new style of writing about Beirut in particular through their bi-monthly \textit{al-Jinan} (1870-1885). Unlike previous historical writings on the city, such as Butrus al-Bustani’s “On the city of Beirut” (c. 1850) which presented knowledge of Beirut’s Ottoman past in dynamic cycles of prosperity and deterioration, \textit{al-}...

In “Markazuna”, Beirut’s geographical centrality emerges through its natural and cultural position between Egypt and Istanbul and between Europe and India. Using expressive metaphors, Bustani outlines Beirut’s multiple future roles. As *al-bab* (“the gate”), Beirut’s “natural strength” lay in the ways in which it centripetally absorbed the qualities of the worlds around it: trade and agriculture. Mount Lebanon and the agricultural hinterland are ascribed the role of *al-batn*, (the “belly”). Bustani realises that in this geographical division of labour, the mountain and its ravines suffered most from the recent recession but they are also the places where “bedouins” and “thieves” carry out attacks against the achievements of the centre in communication and transport. In contrast, the city is the place of “steam and the telegraph.” He asserts that “our centre has two strengths, the agricultural and the commercial. The first rests on hard work and cultivation while the second thrives on connecting the East with the West in a way that corresponds to this age.”

In this division of labour the Ottoman state was seen as the regulator and arbitrator between *al-bab* and *al-batn*. “Our Centre”, Bustani argued, requires

moral security which is established through laws and regulations [by the Ottoman state]. … For the spirit of the empire [al-*umma*] and the strength of its enterprise are responsible for the establishment of moral security inside and outside because the strength to implement laws and regulations prevents dangers … and facilitates unity between knowledge and money.

Anxiety ruled Bustani’s and other journalist’s assessment of Beirut’s role as a gate to the West. Throughout the writings on the future of Beirut, a constant feeling seeps through that the city failed to live up to the standards and expectations of an idealised “West”. Judgments on the city’s conditions were often passed in the imaginary view of ‘the foreigner’:

---

Beirut is a famous city and we wish it good fortune that the eyes of the foreigners may not ill-consider its old and narrow bazaars for their own interests. ... We hope the governor tackles these obstacles and delivers the town from the blame of the Westerners and merchants whose time is so precious.18

In “Reasons for the progress and rapid growth of Beirut”, Salim Bustani returns to the theme of Beirut’s centrality as a product of spatial practices in a world that had moved ever closer together through scientific discoveries and technological inventions. But his style became more prescriptive as he urges his compatriots to embrace the present and “open up” to the opportunities of modernity. It would be unwise to “preserve the old” and pray that “if only [change] would remain alien to us”, as much as it would be loathsome for truly intelligent people (ahl al-mudarik) to imitate superficially habits and fads from the West.19 He stresses that a blessed geographical position and good fortune in trade are not enough for sustained growth. The population of Beirut, he admitted, had obtained a bad reputation in the region for their profiteering and conspicuous consumption. But these “arrows of blame” are unjustified. Beirut’s “immense growth – if it was based on trade [alone] – would scare us for its consequences. Over time, the profits would decrease if not run into serious losses.” Beirut does have the right to be proud of its achievements in the field of industry and learning.

A multitude and abundance of ways in which cotton is produced and around one thousand workers in its factories who process silk, 500 shops which manufacture [goods], not to speak of the carpenters, the blacksmiths, the taylors, the goldsmiths and the tanners ... make sure that the city’s industry achieves an annual [trade surplus] between 160,000 and 180,000 lira.

Clearly Beirutis were working hard to disarm its critics. Sustainable growth lay in things profounder than material wealth, however.

The situation and the courage of its people and their addiction to literary and material gains enable them to turn a place that only forty years ago was a big village into a city in its own right [madinat zat sha’niha]. It became the school for a vast part of the Asian regions instructing knowledge [ma‘arif] and industry thanks to being the treasury of Syria and Palestine. The reason for the growth of this city lies with the acquisition of knowledge [ma‘arif] and industry that changed its people. If we considered what more than 1,000 foreign [ghuraba]’ students spend in it, school fees, recreational expenditures, clothes, transport, the expenses of their parents or guardians together with the expenses of the religious host establishments by means of instructing the youngsters and dressing them

18 Lisan al-Hal, May 20, 1878.
and what they spend for spreading education [maʿarif] and religious learning [ʿilm] due to the seven or eight printing presses, the newspapers, books, hospitals etc. In one year we have an income from cultural affairs [maʿarif] of between 100,000 and 120,000 lira.

Bustani’s economic model put cultural capital at the centre: as “a city in its own right” Beirut’s accumulation of wealth allowed investment in urban cultural capital (education, newspapers, medicine) which in turn generated and diversified new sources of urban wealth. The acquisition of knowledge thus provided a sense of urban self and a “solid foundation” in order to deal with “what Beirut witnesses in terms of continuous construction and consumption.”

A few months later in “The City of Beirut and its Needs”, Salim Bustani expanded his urban scenario and tackled the dangers which urban health hazards posed for a prosperous future. Stagnant water and open sewage “running down the slopes of Beirut” attract mosquitoes and germs, and spread diseases and infections, especially in the hot months of the summer. But taking Alexandria as an example where “the summers are six to ten degrees hotter,” he argues that climatic conditions can be overcome by modern planning measures – street paving, air circulation, water canalisation and street cleaning. He calls for “temporary taxes on land, meat and [fruit]” and appeals to the wealthy merchants “who are used to giving freely to improve urban order” to raise the necessary “15,000 lira to restore health and security.” Projecting into the future, Bustani lists Beirut’s four basic “needs” as being affordable food prices, tighter food controls and selling regulations to avoid disease, improvement of the means of transport and movement on and off-shore, and the support of its inhabitants, especially the notables and intellectuals in order to enrich the place with means of leisure and pleasure [al-tanazzuh wa al-farja].

The Beirut of the Nahda was relishing in perceived spaces such as the commercial ‘Gate of the Arabs’ that opened the agri- and sericultural ‘belly’ to the West. Economically, Salim Bustani saw Beirut’s future very much as a commercial bridgehead. But his Beirut al-

20 Ibid.
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23 For a recent, critical assessment of the “commercial bridgehead”-interpretation of this article, see Fawaz Trabulsi, “Salim al-Bustani fi nass ta’sisi: ‘al-bab’ wa ‘al-batn suratani li-dawr Lubnan al-iqtisadi,” Mulhaq
*mahrusa* emerged as more than just a regional economic powerhouse facilitating export trade. In order to fully understand the signs of the times, Beirut needed economic diversification, industry and construction activity. In the eyes of its literary elite, Beirut stood for progress, for culture in the sense of cultivation and social refinement. The city's cultural and intellectual capital matched the annual revenues of its exported manufactures. Also, as the 'strategic' place of teaching and publishing, knowledge and medicine, Beirut appears to have attracted great journalistic attention precisely because it was constantly perceived as being under threat either from negligence or mismanagement by the authorities, negative foreign influence, rivalry from other towns, like Haifa and Damascus, and by the ignorance of its own population.

This patent 'urban bias' in the leading personalities of Beirut's literary movement was to dominate the discourse of modernity and progress for much of the second half of the nineteenth century. However, in 1909, a young poet shook Beirut's literary world from his exile in New York. In a collection of short stories entitled *'al-Arwah al-mutamarrida'* ('Spirits Rebellious') Khalil Gibran exposed the double standards of Beirut's *al-khassa* class. In the first story, the protagonist Warda al-Hani, a Tolstoyan adulteress who had left the pretensions of what appears to be Beirut's well-born families and found comfort in the simplicity and honesty of the countryside, takes the narrator to the edge of the city:

Look towards those fine dwellings and noble mansions, that is where the rich and the powerful of human kind are living.... Between the walls hung with woven silk lives treachery with hypocrisy... and beneath ceilings of beaten gold stay lies and falseness. They are plaster tombs where a weak woman's deceit takes refuge behind the mascara of her eyes and the reddening of her lips; in whose corners are hidden the selfishness and brutality of a man behind the glitter of gold and silver. These are the places that raise high their walls in pride and splendor; yet could they feel the breath of trickery and deceit breathing over them, they would crack and fall to the ground. These are the houses to which the poor villager looks with tear-filled eyes, yet did he but know that in the hearts of their dwellers was not one grain of love and sweetness that filled the heart of his companion, he would smile in scorn and go back to his field with pity. 

Come, I show you the secrets of these people whom I did not wish to be like. Look at that palace with the marble columns. In it lives a rich man who inherited the wealth of his avaricious father and learnt his way in corruption-infested streets. Two years ago he wed a woman of whom he knew little save that her father was of noble line and high standing among the aristocracy of the town. Their honeymoon was hardly ended before he tired of her and went back to the companionship of women of pleasure and left her in that palace

as a drunkard leaves an empty jar. At first she wept in her agony: then she took patience and consoled herself as one who admits an error. She learned that her tears were too precious to shed upon a man such as her husband. Now she busies herself with the passion of a young man with a handsome face and a sweet tongue into whose hands she pours her heart’s love and whose pockets she fills with her husband’s gold. …

Those are the places wherein I do not wish to live. Those are the graves in which I do not want to be buried alive. Those people from whose ways I freed myself and whose yoke I cast away from me, they are those who mate and come together in their bodies, but in spirit contend one with the other.  

Like the Bustanis one and two generations earlier, Khalil Gibran, juxtaposed city and countryside. However, unlike the formers’ optimistic perception of the edifying powers of Beirut’s urban space, Gibran conjured images of the spiritual harmony of nature and the idyllic countryside of Mount Lebanon. He saw himself as writing in “protest against a society that persecutes the rebel against its edicts before knowing the cause of his rebellion.” In many ways Gibran’s short stories were shot through with manifestations of Kulturpessimismus that marked the pre World-War I period in Europe and the United States, places he may have intellectualised better than the home country he left as a young boy. But critiques of the urban way of life as false and hypocritical such as his were was not uncommon among the urban literati in cities of the Ottoman Empire.

To Gibran’s (autobiographical) narrator who took voluntary leave of society, ‘auto-marginalisation’ was the only remedy against the vices of those professing and defining morality – the corrupt urban elites. As such, his powerful prose not only reversed the urban-rural dichotomy, but his anti-urban romanticism also stepped out of the seemingly naturalized nexus between modernity and urbanity that evolved during the latter part of the nineteenth century. His Mountain romanticism, arguably fostered by his residence in New York, was formulated more systematically as the basis of a new Lebanese national idea by the self-proclaimed ‘New Phoenicians’. Charles Corm in particular expressed his nostalgia for the
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Mountain in a series of publications in the 1930s: for example *La Montagne Inspirée* (1934) and *L'humanisme de la Montagne* (1938). After World War I Mount Lebanon, not the modern provincial capital of Beirut became the idealised historical template for a future as a Lebanese nation state.

5.2. The Ottoman Building Code – Registration and Regularisation

While Gibran’s romanticism may well have nurtured latter-day Lebanese nationalists, it was the rationalism of the urbanite intellectuals that supported the practices of urban management in *fin de siècle* Beirut and found its physical expression in the ways in which municipal engineers regulated the perceived vicissitudes of urban space. The chief ideologue of the city, Salim al-Bustani was also municipal member from 1878-80 – a time of great municipal activism. Hygiene and order have been a battle cry of the Beirut municipality since its inception after the civil war of 1860. At the end of the 1870s, municipal intervention in the urban fabric gained new momentum as urban improvement came to be associated more directly with real economic rivalry and abstract concepts of civilisation. Salim Bustani’s reflections on sustainable growth and “genuine” progress were central to how Beirut was intellectually produced and acted upon. The building codes and street alignment discussed in this chapter and the construction of public schools and gardens of the next chapter were fed by – if not causally linked to – the context of the *Nahda*’s ideas and ideals of Beirut’s urban future.

On *Suq al-Fashkha*

Our city does not have the benefit of offering sight to beautiful, welcoming markets like the ones in European cities. Its commercial centre evokes [anxiety], and current plans to hasten the matter and to reform *suq al-fashkha* are laudable. For the space [*aqdam*] suffers from overcrowding and delays in passage. If renovations were to appear between Bab Serail and Bab Idriss it would be healthier and more aesthetic. For in the city the carriages and ambulant vendours continue [to block the way] from both sides. 29

---


The expansion and diversification of Beirut’s urban space since the 1880s coincided with – and was of course causally linked to – the promulgation of new standardised construction laws and urban management directives in the wake of the Tanzimat. These applied to Istanbul and the provinces alike. The laws were revised and amended throughout the 1860s and 1870s, and it was not until 1885 that they constituted an enforced, reliable and binding source of reference. The building code was subsequently translated and serialised by Na’matallah Nawfal and Niqula Naqqash and made available to the general public in al-Jinan.30

When cities began to develop and progress and in them rose the sun of science and knowledge, every inhabitant worked to improve and embellish his dwelling place and give freely everything he can on decor and good engineering [handasa]. The improvements of houses developed to the highest degree, but the streets and alleys remained in their natural state of narrowness, twistedness and filthiness that bothered the passers-by and jeopardised urban health. Thus all growth and expansion in the cities stopped completely. It is manifest that civilisation and construction are a result of careful planning of roads, squares and buildings for the benefit of the public.31

The Beiruti municipal engineer Amin ‘Abd al-Nur introduced his edited translation of the 1883 Ottoman building code in 1896, expressing the hope “that this service will promote public works, enable the municipal departments to carry out their business and make the property owners aware of their rights and duties.”32 The text expounded the virtues of the urban planner’s ‘logic of the straight line’; a logic which – as we shall see – began to transform the city centre physically. It regulated the width of streets, dividing them into five categories. At the beginning of each street a plate on a wall was to specify its width. The Beiruti author summed up semi-scientifically the underlying objective of the law and the regularisation:

Widening the streets should not be limited to passageways and crossings, but it is necessary to consider streets as agents for health improvement. It is well known that the distance of buildings from each other leaves space for the purification of air, disperses the bad smell and enables the light and the heat of the sun to penetrate the cells. This prevents them from rotting, especially in streets where high buildings are already constructed on

30 al-Jinan, 14 (1883), 49-53
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both sides. [The widening of streets] helps to avoid putting up the burdensome coverings which the inhabitants are forced to erect on balconies of houses too close to each other.33

Article five stipulated that “private construction is not allowed near places of worship, the port area, on the coast, in public places and parks. Similarly it is not permitted to transform these places in any way into private property except if the municipal departments deemed it necessary to replace the old constructed locations.” Yet, any renovation or restoration had to be made in the “original, customary form.” Part two of the construction law specified the procedures for street alignment. Before construction work was to begin a profile map and a bird’s eye map were to be drawn of the street in question. The file with the maps was then kept at the municipality’s registry (ilm wa khabr) for general access for 15 days. The governor had to approve the plans before the municipality could put them into practice. The following parts of the law were concerned with fire regulations and prevention, unifying the facades of houses facing the street, the norms for raising buildings, permits, fees and prohibitions on restoration, registration fees and penal codes.

In `Abd al-Nur’s edition this already very detailed code was further explicated through commentaries in footnotes in which the engineer made cross-references, applied the legal-normative text to particular situations, gave explanations for the terminology or reasons for seemingly arbitrary articles. Indeed, after the creation of the provincial capital, the production of space through registration and in the name of urban regularisation began to posit the ‘conceived space’ of the state against the lived space of urban users – Beirut’s residents, shopkeepers, ambulant merchants and coffeehouse dwellers. Taking this context one step further, the state ideology of “public benefit” became increasingly conflated with the capitalist practices of spatial mobilisation to recast a ‘public space’ modeled after private enterprise.

Time and again during the 1890s, the municipality found itself anxiously poised between its task of modernising the city’s infra-structure and its role as protector of the well-being of its population as a whole. As a local institution it had to play a difficult role in reconciling long-term projects in the imperial and regional context with more immediate local interests. In the 1890s, a protracted struggle over registration fees emerged over the Tanzifat - or street cleaning - taxes. In 1891, the municipality imposed a new tax for cleaning the streets on all occupiers of houses, shops and cafés, both foreign and local. To this effect, the houses

33 Ibid., 8.
of Beirut were inspected, registered and graded according to size and value. Backed by their consuls, however, the foreign residents refused to pay this tax until the governor general convoked a meeting with the council of the consular corps in 1898, in which the consuls finally agreed to the tax on the condition that the tax’s application be properly documented. The new income of the municipality – an “estimated 5,000 to 6,000 Pound Sterling” (5,500-6,600 lira) – was to be reserved to clean, repair and properly reimburse residents affected by street regularisation.34

The publication of the first Beirut directory in the year of the province of Beirut’s creation, Dalil Bayrut 1888, was on the surface a less political example of registering Beirut’s urban space. Nevertheless the directory effectively facilitated a new way of imagining, or “reading”, the city without actually knowing, seeing or living in it. Indeed, its editor, Amin al-Khoury, introduced his pioneering work as a way to “facilitate the connections of the local, the regional and the distant in order to connect our works and our communications with the rest of the empire.”35 The directory listed all local politicians, names and owners of schools, hotels, printing presses, factories, etc., and specified their locations in the bazaars or the quarters. In a way, then, the book mapped Beirut’s political, economic and social life for residents and outsiders dealing with the city from, say, Istanbul, Marseilles, Cairo or Damascus. The directory was used by local businessmen, and notables in Syria and in Egypt. One such notable congratulated al-Khuri by stating: “Your Beirut is on my desk.”36

With spatial registration came regularisation. A few months after the general euphoria over the establishment of the provincial capital of Beirut, the newspapers took stock of the sobering state of affairs of the urban fabric:

Beirut has become the garden of wealth. A stranger coming to it is impressed by the quality of its people and goods, and would testify that it is truly the bride of the East [arûs al-shârîq]. But there are persistent forces that belittle its role and that frustrate its order. We mention only one factor and that is the state of its roads.

We are not afraid to say that the most important aspects of [spatial] organization that the people demand apart from their private residences and their workplaces, are the public throughways. If they were repaired quickly we would have less crowding, aggression, ample supply of charm, peaceful perambulation and health of the country.37

34 PRO, FO, 195/2024, Beirut, June 7, 1898.
36 Ibid.
37 Lisan al-Hal, September 27, 1888.
The message was that something needed to be done. Khalil Sarkis’s publishing house decided to commission 'Abd al-Nur’s translation at a time when unambiguous legal definitions had become necessary for Beirut. Between 1892 and 1894, the first major city centre demolition scheme generated protest amongst the affected residents. Shortly after his arrival, Isma'il Bey Kemal, addressed Beirut’s problem of traffic circulation. Backed by imperial rules and procedures, the governor general ordered the alignment of the two parallel market streets, Suq al-Tawila and Suq al-Jamil, hoping to improve the connection between port, city centre and Sahat al-Sur. Another street that widened and aligned the busy east-west artery through Suq al-Fashkha was to connect Bab Idriss with the Petit Serail.38

Kemal Bey had picked the very heart of Beirut’s centre. Not only were these “plots in the middle of the old city probably the most valuable ones in the entire city”, but Beirut’s chamber of commerce had recently moved to the corner of suq al-fashkha and Suq al-Tawila.39 Nearby, Khan Antun Bey and the offices of leading merchants (e.g. the Bayhums, the Bassuls) had long been established. The issue of compensation caused the implementation of the project to be stalled, and led the British consul general to speculate, “maybe the ill-feelings on the part of some Muslims caused the removal of the Vali.”40 But after Kemal Bey’s premature recall to Istanbul, his successor, Khalid Bey Baban, resumed and delegated construction works to the municipality. In 1894, the municipality decided that the streets would be widened from an average of seven to twenty dhira‘ (5.25 to 15m) “beginning at the coast [sahl al-bahr] and finishing on Sahat al-Sur and running past the new municipality building, and from the Tuwayni & Sursuq building in the north to Bab Idriss.”41 In the process, a number of markets had to be pierced through, most notably the “lower vegetable market” and parts of the blacksmiths market. To this effect “the municipality commissioned the drawing of a map of the two large streets ... , decided to inform the inhabitants and to set up a committee to assess the appropriation of property” in accordance to article twelve of the building code.42

---
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Such measures failed to appease the affected residents. Instead, they staged effective protests against the governor general claiming the compensation scheme in no way made up for the expulsion from their livelihood. When it transpired shortly afterwards that “the former governor general Khalid Bey had made mistakes in the assessment of the widening of the streets” he was duly recalled to Istanbul. Like his predecessor, he was unable to reach an equitable agreement with the residents. Khalid Bey’s successor, Nassuhi Bey, appointed a committee of local notables to look into the dispute between the residents and the municipality. They agreed that the only way to come to a solution in this conflict was to increase taxation on certain goods, to hold the foreign community accountable, in particular the investment companies which benefited from the effects of these urban renewal measures. But this line of thinking provoked protests from new quarters.

A series of advertisements in the local press, coinciding with the completion of the alignment project in 1894, announced the opening of two new luxury shops near the crossing point of the new streets in Suq Tawila, Suq al-Fashkha and Suq al-Jamil. Although the new streets were officially opened amid public celebration in Bab Idriss in May 1894, the financial aspects of the construction continued to remain unclear, and they were to haunt municipal politics throughout the mid-90s. In 1893, rumours circulated in Beirut’s press that the project would be co-sponsored by a foreign “financial company” which would share the expenses with the adjacent house owners whose property value rose. No names were mentioned but during further demolition work and reconstruction of the old city in 1896, open confrontation erupted between de Perthuis and his port company on the one hand and the municipality and the local press on the other.

When de Perthuis issued a company statement pleading his company’s exemption from demolition, construction and paving costs on the grounds that it already contributed enough to the city’s welfare, al-Bashir and Thamarat al-Funun joined forces and ran articles that demanded that the port company shoulder its share of the costs: “We had hoped the port

43 Thamarat al-Funun, December 17, 1894.
44 Ibid., May 13, 1895. The committee included the Mufti, the Naqib al-Ashraf, the municipal president Muhammad Bayhum and the members Muhi al-Din al-Qadi, Nakhla Bustrus, Jibran Tuweini, Habib Trad, the secretary Yusuf Araman and the engineer Yusuf Aftimos.
45 Lisan al-Hal, September to December 1894.
46 Thamarat al-Funun, May 21, 1894.
47 Ibid., October 4, 1893.
48 Quoted in ibid., March 30, 1896.
company was there for public benefit.” They claimed that “the port company had promised assistance worth 100,000 francs or more.” It is unclear whether the company yielded to these popular press demands but it appears that the municipality was forced to raise taxes in order to meet the legal and financial obligations vis à vis its constituency claiming reimbursement.

5.3 The New Quarters: Spaces of Representation – Representations of Space

When the French geographer Vital Cuinet arrived in Beirut, he was impressed:
“Today’s city of Beirut is built as an amphitheatre. Seen from the sea, its sight is very beautiful. One notices first of all the imperial barracks” then the mosques and the churches and the universities and the schools on the hillsides which educated a total of over 23,000 pupils and students. Cuinet proceeded to count five public baths, ten public fountains, six hospitals, fifty doctors, thirty pharmacies, 24 cemeteries, thirty bazaars and thirty caravasereils, 25 hotels, three casinos, two circuses, 55 cafés, ten public beaches, two public gardens, 23 police stations, ten carriage companies, thirty clockmakers, 45 jewelries, 12 photographers, 12 printing presses, 12 libraries and around 20,000 private houses.

The vast majority of these 20,000 houses of Cuinet’s thumb-nail count were rented by more than one family either in collective occupancy (hawsh) or by wage-working bachelors in modest second or third-floor rooms in one of the qaysariyyas for less than a mecidiye per month (equivalent to four francs or three shillings and about 1/6 of their monthly salary). In his youth, Jirgi Zaydan moved six times and criss-crossed the entire city of Beirut:

The tenant carries his house on his back. … Some houses had three rooms. There was no urgent need for many rooms since people did not use any beds. In the same room one could receive guests in the daytime and sleep at night. When getting up one would fold the bed rolls and pile them one on top of the other on a chest on the ground.

This was a world apart from the grand villas on the hilltops around the city centre. The growing security in and around Beirut affected domestic architecture. Vast two- to three-story mansions were built whose high towers and multi-arched galleries commanded a magnificent

49 Thamarat al-Funun, April 22, 1896.
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52 A qaysariyya usually had a ground-floor shopfront and private lodgings on the floors above.
53 Thomas Philipp, Gurgi Zaidan: His Life and Thought (Beirut, 1979), 133.
view over the city centre and the port. The first Beirutis had taken great risks by moving out
of the sanctuary of the walled city at the beginning of the nineteenth century and built
fortress-like palaces. At the end of the century the terraces became so densely populated that
fences and walls were erected around the properties to ensure privacy.

All members of the municipal council lived in two-to-three-story residences on the
hills looking down onto the city centre. Multi-arched galleries like the qasr al-Khuri in
Musaytbeh, double turrets like the Sursuq qusur in Eastern Jemayze and the impressive,
double-winged qasr Musa de Frayj in Zuqaq al-Blat spoke a language of self-consciousness
and self-confidence.

One of the most magnificent houses belonged to the municipal president Muhammad
Bayhum (1892-94) in Ras Beirut. It inspired a poem by Shakir al-Khuri in the popular qasida
meter:

“You have a house the hearts desire you have a heart free of vice
Never sets the sun upon your house for your noble character knows no price
Emerging from your place in Ras Beirut you are the literary head of all Beirut.”

Immigration waves added new demographic layers to these Beirut suburbs.
Maronites arrived either from the eastern suburbs or the Kisrawan mountains in the wake
of the unrest between 1858 and 1860 to settle in what could be labelled, in conjunction
with chapter three, the ‘Young Maronite belt’ from Bab Idriss uphill south towards later-
date Zuqaq al-Blat. It was on this stretch east and southeast of the sand dunes that in the
late 1850s future notable families, such as the Khuris, the Htnaynas, the Bassuls, the
Eddes, the Naqqashs, the Nammurs and the Quyumcis, formed the Maronite parish of the
church of St. Elie in Qantari. Moreover, in the late 1860s, the Roman Catholic
community (Frayj, Misk) of Beirut moved their Cappucin church from Ghalghul to
Qantari.

By the end of the Hamidian era, the southern and western suburbs which formed a
ring around the commercial centre of the old city began to develop towards new points of
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urban reference. As the quasi natural, concentric urban order of the so-called Oriental city broke up, suburbs turned into urban quarters whose public utilities made them increasingly self-contained as they became more densely populated. As electoral entities presided over by *mukhtars*, the residents of the confessionally mixed quarters to the west and the south of the city centre and along the Damascus Road successfully vied for the (re-)construction of mosques, churches and schools in their neighbourhoods. The church of St. Elie was reconstructed and enlarged between 1901 and 1904 to accommodate the growing parish. Further downhill in Wadi Abu Jamil, a synagogue was built – probably in the 1890s - for the growing Jewish community in the quarter.

Meanwhile, the Muslim “residents [of Zuqaq al-Blat, Ramel al-Zarif and Qantari] lobbied successfully for the construction of a mosque and established one in Qantari and one in Zaydaniyya. Both were erected through funds from benevolent individuals encouraged by the *naqib al-ashraf*, 'Abd al-Rahman al-Hut.”

**Conclusion**

The particular structural sequence of this chapter unites its divergent, constituent parts. The physical expansion of the city of Beirut was regulated and facilitated by an active municipality and imperial authorities struggling with European investment companies. This endeavour may not always have been successful, but it prevented Beirut from becoming a colonial bridgehead. Urban organisation was legitimated as the municipal and imperial governments were accountable for their decisions. The local residents and the local press had considerable power to appeal to them.

Nevertheless, the fact that urban institutions struggled to maintain their agency against external interests does not absolve them of criticism. Rather their local agency constitutes the beginning of their accountability. Despite the appeals to public welfare and the achievements of civilisation, the regularisation efforts of the municipality and the governors general – the demolitions and street alignments – were not so much born out of a concern for the population generally, who were paradoxically seen as an obstacle to that “public welfare”. Rather they were born out of planning attempts to mold the physical shape of the city according to the mental image which Beirut’s literary elite had of its city.

---
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Farah Antun’s novel *New Jerusalem* may not have been the best-seller that most of Jirji Zaydan’s historical novels were in this increasingly fashionable genre of Arabic literature. However Antun’s historical novel, as his 1903 *Religion, Science and Wealth or the Three Cities*, suggest wide-spread intellectual associations with the urban environment. This point is a central argument of the third part of this thesis in general and it explains why al-Bustanis’ urban writings preceded this chapter’s explorations of actual implementation of planning measures: *Fin de siècle* Beirut was shaped as the physical embodiment of the intellectual urban ideal of the *Nahda* movement. As teachers, lexicographers, founders of printing presses and schools, presidents of cultural societies and journalists, the Bustanis’ were Beirut’s most influential thinkers with a large network of like-minded intellectuals in the second half of the nineteenth century and beyond. But the Bustanis were not alone as many of Beirut’s literary elites were employed in the city’s organisation, on municipal- or educational councils.

As we have seen in previous chapters, Khalil Khuri, the editor-in-chief of *Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, was long-service director of Beirut’s provincial foreign affairs bureau. The editor of *Thamarat al-Funun*, ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani, was founding member of the *Maqasid* society and long-term municipal president at the turn of the century. Ishaq Adib, critically independent thinker of Arab society, wrote at least one article in defence of urban reform in Beirut, but was more critical of its actual implementation. Taken together, the urban writings of *Nahda* intellectuals had a profound impact, as they were thinkers with a distinct spatial awareness.

Neither the urban nor the literary developments were isolated from the political reality in which they were embedded. On the contrary, literary narratives of the city and urban planning produced a new reality of lived experience not by reflecting that experience but by attempting to turn the abstract space of conception into a lived reality. These dialectic processes between urban signs and urban reality were also shaped by a reforming and centralising Ottoman state which used the urban fabric of its provincial capitals as prime sites for imperial display of power. To this dimension we turn in the next chapter.

---


Chapter 6: Public Construction and the Ritual of Commemoration under Sultan Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)

Monumental imperishability bears the stamp of the will to power.¹

During sultan Abdülhamid’s long reign, public architecture in the Ottoman provinces became a pervasive site of imperial inscription onto the urban fabric of provincial capitals. Two dates punctuated the construction calendar in the “well-protected domains” with quasi-religious regularity: Abdülhamid’s birthday and the anniversary of his accession to the Ottoman ‘throne’. In the 1890s and 1900s, all of Beirut’s important public buildings were inaugurated on these two occasions. Imperial architecture was targeted as a potent symbol of Ottoman modernity and a recurrent stage upon which to convey imperial permanence to the provinces.

The facades of government buildings transmitted a sense of sobriety, regularity and discipline. To onlookers and users – all inhabitants who needed to register themselves or their properties in government offices but also teachers, school children and their parents – they ‘oozed’ state power. Stefan Zweig gives a vivid and applicable account of the general effect of these new kinds of “functional buildings” for fin de siècle Vienna.² He experienced the facades and rooms of barrack-esque government buildings, schools and official registries as impressive but impersonal “aerarian architecture” which stood in stark contrast to the overloaded bourgeois architecture of the time.³ To Zweig they imparted an intimidating aura. Its “aerarian scent that emanated from all Austrian government offices, the scent of boiling, overcrowded and badly aired rooms, that first cling onto your clothes and then onto your soul.”⁴

³ According to the Oxford dictionary, the adjective ‘aerarian’ derived from the Latin noun aes, and first used in 1854 in Melville’s studies of the Roman Empire to denote “of fiscal or state budgetary origin”.
⁴ Ibid., 47. Italics added.
In Beirut and other provincial capitals, Ottomanization of urban space in the provinces engendered not just physical changes of the built environment but also filled that urban space and time with new socio-political meaning. Ottoman attempts to inscribe the state’s presence onto the urban fabric were historically nothing new. Prior to the Tanzimat, a recurring transmitter of Ottoman rule had been the construction of mosques with characteristic pencil minarets. Often, as in the case of the “Ottomanization of Crete” the functional aspect of these mosques was secondary to the aspect of representation of Ottoman power. During the Tanzimat, aerarian architecture came to denote progressive time as the duration of imperial existence that supplanted, if not politically replaced, previous religious time as the duration of eschatological existence.

In Aleppo, Damascus and Baghdad, but also in the port towns like Izmir and Beirut, numerous public buildings, barracks, hospitals, prisons, schools and government palaces (or Serails) were constructed as the architectural embodiment of the centralising and regularising, urban project of Tanzimat and Hamidian rule. These were not only responding to practical and functional necessity. Through the monumentality of the buildings’ dimensions, the amplitude of their lines, the symmetry of their design, the functional effect of their plain decorative elements, they ‘communicated’ the will to power of the Ottoman state.

The repetition and uniformity of state architecture provided visual and physical representations of progress and modernity with which the Ottoman imperial government strove to enlighten, modernise and homogenise those ‘backward’ and ‘aberrant’ provinces. Since the beginning of the Tanzimat, public buildings were purposefully erected on large, extramural squares (like Sahat a-Marja in Damascus) creating new urban centralities in the process. Just as Damascus was targeted by the Ottoman government for extra-mural urban development and public architecture after it became the capital of the ‘super-province’ of Syria in 1865, two decades later Beirut became a platform of concerted architectural inscription after it was made a provincial capital under Abdülhamid II.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the construction of public buildings (administrative or educational) or in public places (infrastructural or recreational) was an extension of the discourses of regularisation and registration of space, of policing and public health. Together, these practices merged to produce a specifically Ottoman "system of coherent relations between
society and the space in which it expand[ed]." In Beirut, the development of the urban fabric was a conscious and a joint effort of the Ottoman government and local elites which was played out between the different governors general and the municipality. Within this dual process the border between the Ottoman state and the local society was produced as a topographical dichotomy of imperial versus local or elite versus lower classes.  

The construction of public buildings and squares in central urban locations, on hilltops or river banks outside the old cities, signified the presence of Ottoman central authority in Beirut. Yet, at the same time, this presence made this authority more tangible, accessible and accountable. Moreover, the buildings acquired a highly local meaning through the choice of local architects – particularly Bishara Dib and Yusuf Aftimos – and building material, and through the fact that the buildings were largely financed locally, that is, by municipal funds.

7 Timothy Mitchell, “The Limits of the State, Beyond Statist Approaches and their Critics,” American Political Science
Ottoman photography of “aerarian architecture” emerged as a conspicuous mode of urban representation. In particular, during the rule of sultan Abdülhamid II, photos from the provinces constituted reifying instruments of imperial control, power and legitimacy. The sultan taught himself photography and amassed a vast collection of pictures in his palace, mainly of public construction and modern infrastructure. Under Abdülhamid II who rarely ventured outside his palace himself, “cities and provinces were registered in a sort of photographic survey, the peoples of the empire catalogued, and even portraits of higher civil and military officials could be collected and centrally kept.” The documentary focus was on progress and industry, on railways and bridges, barracks and hospitals and the provincial governors and engineers staged themselves under Ottoman flags as the harbingers of this modern era in the name of the sultan.


As mass-produced commodities, postcards were tools of reality-shaping urban (self-) representations. The recurrent bird’s eye perspectives and panoramic vistas across the old city, either onto the sea or the mountains, reproduced aesthetic and total images of necessarily sanitized urban landscapes. In their urban fictionality, postcards were to the tourist what Ottoman photography was to Abdülhamid II: a template of what an ideal, modern city should look like. As Beirut became an increasingly attractive destination of Orient tourism, so too did the local photography industry flourish. The brothers Bonfils, Sarrafián, Dimitri Tarrazi and Son, Octavio Kova and the Jerusalem-based Garabed Krikorian were professional photographers whose art of reproduction was readily-available merchandise in Beirut and Istanbul and sent to Europe by mail. The reproduction of selected motives produced a panoramic expectation of city, sun and the sea, and an imaginary site geography of public buildings and gardens, schools and hotels that reified the fin-de-siècle image of ‘Beirut Beautiful’.

Likewise, governmental plans or tourist maps are not merely representation of an urban reality of a given epoch. Neither are they merely a historian’s tool to find his or her bearings. Rather, city
maps are partial and transformative projections into the future. They are as much the eye of the historian as the eye of different agencies of urban intervention. They provide a knowledge and a truth upon which military forces (illustration 1), investment companies (illustration 4, 6, 25) and urban planners (illustration 13, 14) acted. They, too, produced an urban reality for Beirut.


Ever since its construction during the Crimean War, the imperial barracks (qishlat al-humayun) on Qubbat al-Qantari – the Qantari hilltop – was the most conspicuous reminder of Ottoman state power in this flourishing port-city. The construction stood as the architectural expression of the new Ottoman military organisation, the Nizam al-Jedid, or ‘New Order’, at the time. Both in terms of its lofty location and austere facade, it was in fact a smaller version of the Selimiye Barracks in Haydar Pasha, Istanbul, whose enlargement was also completed in 1853. The two tall floors spread well over eighty metres on the elongated side easily making it the largest building in Beirut in contemporary memory. Its arcaded porticus, protruding on the eastern facade, was flanked by two symmetrical wings regularly structured by three rows of sixteen small, identical windows.

---

The building overlooked conspicuously from an imperial distance - seemingly incorruptible - the bustle on Sahat al-Sur and the old city, and afar, the port and Mediterranean Sea. The emphasis was on the building’s imposing order whose monumentality was duplicated and amplified when, in 1861, a similar but smaller structure of the military hospital emerged alongside the imperial barracks. Within two generations the urban profile of Beirut was to change dramatically from what it had been in 1840. An impressive skyline that appeared on the Qantari hilltop, the joint visual effect of the barracks and the military hospital erased all traces of Burj Umm Dabbus and Burj al-Jadid of old.

With time, the barracks’ military purpose of accommodating regular and mobile units was supplanted by political purposes. Fuad Pasha, the sultan’s special envoy to Mount Lebanon and Damascus after the civil wars of 1860, made the building his headquarters. It was in the barracks that the plans for a new Ottoman order in Mount Lebanon and Bilad al-Sham took shape. It housed the city’s main prison and, since the 1870s, the Ottoman medical units. After the creation of the province of Beirut, the governor general used the barracks for official ceremonies, such as imperial commemorations and awarding of state insignia. Although the area around the imperial barracks continued to be used for military exercises and parades throughout the Ottoman period, by the late nineteenth century the imperial barracks underwent a semantic switch to Grand Serail (al-Saray al-Kabir) that followed the building’s accumulation of civil functions.

The monumentality of the Grand Serail stood in contrast to the image of the Petit Serail on the other side of the old city. The Petit Serail was built by the municipal president, Fakhri Bey, who had already constructed Beirut’s second largest khan a decade earlier. Khan Fakhri Bey. Construction started in 1882 and lasted for two years. Correspondence between the governor general of the province of Syria, Hamdi Pasha, and the Porte in Istanbul reveals considerable difficulties in financing the construction. Hamdi Pasha was forced to take up a loan from an Ottoman Bank, to mortgage public buildings and finally to impose new taxes on the population to buy office installations. As the palace of local government, it was to accommodate municipal and sub-provincial offices such as the city’s legal court, the Mahkama al-Shari’a. Ten years later, when Beirut became a provincial capital, it housed the seat of Beirut’s governor general. Located at the head of what was until then a vast, uneven field with a ruined tower at the foot (Sahlat al-Burj), this palace spearheaded urban development east
of the city centre. The Muslim cemetery behind the palace was effectively severed from the field which subsequently became the target of intense urban planning schemes.

Most probably, the building’s historicist style – or rather its eclectic ‘Occidentalism’ – was designed by the municipality president himself. The mixture of playful ornamentation and solid geometric structure was very much a reversal of Orientalising trends in European architecture at the time. It consisted of two floors above a semi-basement, erected on a rectangular ground plan with a central courtyard. The two floors were lined with tall windows set off by neo-baroque marble frames producing a marked contrast to the darkish Beiruti sandstone facade. The monumental white marble portal opening onto Sahat al-Burj stretched over the basement and the first floor recalling the entrance to an Italian Renaissance palace. Over the entrance a flowing gable with ornate volutes decorated the roof. The corners of the protruding rectangular corner towers and the central part of each facade were topped and accentuated by octagonal miniature towers which, in harmony with the miniature battlements lining the roof, evoked a medieval, Gothic European castle.

The reinvention of ‘classical’ architectural styles was a common symbol of independent municipal authority in nineteenth-century European cities. However, the features of the Petit Serail’s also reflected contemporaneous architectural trends in Istanbul. The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed an Ottoman architectural revivalism that was highly eclectic in form. It was initiated by the neo-baroque and neo-classicist interpretations of Ottoman architecture by European or European-trained architects, such as the Fossati and the Baylan brothers, who came to Istanbul where they were commissioned by consecutive sultans to design new palaces and public buildings. Thus, even in this example of ‘Occidentalising’ architecture, the style corresponded to fashions in the imperial capital. Moreover, the particular timing of its construction at the beginning of Beirut’s extramural construction boom may have made the Petit Serail a trend-setter for the burgeoning domestic architecture. The new mansions of the wealthier municipal members in the late 1870s and early 80s readily shared the Petit Serail’s eclectic style. At the same time, waves of successful Beiruti
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businessmen returned from Egypt and built ostentatious villas on the outskirts of the city centre. In Rumayl, Jemayzeh and Zuqaq al-Blatt, the villas of the Mudawwars, Sursuqs and particularly the 1898 miniature castle of the Fara'uns simulated decorative turrets and battlements.

6.2. The Ottoman Clocktower – a Sign of Time on Beirut’s ‘Capitol Hill’

To His Exalted State Secretary at Yildiz Palace

Honourable Sir

In the city of Beirut there are a number of foreign institutions that have established clocktowers with bells, all of them with a western clock. There is no public clock for the Muslim population which shows times changed to Islamic times. And even the officials and users have to adapt to the foreign clocks. The Islamic people need urgently a public clock to link up with the rest of the empire. In order to build such a clocktower from municipal revenues, the administrative council has done research as to the location. An appropriate place in the vicinity of the government was found. There, the famous imperial barracks have a view in all directions. Since it is in such an elevated position, the vast square in front of the barracks was chosen as the proper place to represent the Sultan. Into the precious structure a large clock-bell with an unusual diameter will be installed at the top linked to the hanging clock. We thank the Sultan for graciously offering help in bringing about positive measures by honouring [us] with granting imperial authorisation.

Vali of Beirut

23 Rabi’ al-Akhir 1315/ September 8, 189716

16 BBA, YMTV167/200, September 8, 1897 (1315).
This letter from the provincial governor to Abdülhamid’s Yıldız palace in Istanbul is a representative sample that aptly captures the relations between provincial capital authorities and the imperial government. The tone and narrative – a mixture of flattery and pressure – speaks of a dedicated Ottoman official and local population which proudly informed the sultan of its loyalty to the Ottoman state by dispatching a detailed progress report. Significantly, the particular discourse of ‘foreign’ advancement suggests that persuasion had been necessary to obtain building permission. By extension, at least in the case of Beirut, the initiative for a clocktower was local and not an imposition by the imperial government. Beirut’s clocktower project predated other such constructions in the Arab provinces by three years and may have been triggered by preparation for a German royal visit to Bilad al-Sham. In 1897, the visit of a German photographer to Baalbek fuelled speculations over a possible visit from the German Emperor and local dignitaries must have calculated that an urban ‘face-lift’ would not only flatter their sultan, but also be an investment which would be amply repaid by the visit of a large royal entourage from Germany.  

Various-styled clocktowers have dotted Ottoman towns in the Balkans and Anatolia since the seventeenth century. But in the Arab provinces they were a much rarer occurrence. Most of the fifty clocktowers in Anatolian towns were built during Adbülhamid’s reign. To name but a few. Amasya’s minaret-style clocktower was built in 1865, the Campanile-style clocktower in Adana dates back to 1881, Ankara’s was built on top of a pre-existing structure in 1884 and Izmir’s Orientalising clocktower of 1901 donned a clock presented by William II. Istanbul hosted a great number of diverse clocktowers. The first Ottoman clocktower under Abdülhamid II was built in the gardens of his Yildiz palace between 1889-90. The most famous in Dolmabahçe palace was completed in 1895, and the Hamidiye children’s hospital unveiled its clocktower in 1898.

When clocktowers mushroomed in Bilad al-Sham in the year 1900/1, they constituted a new Ottoman symbol of imperial homogeneity and urban modernity as they were marked by greater stylistic similarity than those in Anatolia. The municipalities of Acre, Haifa, Safad and Nazareth erected clocktowers in the sultan’s honour. Others were built simultaneously in Tripoli, Aleppo and Jaffa. Invariably, they were built on the central town square and were purposefully placed in public gardens. In Beirut, by contrast, the location chosen for the clocktower was in the middle of the military parading ground between the Grand Serail and the military hospital reinforcing the Ottoman skyline of Beirut. At exactly the same time as port construction demolished Beirut’s historic remains of the citadel on the other side of town, Qubbat al-Qantari became Beirut’s Capitol Hill. With the rapid disappearance of old landmarks of political power, Ottoman commemoration of the modern was fast becoming the only (official) memory.

There had been a few towers with clocks and bells in Beirut as the governor general’s letter suggested: the Maronite cathedral on Rue Emir Bashir, the church tower of the Anglican parish on the Qantari hill – “a fine bell … and a $1,200 tower clock given by the Madison Square Church in New York” – College Hall of the Syrian Protestant College; on top of the Jesuit College building and the French Hospital. In contrast to these icons of missionary rivalry in Beirut, this new, Ottoman ‘conquest’ of verticality addressed the rhythms of the city as a whole. These “towers were considered
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'civic art' [...] as they expressed the dissociation of time and religion.” while the conspicuous chronometer signaled state-time in a new regularity, discipline and order imposed on the city.  

The 25-metre-high clocktower became the highest building in Beirut and was duly celebrated as such:

The viewer on the roof can have a panoramic view of the whole city. Nothing would escape his eyes. His view stretches to the outskirts, as far as the coastal plains and to the border with Lebanon. The public laying of the first stone of the clocktower took place on January 9, 1897 - the birthday of the Sultan. The celebration was carried out in the presence of the high officials of the province, military rank and file and members of the municipality. A military orchestra played a most delightful melody, and later a speech was delivered in Arabic and Ottoman calling upon the Sultan's resplendent and eternal nature, and the assembled crowd believed in these emotional exclamations. After the celebrations the Governor general symbolically laid the first two stones with a silver hammer. At the end of the party, several photographs were taken.

The tower was built from a variety of local wood and marble, Jounieh limestone, Beiruti sandstone, Damascene basalt, and red stone from Dair al-Qamar. The obligatory Hamidian tughra was installed above the entrance. Inside its four by four metre square shaft, 125 steps in pioneering cast iron led up to the top. On the third floor a 300-kilogramme bell with a diameter of 85 centimetres was suspended. This floor contained four miniature, neo-orientalist balconies to which mashrabiyya-style doors led. Above the bell, four large clock-faces imported from Paris by the Ottoman embassy, two clock faces with Arabic and two with Latin numerals, soberly heralded exact (but dual) city-time. All in all, the building cost the municipality 126,000 gold piasters, around £100 at the time.

Despite its Arabesque style, its rectangular shape and the rooftop battlements reminded the European traveler to Beirut of belfries in Florence or Bruges. To the Ottoman eye, however, the tower would trigger connotations from Anatolian and Balkan provinces where such clocktowers had become common landmarks. It was a striking feature of the Hamidian clocktowers that they represented, on the one hand, the uniformity of the empire through their ubiquity in Ottoman towns. On the other hand, the building material and the outer shell tended to be specifically local. This symbiosis of the imperial and the local was also reflected in the planning procedures of Beirut's clocktower. In fact, they probably exemplified those of other Ottoman public works. First, the Governor general Rashid Bey had “put
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together a construction cadre and asked for permission from the authorities in Istanbul for the municipal agency to build, out of its own financial allocations, a grand tower in oriental style, and to install a huge clock and a bell to announce the time in Arabic." 26 When the imperial decree was read out amidst great public celebration, a planning committee of ten was established consisting of two municipal engineers, two members of the municipal council, the president of the municipality, ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Qabbani; Bishara Dib, the provincial chief engineer and four Ottoman military officers. Together, they decided on the location and charged Yusif Aftimus, a local architect and municipal engineer who had worked for the Ottoman emporium at the 1893 world exhibition in Chicago and for the Egyptian pavilion at Antwerp, with designing the building. The marble masonry was carried out by Dionysos Sawan, a Greek Orthodox from Musaytbeh, and the muqarnas carved by the Damascene artisan Yusif al-ʾAnid.27

The ritualistic opening ceremonies of such public buildings and places in honour of Sultan Abdülhamid II were intended to bring across the distinctly personal and homogenous idiom of Ottoman space and time. As pro-Ottoman demonstrations and celebrations took place simultaneously across the Ottoman Empire on September 1, they were front page stories in most Ottoman newspapers often making cross-references to the commemorative rituals in other cities.

What Beirut’s clocktower did in a routinely, daily manner, exhibiting public, distinctly “Ottoman” time, these simultaneous celebrations conjured up on a larger scale: on September 1, 1900, the 25th anniversary of Abdülhamid II, all Ottoman citizens performed – or were supposed to – the same collective ritual wherever they were in the empire. The Hamidian clocktower began to shape city rhythms. Just like the Italian “freestanding campanile … dominated space – [it] would soon, as clock-tower, come to dominate time, too.”28 Simultaneity of action would thus bring about the imagining of a common community on a common geography in a common time frame. As Anderson put it: “The idea of a social organism moving calendrically through homogenous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation, which is also conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history.”29


26 Ibid. It is not clear from the Shaykhu text whether “Arabic time” referred to a different way of counting the hours of the day or whether he merely referred to the Arabic numerals on the clock-face.


28 Lefebvre, Production, 265.

29 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 26.
6.3. The Orosdi Back Department Store – Consuming Modernity

The Orosdi Back building accommodated the first large-scale department store in Beirut. It was part of a Franco-Egyptian chain of department stores founded by naturalised French businessmen of Hungarian origin in 1855. In the Beirut’s watershed year of 1888, Léon and Philippe Orosdi and Joseph Back began to open branches in Paris, Istanbul, Salonika, Izmir, Adana, Aleppo, Beirut, Alexandria, Cairo and Tunis. By 1914, the Beirut branch generated a net profit of 117,699 francs.

The branch in Beirut was the first and the largest to open in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Beirut port company had ear-marked a plot of land for this department store as early as 1894 but it took

---

31 Saul, Samir, La France et l’Égypte de 1882 à 1914; Intérêts Economiques et Implications Politiques, (Paris: Ministère de l’Economie, des Finances et de l’Industrie, 1997), 170-4. I would like to express my gratitude to Stéphanie Samson to point me to this source.
32 Saul, La France et l’Égypte, 173. Beirut’s revenues were inferior to those of Paris (854,651ff) and Istanbul (452,831ff), less than the branches in Izmir (168,992ff) and Salonika (124,610ff), but superior to Tunis (93,720ff), Alexandria (84,535ff), Cairo (65,960ff), Aleppo (44,336ff) and Adana (42,638ff).
until the magic date of September 1, 1900 to open to the public as part of the city-wide celebrations in honour of Sultan Abdülhamid II’s silver jubilee. Situated on the quays next to the customs offices and warehouses at the port it lay at the intersection between maritime trade – that is the import of luxury goods from Europe – and the inland trade – that is the export of regionally produced goods. The opening of a railway station on the port premises, which coincided with that of the department store, further enhanced the central location of the building. Thus its customers consisted of both residents of Beirut, as well as regional and international visitors, especially since the port-railway compound became a transit stop for Muslim pilgrims to Mecca.

The international character of its merchandise and customers was clearly reflected in the building’s architectural style. On the ground floor of the two seaside facades that looked onto a wide area, large shop windows offered an easy and attractive view onto the merchandise presented inside. The upper floors impressed through their rich variety of structuring and ornamenting elements, like pilasters, differently shaped and sized windows, statues, shells, garlands and small towers, purposefully rendering an eye-catching effect from afar.

This arcaded department store introduced fetishes of modern consumerism and gadgetry to Beirut.33 Between the “phantasmorgia” of richly laid-out shop windows, inside the building an elevator facilitated consumers’ access to the assorted commodities, and an in-house telephone service connected the different shops.34 Orosdi Back spearheaded technological innovations in Beirut. It took another two years for a local concession holder to start a rudimentary telephone system for the city.35 On the whole the building was strongly ostentatious, even exhibitionist. The Orosdi Back building held every feature of an en vogue contemporary European consumers’ temple. The magazins des nouveautes or the galleries in Paris were, in fact, originally based on the perception of an oriental bazaar that tended to be reproduced in world exhibitions.36 On Orosdi Back, the only trace of Ottoman influence on the building itself were the small token stars on top of the pilasters. Yet, through the simultaneous inauguration ceremonies of the Orosdi Back, the railway station and the fountain on Sahat al-Sur, the building became part of the stage setting, perhaps even an actor, for the self-projection of the modern Ottoman state as manifested in the provincial capital, Beirut.

33 The particular form and function of the Orosdi Back building evokes Walter Benjamin’s Das Passagenwerk and his spectral analysis of the spatial organisation of modern consumerism.
34 BBA, YMTV 214/197, Zi al-Qa’da 25, 1319 (1902).
35 BBA, YMTV 249/18, Jumadi al-Awal 11, 1321 (1904).
The port company implemented a successful policy designed to attract local property investors, and international offices to the port premises. It was able to sell a number of plots on the newly reclaimed landfill to companies like Orosdi Back whose ‘radiant’ presence in the port was a fine return on investment and helped gentrify the area. Opposite the department store and inside the customs office, a corps de garde post safeguarded law and order. In the 1900s, notables like the Tabits and the Badawis erected buildings on the quays and rented them out as office space to the Beirut-Damascus railway company and other businesses.

The decision of the Ottoman Imperial Bank in 1905 to open a local branch on the first quay was both a reflection of the financial stakes it had in the port company and of the reputability of this privatised part of Beirut’s coastline.37 For 152,000 francs (“not comprising furniture, cloth awnings, ringing system and electric ventilation, heating, drainage and sewage, gas lighting and municipal taxes”) the bank was designed in a style reminiscent of modernist buildings of another, much grander,

37 OBA, Litiges diverses, Istanbul June 7, 1905.
These Muslim urban notables formed the nucleus of the Jam’iyyat al-Maqasid al-Khayriyya which opened a girls’ school six months after its inception in July 1878. With Midhat Pasha’s resourceful governorship between 1878 and 1880, more Maqasid schools opened in Beirut and Saida. After the departure of Midhat Pasha, the Maqasid Society was absorbed into state Ottoman structures until it became autonomous again after the Young Turk Revolution. In 1883, Ahmad ‘Abbas al-Azhari (1853-1927) founded the Madrassa al-Sultaniyya with members of the local educational authority. It briefly became the meeting place of leading members of the Islamic Reform Movement. In 1888, one of them, Muhammad ‘Abduh, called on the governor general in Beirut to step up education efforts. Seven years later another Ottoman school was built in Zuqaq al-Blat. Founded in 1895 “on an airy plateau overlooking Beirut and the Mountain” the madrasa al-‘uthmaniyya started as a small scientific institute accommodating a small number of different pupils. Two years later, the school secured a larger number of teachers and pupils. Now almost 30 teachers offer education to 150 pupils, boarding to half of them, most of whom come from all corners of Syria, some from the Hijaz, Yemen, Tunis and Anatolia, and the capital, Istanbul.

Indeed, the creation of the province of Beirut and the arrival of its first governor general were landmark events in the field of Ottoman education efforts in Beirut. Driven by the same sense of competition with foreign establishments we have already encountered with regard to the clocktower, the governor general, ‘Ali Pasha dispatched a memorandum to Yildiz palace in Istanbul in which he assessed the state of Ottoman and Islamic education in his new province. He recommended that the only way to prevent a sell-out to missionary education was to provide ‘indigenous’ alternatives for the Ottoman Muslims who were suffering from the unequal quality of their schools.

At the turn of the century, the idea of building an industrial complex emerged in Beirut’s reformist circles. By 1903, the reformists began to raise the issue in Istanbul where, conveniently, Syrians had established a considerable presence near the sultan. The idea gained momentum when the Provincial Council of Beirut sent a proposal to Istanbul trying to convince the Ottoman government and the sultan to support plans for an industrial school in Beirut. It was to be a day and boarding school
land reclamation scheme, Haussmann’s Second Empire Paris. A private enterprise like Orosdi Back, it made no attempt at blending into the urban fabric. On the contrary, its building material, the colour of the two-story façade and the triple domed, grey rooftop contrasted starkly with the conventional sand stone structures and red-tiled roofs of nearby khans, qaysariyyas and wikalas.

6.5. The Sanaya Complex and the Geography of Education

The push to expand the provision of Muslim educational expansion in Beirut began in 1875 with the foundation of the Jam‘iyat al-Funun by the city’s established ‘ulema led by Yusuf al-Asir, Ibrahim al-Ahad, and Sa‘id Hamada, and the younger generation of ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani and ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Barbir. The educational movement was a reaction to and a continuation of the short-lived Syrian Scientific Society of Hasayn Bayhum and Butrus al-Bustani. In contrast to its predecessor’s emphasis on science and intellectual theories, this Muslim society focussed on applied arts and practical skills. The society promoted modern state education which upheld Islamic morality while embracing the principles of the Ottoman Public Education Law of 1869. As such, it was intended as an alternative to both the traditional madrassas and kuttab, based as they were on memorisation of religious scriptures, and to the monopoly of missionary education.

38 For a biography, see As‘ad Rustum, Ara wa ahbath, 86-88.
39 Donald Cioeta, “Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Syria, 1875-1882,” Islamic Quarterly 26
for one hundred pupils, teaching in all disciplines.45 Ahmad `Abbas, the school’s founder and designated director, also lobbied at the Porte on behalf of the project.46 The school was to concentrate on teaching practical skills in crafts, arts and manufacture for poor children and was intended for aspiring industrialists and merchants. At the same time, `Abbas, Ahmad al-Da’uq and Hasan Qrunful requested teachers from French authorities emphasising the school’s interconfessional nature.47

After imperial approval was granted for both the hospital and the school, the municipality set about to find a suitable location. Ramlat al-Zarif, the plateau west of the old city, was chosen as the ideal place for the project. As "the most important spot of the city, on a wide stretch of land west of the city, [al-Raml provided] a pleasant location with good climate as the wind passes over it from the sea before heading towards the city."48

Throughout the early phases of Beirut’s urbanisation, the sand dunes had remained a deserted stretch of land. Too rocky for cultivation, Ramlat al-Zarif was a wasteland that occasionally served as a quarry49, while the distinct colour of the plateau’s fine, red sand had helped navigate sailors into Beirut harbour prior to the construction of the Beirut lighthouse.50 The French traveling poet-politician Lamartine called the area “un morceau du désert d’Egypte, jeté au pied du Liban.”51 But to the inhabitants, the sand dunes of al-Ramal had been a menace to health and trade for centuries. Twice a year, the city suffered sand inundation as heavy spring and autumn winds carried the sand across the city. Henri Guys noticed over the course of his fourteen years of residence in Beirut that several properties near the sand dunes had disappeared under the shifting sands and “judging from the annual encroachment, one can predict that it will take less than two centuries for this part of the cape to be covered in its entirety.”52

From Emir Fakhr al-Din to Ibrahim Pasha, attempts to contain the sand dunes have led to periodic forestation of some parts of the outlying areas of Beirut. Thus, the pine forest on the outskirts of Beirut had been laid out by the Emir partly to stem wind erosion. From the 1880s, with the growing elimination of natural imponderables that jeopardised routine commercial operations, scientific

44 See chapter four.
45 BBA, Giden 274, vesika 234938, Shawwal 10, 1321 (1904).
46 BBA, YMTV 267/140/1, Jumadi al-Awal 27, 1322 (1905).
48 Abd al-Basit al-Unsi, Dalil Bayrut wa Taqwim al-Iqbal, (Beirut: Matba’at al-Iqbal, 1910), 110.
49 Ibid.
51 Ibid., Vol. 2, 336.
Knowledge began to be applied to urban renewal in Beirut. The French natural scientist and resident of Beirut, Dr. Louis Lortet, was alarmed when a British company’s “half-hearted bid” to stop the erosion yielded no results the previous year. He warned that “if the Turkish administration does not care to take an energetic measure to combat the plague, these dunes – pushed incessantly by the winds – will rapidly engulf the whole city under their moving shroud.”

In 1886, the influential Arabic journal of technology, science and education, *al-Muqtataf*, published a thorough article on the issue and offered solutions for the problem of wind erosion. The author reported on French engineers who had recently invented new horticultural techniques to reinforce an area of 85,000 hectares in the Gascoigne and turned it into fertile land and encouraged Beirut’s authorities to learn.

It is no secret that the sand weighs heavily on the city of Beirut and oppresses it by burying its gardens. It now threatens a number of its proudest residences so that one cannot neglect the importance of preventing further encroachment.

The first signs that the municipality was taking concerted planning action against the sand drift was an official announcement in *Thamarat al-Funun* that “the residents of the sanded suburbs [were] required to show their legal ownership documents.” Once the property relations were established, the confines of the complex could be delineated. In September 1905 – on the sultan’s coronation anniversary – the governor ceremonially laid the first stone of the school. But construction ran into financial difficulties that forced him into levying extra taxes, such as two silver mecidiye on travel permits (*tezkere*).

Ibrahim Khalil Pasha, the Governor general, expected this and other taxes on merchandise to generate an additional and sufficient revenue of 1,000 Ottoman lira per year. Moreover, he suggested raising special taxes on produce, such as grain exports, oranges and tobacco. By early 1906, the financial situation seemed to have improved, so much so that the governor general asked the imperial government for funding for a municipal hospital for some one hundred in-patients as a complement to the school of industry. The Sanaya complex was the largest urban development project during Abdülhamid’s reign.

55 *Thamarat al-Funun*, June 10, 1902.
56 PRO, FO, 195/2217, November 13, 1906.
57 BBA, Giden 274, vesika no. 234938, 10/10/1321 (1904).
58 Ibid., 24/3/1323 (1906).
Although the funding for this huge, 350,000-lira project remained uncertain, the school and the hospital were inaugurated with the annual ritual commemorating the sultan in August 1907. The obligatory photo with carefully choreographed lines of Ottoman and Beiruti civil and military dignitaries was sent back to sultan Abdülhamid’s palace as visual evidence of provincial enterprise and loyalty. But even before the first stone had been laid, the head of the grain merchants’ guild in Beirut, one Amin Sinnu, cabled a petition to the Porte requesting that his guild not be expected to bear the brunt of the costs. He considered the taxes “another punishment” against them, too high and too one-sided as they affected exports rather than the already favoured imports. While it is not clear how the Sanaya complex was ultimately financed, a levy of 20-para (equivalent to half a piaster) for each traded sack of flour valued at 130-150 piasters was agreed on between the Provincial Council and the grain merchants. The Provincial Council had considered other sources of revenue, and a cross-reference in

59 BBA, Giden 274, 234938, 20/3/1323 (1906).
60 Ibid.
the Gelen file claimed that money generated from reclaimed coastal land was used – despite the protest of the municipality.61

The example of the protracted struggle for construction of the Maktab al-Sana‘i‘ wa-l-Tijjarat al-Hamidi allows for a number of important insights into the process of urban planning in Ottoman provincial capitals at the turn of the century. It involved the three levels of government, the local (the residents and the municipality) the regional (the Provincial Council and the governor general) and the imperial (the Palace and the Porte in Istanbul). Clearly not a profit making enterprise, the project did succeed because, despite different views on how to finance it, all three levels were ultimately convinced of its benefits. In terms of production of space, the Sanaya complex “resembles a self-contained townlet with cultivated fields.”62 Walkways through artificial patches of lawn and lines of young palm trees reclaimed destructive wasteland and turned it into prime urban property. Additionally, the new Sanaya garden, the hospital and the school were celebrated as a triumph of man, culture and science over volatile climates and nature’s hazards to health and trade. The impressive presence of educational and sanitary institutions promised to reproduce the same modern, scientific knowledge that made it possible to overcome the sand drifts. Such remarkable achievements boosted the Beirutis’ optimism and belief in modernity. The city’s future seemed to look bright.

The particular layout of the Sanaya complex also had a very tangible effect on the urban fabric that developed around it in years to come. A perpendicular grid of streets was grafted around the rectangular school building and the square-shaped public garden even before the property marked became active. In this area, a number of private gardens were developed nearby bearing Maronite names such as “Bustan Rizqallah”, “Bustan al-Murani”, “Bustan al-Balha”.63 The urban development was complemented by the construction of two new mosques in Qantari and al-Raml between 1900 and 1908. Sanaya had become the latest urban quarter in fin de siècle Beirut, and the building complex encouraged the settlement of further educational institutions.

Protestant missions, too, began to settle in this newly developed area between Musaytbeh in the south, Bashura in the east, Ramleh al-Zarif in the west and Wadi Abu Jamil in the north as the centre for their new schools. On 13 Zuqaq al-Raml (later sharif Ābd al-Qadir al-Qabbani), the British Engamon schools and the society for the blind established training institutes. At around the same time, the order of St. George established its training home near the madrassa al-sultaniyya in Bashura near

---

61 BBA, Gelen 271, No. 197149, 11/12/1321 (1904).
62 Dalil Bayrut, 110.
the VaWs cemetery. The Church of Scotland hired private houses for a boys' day school in “the barracks district.”

The Sanaya complex was also at (and in) the centre of Ottoman-Muslim primary and secondary schools that cropped up next to Christian schools in the neighbouring quarters. By the end of the Hamidian period in 1909, the nearby quarter of Bashura boasted an 'Idadiyya school, the Suriyya and Adabiyya schools for a total of 400 borders and day students. Closer still, between the Sanaya complex and al-Bashura, were the 'Ilmiyya school, Bustani’s (and Muhammad 'Abduh’s) al-Wataniyya in al-Khadra, and the 'Uthmaniyya school in Zuqaq al-Blat for a total of 700 pupils. Just north of al-Raml al-Zarif in Musaitbeh, a military Rushdiye school for 150 day pupils had been built near a Maqasid day school that provided education for some 560 pupils. In nearby Bast Tahta the Tawfiqiyya offered teaching to 200 pupils while more primary schools for both boys and girls were registered in Samtiyya, Basta Fawqa', Ras al-Naba, Suq Bazarkhan and Ras Beirut. Finally the Lajna al-Ta'lim al-Islami in 'Ayn al-Mreisse educated 150 pupils yearly.

Thus, by the time the construction of the Sanaya complex was underway, the quarters of Qantari and Zuqaq al-Blat had emerged to its east whose “number greatly influenced the plans for the Hamidian school in the southern part of the mentioned sand plateau,” while to its west the orchards and scattered mansions of Ras Beirut still dominated the landscape. In terms of visual impact from the sea, the Sanaya complex formed the westward extension of the Ottoman skyline on the Qantari hilltop.

The longitudinal facade of the Hamidian school dominated the burgeoning hotel district and the premises of the Syrian Protestant College below (even the towering College Hall).

---

64 PRO, FO/195/2140, April 9, 1903.
65 Dalal Bayrut, 111. On the girls’ schools, see Bayrut Vilayeti: meclis 'umumisinin 1330 senesi ictima’indan ittikhaz eldigi muqarrirat macmu’asi, (Beirut: Bayrut Vilayeti Matba’a, 1331/1915).
66 Dalal Bayrut, 110.
6.6. “It is like someone selling his eyes to buy glasses” – Two Public Squares in Comparison

In the late nineteenth century Sahat al-Burj\textsuperscript{67} and Sahat al-Sur (later Riadh Solh square) were subjected to a series of major physical and functional transformations. Yet, comparing the development of both squares, there emerged sharp contrasts between their levels of urban integration and spatial politics. While Sahat al-Sur maintained its local organisation and function, Sahat al-Burj became a place of regional integration and imperial ostentation and, in this capacity, constantly compared to other ‘great squares’ in Europe and the Azbakiyya garden in Cairo.

The barren field between the tower Burj al-Kashshaf and Fakhr al-Din’s palace had been an area of strategic value for centuries.\textsuperscript{68} The Russian military expedition of 1772 had placed its canons

---

\textsuperscript{67} Or “Place des Canons”; since 1876 Place Hamidiyya; after 1908, it became “Place de la Liberté” and after 1909 “Place de l’Union”, after World War I it became “Martyrs’ Square”.

\textsuperscript{68} The near mythical marble palace and hanging gardens of Fakhr al-Din deteriorated since the late seventeenth century. The palace became a quarry for subsequent construction work on the city walls before the Cinema Opera was built on its site in 1923.
here to destroy city’s fortifications.\textsuperscript{69} When the French army entered Beirut after the civil war of 1860, Poujoulat relished the sight of this “300 by 150 metre square” and the multi-coloured “omnibuses” which took the leisurely strollers to the pine forest at fifteen-minute intervals. More so, he enjoyed the dominance “of restaurants, cafés, shops or boutiques tenues par des Français” which had arrived in the wake of the Crimean War.\textsuperscript{70} Significantly, following this description of the “Frenchness” of Sahat al-Burj, Poujoulat’s \textit{La verité} appealed strongly for a French military intervention in Lebanon.

Such colonial designs having been thwarted by Fuad Pasha, the square gradually came to embody the model of an Ottomanised Beirut, the “jewel in the crown of the Padishah”, as the German emperor William II called the city during his visit in 1898.\textsuperscript{71} The first regularisation efforts on Sahlat al-Burj came after the civil war and were infrastructural. The aim was to level the inclination between the imperial barracks [qishla], Sahlat al-Sur and Sahlat al-Burj. A great earthen dam was built “behind al-sur” to ease the journey of the passengers of the Diligence service. They put together a great heap [qantara] of stones above Bab Ya’qub so that the carriages from above and the people from below may be free from worry on the way to the gate.\textsuperscript{72}

When Ibrahim Fakhri Bey replaced Ahmad Pasha Abaza to become Beirut’s second municipal president in 1878, a new era of urbanist activism dawned which also coincided with Midhat Pasha’s governorship of Syria and Abdulhamid’s coronation. Fakhri Bey made Sahat al-Burj his top priority and even committed private funds to its development. Money was collected from the notables for the planting of young trees and patterns for pathways laid out: the field metamorphosed into a square. In an article entitled “Improvements on Sahat al-Burj” \textit{Lisan al-Hal} announced that

\begin{quote}
The entire municipal council under the able leadership of Ibrahim Fakhri Bey has begun to continue the work for the ordering of the city, especially on Sahat al-Burj’s park. For a while now, lamps have been demanded to put up around the park. They cost at least 10,300 piasters. We are waiting for lamps to be put up inside it.

As we see it at this moment, it absolutely necessary to improve al-Burj. Already it is necessary to collect the sum of 41,000 piasters from [Fakhri Bey’s] private money to pay for this work [but] the municipality needs to decide that is necessary to spend 30,000 piasters from its budget to develop the square according to the map which had been drawn [by Bishara Dib].\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{69} Taha al-Wali, \textit{Bayrut fi al-tarikh wa al-hidara wa al-’umran}, (Beirut, 1993), 85.
\textsuperscript{71} PRO, \textit{FO}, 195/2024, October 10, 1898.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Hadiqat al-Akhbar}, January 24, 1861. Later, this street was renamed Rue Emir Bashir.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Lisan al-Hal}, May 1, 1879.
*Lisan al-Hal* appealed to its readers' taste and pride of place by urging them to contribute financially in order to make Sahat al-Burj "as beautiful as the Azbakiyya park in Cairo."4

At the same time, the newspaper resorted to customary name-dropping of "local investors": Elias Sayyagha (head architect, 500 piasters), Sa'id Jawish (100 p. – the equivalent of £1!), 'Umar Ramadan (200 p.), Jirjis Mitri Sursuq (200 p.), Ra'ad & Hani (2,000 p.). As'ad Malhame (2,000 p.), Muhammad Badran (100 p.), Ahmad Ramadan (municipal inspector, 100 p.), Salim Thabit (1,000 p.). Yu'akim al-Najjar (200 p.), 'Abd al-Rahim Badran (president of the chamber of commerce, 500), Salum Bassul (500), Niqula Qimati (200), Salim Shihab (200 p.), brothers Ayyas (2,500 p.), Yusuf al-Jadday (2,000 p.), Elias Qutayta (200 p.), Christophurus al-Rumi (250 p.), M. Aubin (227 p.), Khalil Sarkis (editor of *Lisan al-Hal*, 221 p.);75 Nikula Sursuq (1,500 p.), Jirji Tuwayni (1,750 p.), Musa Frayj (227 p.), Hanna Shakkur Trad (1,130 p.), M. Lafique (director of the Beirut-Damascus road, 227 p.), Comte Perthuis, (president of the Beirut-Damascus road, 227 p.), the Italian consul (500 p.), Bishara al-Khuri (500 p.).76 With the curious exception of the Bayhums most municipal members contributed to this project of urban improvement, even if some notables only gave a token amount.

The construction of the Petit Serail was the central trigger of municipal development plans for Sahat al-Burj. Subsequent landscape design transformed the field (*al-sahla*) into a modern square (*al-saha*) replete with trees, fences, and fashionable architectural features in Ottoman urban design – the octagonal kiosk and the sumptuous fountain in the middle of the park. In 1903,

the Governor general has paved al-Burj to make it the beauty spot it deserves to be as it is the entrance of the governor's palace and to the Ottoman Bank and other administrative buildings as well as the garages of the railway company, the Tobacco Régie, the Beirut tramway, the gas company and the Lebanese tramway company.77

But at the same time that the government palace appropriated the square as an extension of its own structure and emanation of imperial power, the popularity of Sahat al-Burj as an outlet for the pursuit of leisure and popular protest also frequently turned the square into a counter-space of everyday life. Time and again, these opposite claims between conceived and lived space, between the representations of space and the spaces of representation, caused urban conflict over the right to enter and define this, Beirut's most central place. To its users, Sahat al-Burj was the lived place of encounter, gathering and simultaneity. To its architects it was the abstract place of order and ostentation.

---

74 Ibid.
75 Ibid., May 22, 1879.
76 Ibid., May 26, 1879.
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Any threat to this order, however unpremeditated, was also seen as a challenge to the
generalised project of modernity. A few months into the establishment of the provincial capital. Lisan
al-Hal took an attack on a bureaucrat (mē'mīr) strolling along Sahat al-Burj as a pretext to stage a
verbal assault on the lower classes writ large while claiming to speak in their interest:

The Burj is surrounded by small, entangled shops which offer easy escape routes [for the criminal]
despite the presence of the Serail and the barracks of the cavalry. We hope the new system of
justice will sort out such threats to the peace and stability of the city. They are a menace to society
and need to be punished severely. … It is known that in a city like Beirut which thrives on trade,
more security means more profit. Those most affected by such crises are the ones with medium
income and the poor. Anybody who halts our progress with such acts [commits] a theft.78

Here, Lisan al-Hal blamed the tortuous bazaars for the impunity of criminals but fell short of
advocating whole-sale demolition. The effectual regularisation on Sahat al-Burj gave the square
something external, severed from its natural, local environment. This view was expressed in a polemic
article in Lisan al-Hal which compared Beirut’s two squares’ histories to strengthen his argument: In
the 1880s, the few scattered Azdarahit plants, the last reminders of the “old” Sahat al-Burj, had been
fenced in to produce a picturesque oval garden. The article complained about the fact that entry to this
garden was forbidden, subject to an entrance fee and that it was turned into a commercial area:

The municipality had built some small huts on the edge of its fences and today [1913] large shops
made of stone and lime are built for revenue, in the knowledge that in Beirut there are a number of
very rich people who hope to buy them for no less than 150,000 piasters. But if the municipality
sells this garden, it is like somebody selling his eyes to buy glasses. It is easy for every Beiruti to
witness the beautification of this square in how it is surrounded by stores and shops. What is the
need for a garden if it is inside a wall? It is upon us to remove these constructions [around the park]
and open its gates to everyone who wishes to enter them. For the we deserve better than an
inaccessible park, as it represents for us the fabric of the previous century.79

Far from being merely of aesthetic value, the square had become a political space and was used
as a venue for demonstrations. For example, when Austria annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina on October 5,
1908, the Beiruti notables organised an anti-Austrian demonstration on Sahat al-Burj - or the “jardin de

77 Ibid., March 16, 1903.
78 Ibid., June 25, 1888.
79 Ibid., November 6, 1913.
la liberté’ as it was then called - five days later. The newspaper al-Ahwal reported that "numerous Beirutis gathered last Saturday in the ‘jardin de la Liberté’ and formulated an address against Austria’s violation of the Berlin Treaty. Amongst them were [Beiruti merchants. intellectuals and bureaucrats like] Hasan Bayhum, Shibli Mallat, Ahmad Tabbara, ‘Arif Ramadan, Felix Farés, Mustafa Ghaylani and Salim Ya’qubi.”

Large public squares or parks like Sahat al-Burj were purposefully targeted by the Ottoman authorities for these rituals as they provided political order despite a high degree of popular, urban mobilisation. At the same time, the imperial state never quite mastered these public squares which also became the rallying points of popular anti-government protest. When a group of notables demanded that the governor general release political prisoners on April 20, 1913, “a large mass quietly gathered on Assour and the Place des Canons” to put pressure on the government. When the prisoners were finally set free from the Grand Serail late into the night, they were greeted with standing ovations across the city.

The barracks of the imperial light cavalry next to the Petit Serail signaled the maintenance of political order as it was conveniently situated at the intersection between the square and the newly aligned street that led west through the old city. Next to the barracks, a large office accommodated the Hijaz railway company, the epitome of Hamidian development of the Arab provinces. On top of the red-tiled roof of its three-floor building, a central crest displayed local time to the leisurely flâneurs and to the newly arrived from the mountain as the Beirut-Damascus road led directly onto the square.

Rue Emir Bashir formed the axis between the two main squares in fin de siècle Beirut. From Sahat al-Burj wide pavements lined with trees led the way to the ‘other’ square, Sahat al-Sur. Compared to the dominance of the conceived space of Sahat al-Burj, the organic development of Sahat al-Sur preserved a distinct heterogeneity. Despite the profound effect of the expanding city, the ‘square’ resisted the regulatory forces of the Ottoman and French colonial authorities and “has guarded its curious triangular form which seems to have persistently disturbed urbanists.”

In many ways Sahat al-Sur became the main local traffic junction in late nineteenth century Beirut. Situated on the south-western side of the old city, it “was a natural outlet for the district of
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Zukak al-Blat and for the more working-class area of Bashura and its prolongation. Basta. A new
Ottoman telegraph office was installed at the northern side of the square next to the public bath Zahrat
Suriyya. By the end of the century the square became a popular spot for lower-class coffee houses,
generating a new kind of market, one of local gossip and regional, even global, information, given the
location of the Ottoman telegraph office on the square. The construction of the tramway between 1907
and 1909 connected Sahat al-Sur with the quarters of Mazra‘t al-‘Arab and Ras al-Naba‘ in the south.
Khan Antun Bey at the port and Nahr Beirut in the east.

Designs to turn Sahat al-Sur into a public park dated back to 1869 when the newly formed
municipality requisitioned recently-built, popular stores and tore them down. Lack of funding aborted
all further development until 1892 when the governor general decided to construct a public building on
the square and create a leisure park around it. With the dismissal of Isma‘il Bey Kemal, the incomplete
building was torn down again and the idea of a public park was dropped “due to pressure from some of
the local inhabitants.”

The celebrations commemorating Abdülhamid II’s jubilee on September 1, 1900 brought Sahat
al-Sur into the limelight of imperial, regional and municipal affairs. To the sound of military music and
under flying imperial banners, an eight metre tall white marble fountain was unveiled in the square’s
centre. The Governor general turned on the water tap and symbolically drank the first cup from the
fountain’s pipes. As with the Ottoman clocktower, Yusif Aftimos was the chief architect and Yusif al-
‘Anid the sculptor. The golden Arabic and Ottoman calligraphy, engraved by the local artist Shaykh
Muhammad ‘Umar al-Barbir on commemorative plates in honour of the Sultan, clearly reflected the
larger phenomenon of using architecture in order to promote the Hamidian personality cult. In a sense,
the commemorative plates on monuments were a constant reminder of the noble donator (although
most public construction was paid for out of municipal funds). As a way to express the city’s gratitude
a delegation of Beiruti notables including Iskander Tuwayni, Amin Mustafa Arslan and As‘ad Lahud
paid a personal visit to the Sultan in Istanbul “carrying valuable presents.”
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Partie de Beyrouth II.
The square continued to function as a kind of people’s place, as the meeting point of public processions and the venue for popular festivities where “[s]wings and merry-go-rounds [were] installed around the square’s famous cafes.”87 Here migrant workers arrived early in the morning to wait for work opportunities at one of the many construction sites of the city. The square’s spatial boundaries remained intrinsic and irregular. The general absence of encircling pavements around the square accounted for its intimate character. In a way, the privacy of the houses, lining Sahat al-Sur to the north and south, disseminated into the public square while, inversely, the boundaries of the public square incorporated these houses.

In sum, the comparison between the two main squares of Beirut has shown that analysing specific places reveals their differentiated historical trajectories in the context of Ottomanisation. In the late nineteenth century Sahat al-Burj transcended the local character which Sahat al-Sur embodied. While the latter successfully resisted the imposition of larger, external rhythms, the former became an agent of external change, whether as the French-dominated Place des Canons that Poujoulat had described, or as Abdülhamid’s Sahat al-Hamidiyya. Indeed, by the turn of the century, Sahat al-Burj had become the showpiece of Ottomanised Beirut, just as it was to become a symbol of French rule during the Mandate period.


The Beirut press eagerly awaited the visit of Wilhelm II, German Emperor since 1888. Thamarat al-Funun and Lisan al-Hal, ever the mouthpieces of public opinion in Bilad al-Sham, heralded the visit as a milestone of German-Ottoman friendship.88 The Beiruti journalists realised that Wilhelm II’s journey to the East marked a symbolic departure from German foreign policy in the Middle East from Bismarck’s non-interventionism to a declared pro-Ottoman stance.89 Under these conditions, the fact that Beirut was chosen as the site of Wilhelm’s departure from the ‘Orient’, caused a frantic surge among the city authorities and urban notables to present Beirut in the best of lights. In

87 Debbas, Beirut, Our Memory, 90.
preparation, the governors of Beirut, Damascus and Mount Lebanon set up planning committees for his final reception in Beirut.

Khalil Sarkis, the ubiquitous editor of *Lisan al-Hal*, was one of the official local representatives who accompanied the Emperor on his tour in Beirut and to Damascus. He published a detailed description of the preparations in both cities and the perambulations of the royal visitor. Under the supervision of Yusuf Aftimos – recently returned to his post as municipal engineer from the Chicago world exhibition – the municipality erected special gas lanterns decorated with German and Ottoman flags and garlands along the imperial paths. The Ottoman infantry and cavalry were trained long in advance to line up and parade in their new uniforms on the quays and on the marching square in front of the Grand Serail.

The port company played an important role in the preparations, and the honourable municipality agreed [for once] with the gas company to line the thoroughways with gas lighting of the most beautiful kind. Along the entire path [of the Emperor’s projected procession], the offices of the port company, the customs, the Khedival Lines and the adjacent mansions and all the official and unofficial Ottoman government offices were laid with cedar twigs, pine branches and splendid lighting. And especially Sahat al-Burj was decorated by [the mufti] ‘Abd al-Basit [al-Fakhuri] and the engineer Yusuf Efendi Aftimos with three arcs of the highest order, one on top of the other with a German and an Ottoman flag above.

When the Emperor’s yacht arrived at the port of Beirut, a crowd of some 50,000 people welcomed him. The city’s student population was given a special holiday to mark the occasion. Before the Emperor and his wife went ashore, the governor general and the municipal president of Beirut, Rashid Bey and ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani, were received aboard the ship for lunch, and they returned the favour by presenting them with a host of gifts and memorabilia from the city of Beirut.

The parade through the city along the designated path of procession directed them to the German charitable organisations in Ras Beirut, to Sahat al-Burj and the Grand Serail. At the end of William’s guided tour, speeches were made and a sumptuous military parade was staged on Beirut’s ‘capitol hill’:

While refreshments were served, His Majesty feasted his eyes on the beautiful view of the city, the harbour, and the deep blue sea. In the other direction, he looked across a densely wooded plain up to the heights of Mount Lebanon. ... The return trip resembled a triumphal procession. The route
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was flanked by countless people, all cheering endlessly. Night had already set in as the procession continued through the brightly illuminated city, across the cannon square with its decorative public garden, and down to the harbour. Everywhere the streets, the windows, and balconies were lined with people, who were outdoing each other in expressing their joy.95
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6.8. Khalil Gibran's Fantasy Opera House of Beirut

Khalil Gibran's rendering of an imaginary opera house comes across as a forerunner to postmodern pastiche architecture. It was probably inspired by the then popular transient eclecticism of the Great Exhibition architecture in Antwerp, Chicago, Paris and London. The drawing was sketched during a joint visit to London by Amin al-Rihani and Gibran in 1910, a few years after the famous White City exhibition. Gibran's phantasy-opera was dotted with images of Islamic and Christian paraphernalia - minaret and dome - and an arabesque entrance. The semi-naked Athena figure topping the central dome was a fashionable neoclassical symbol of ancient freedom and democracy but had few direct connotations with music and theatre. But it could be speculated that with this particular composition Gibran conveyed an ideal of freedom of expression for Beirut that was sanctioned by Christianity and Islam.

Ideals such as Gibran's of what Beirut should be and what it should stand for, emerged at a time of technological and scientific advances, changing world-views and social categories. Even if this particular drawing was in all likelihood a prank between friends (it was certainly not meant for publication), diverse renderings of urban symbolism - whether textual or pictoral - tell a rich story of abstract visions, human creativity and future-oriented (even futuristic) normativity. As we have argued throughout, they also physically transformed the urban fabric of Beirut. But it is important to note that Gibran's projections were not a reflection of the lived reality and the usage of theatres and places of leisure in fin de siècle Beirut. It is the discrepancy between the conceived spaces of public normativity and morality and the lived space of everyday practices that the next chapter addresses.
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Conclusion

Chapter five examined the effects of literary imaginations of Beirut's rôle and function, its assets and its perils on the way urban planning and regularisation was conducted. By way of extending this argument to public architecture, this chapter offers an imperial 'site geography' of Beirut's landmark buildings which, it was argued, purposefully punctuated the urban landscape and shaped the rhythm of the inhabitants' everyday itineraries. Monumentality and visuality in architectural and urban planning marked the political power of provincial capitals, while the economic struggle between local merchants and authorities and the imperial government over the funding of public buildings such as schools, palaces and hospitals was matched by a symbolic struggle over access to, and interpretation of, public squares and gardens. The annual recurrence of Ottoman rituals of commemoration at opening ceremonies was a pervasive way to
Ottomanise public architecture and inscribe into the urban fabric of provincial capitals the Ottoman will to power and the imperial project of modern reform.
Chapter 7: Public Morality and Marginality in *Fin de Siècle* Beirut

Marginality is not automatically synonymous with ‘the excluded’ or ‘the outcast’ who are “condemned by law or a dominant culture or confined to spatially designated zones.” Rather, marginality is a relational and negotiated phenomenon, produced as much by the power of literary and political imagination as by past experience and designs for prospective order. In fact, it will be argued for Beirut that local marginal men and women were produced as tragic urban figures not merely by objective alienating processes of rapid urbanization (as identified by the Chicago School), but rather by a powerful discourse on morality that viewed marginality as an obstacle to the imagined industrious and prosperous future of Beirut. This discourse was in part literary, and took place in the imagined public sphere of journals and newspapers. Yet, we suggest that its transformative power manifested itself in the (very real) production of urban space, in the process of geographic and demographic urban expansion. Central and marginal places are mutually dependent and naturally tended to share the same geography. Beirut’s discourse on morality derived from continuous attempts at disentangling central and marginal places.

7.1. A Stage of Everyday Life

Beirut was spared the sectarian violence of 1860. Yet, the maintenance of peace and stability in Beirut, and the intellectual’s quest for social harmony and economic prosperity, evolved around - and was defined against - the memory of the devastating experience of the war in the Mountain. “At the turn of the century, they [the immigrants to Beirut] were still dating events in terms of the civil war.”

Often coffeehouses and taverns were the outlets for disorder and brawls but on a regular daily basis they formed meeting points of social groups from different geographical backgrounds. For strangers to the city – merchants or peasants from near and far –
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coffeehouses offered a gateway into urban life where habitual encounters brought the locals in contact with others and provided daily news and gossip. The most famous and long-lasting of Beiruti cafés was the Qahwa al-Hajj Dawud built in Zaytuneh on wooden poles over a cliff within close range to the port. “After eating breakfast, drinking coffee and smoking water pipes at Hajj Dawud’s café… [Nabulsi merchants] trekked to Suq al-Tawila, the heart of the textile commercial sector in Beirut.” But coffeehouses were also places where authorities were mocked. Bishara al-Khuri’s memoirs give a sense of this element of popular culture in coffee houses, especially the ones on Beirut’s main square, Sahat al-Burj, like al-Qazzáz, which became spaces where not only the new Ottomanized flanneurs with their fezes and frocks were ridiculed, but where pinging social criticism avoided punishment:

Just before the Young Turk revolution, one Sam’an Bulus from Zgharta caused scandal in the café of Najib al-Khuri on Sahat al-Burj, when he dressed in the attire of a mushir [general] smoking a nargile and mocking the social hierarchy under Muzaffer Pasha [then Mutasarrif of Mount Lebanon]. When reprimanded by an onlooker of the spectacle how he dares to wear the uniform of the highest rank in the Ottoman army, our hero of the day replied: “Why should it matter to you, if I dress smarter?”

Henri Lefebvre’s definition of the café and its function in everyday life captures these varied experiences of leisure in fin de siècle Beirut:

> generally an extra-familial and extra-professional meeting place, where people come together on the basis of personal affinities (in principle and at least apparently), because they have the same street or the same neighborhood in common.… . It is a place where they can speak freely (about politics, women, etc.) and where if what is said may be superficial, the freedom to say it is fiercely defended.

Crime and murder may have tended to be isolated and instantaneous night-time occurrences but local and foreign commentators at the time expressed unease that the ‘slightest incident’ would trigger ‘the eruption of this dreadful volcano.’ The persistent angst of a return to the conditions of civil war is a common theme in the historical sources. The diplomatic and administrative correspondence of European and Ottoman officials as much as local city news and editorials give the impression of raucous and indomitable lower classes
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and, by implication, produced the image of knowledgable consuls, bureaucrats and notables. In this respect, these commentaries were strategic representations of the reality of everyday life that reaffirmed the legitimacy of elite hegemony over (and intervention in) Beirut’s social space.

With the claims of historical sources, “[t]here can be no doubt that social space is the locus of prohibition, for it is shot through with both prohibitions and their counterparts. This fact, however, can most definitely not be made into the basis of an overall definition, for space is not only the space of ‘no’, it is also the space of the body, and hence the space of ‘yes’, of the affirmation of life.”9 Coffeehouses and public places in Beirut were the sites of intense but harmonious sociability. Public baths, too, were places of encounter and gathering.10 Before we relate the socially constricting discourses of morality to the times and spaces of urban violence, the following, extended description of the different layers of socialibity in a popular theatre by an Austrian traveller serves as a representative vignette of Beirut’s everyday life.

Not far from the Place des Canons [Sahat al-Burj] we found ourselves in front of a house with large, lit-up windows. We descended the rickety wooden stairs that were covered by an inviting red carpet. Downstairs a man got up from his wooden table to greet us with a bow. An Italian show. While we were still deliberating, an elegant carriage drawn by two magnificent horses stopped in front of the staircase. A young gentleman in an immaculate blazer and a red Tarbush stepped out and helped a lady descend dressed in a flowing Frou Frou of silk pleats, in flashing diamonds, a layering of Brussels laces and a scent of some provocative perfume. She had the appearance of a typical European lady of fashion. He belonged to one of the immensely rich local Syrian patrician families in this trading city. These young people go to Europe, especially Paris, for a few years and return with a firm command of several European languages, good etiquette and particularly with many new business connections. Their vast fortunes never leave the country, and the merchant dynasties marry amongst themselves. However pleasant and polite these distinguished patricians are towards the Europeans, they do not allow them to gain a durable foothold in their society. Of such a dynasty was this man. And the lady? Looking over his shoulder secretly, the consular official whispers: ‘His girlfriend. From Paris… absolutely authentic! Direct import. He has brought her himself.’

We decided to enter the theatre and followed the young man and his girlfriend. The box where we were placed was one of many on an encircling balcony. It was not exactly comfortable, but the arrangement permitted to bend over the low railings and chat animatedly with the neighbors to the right and left.

[When the show was over, it] was greeted with frenetic applause by the audience. The lights went on and I could have a look around the theatre. In the boxes on the balcony, the ladies of the

10 There were six hamams in Beirut, two inside the city – al-Darka and al-Shifa’ – one on the Damscus Road (Hamam al-Zahariyya) – one in Bashura (Hamam al-Nuzha), one, in lower Basta, and on next to the Serail (Hamam al-Qishla) which offered treatment of rheumatism. See *Dalil Bayrut* (Beirut, 1910).
Syrian notability sat in their European dresses. It was glittering and glamorous as if these women were not sitting on the pathetic balcony of a puppet theatre, but within the mirrored walls of any one of the largest opera houses in Europe. And the ladies knew how to wear the volume of laces, the incredible wealth of jewelry with grace and matter-of-factness and with a truly aristocratic calm and self-confidence... A tad too much in some aspects which was surely added here and not in Paris or Vienna. And these ladies were free, they went about unveiled. Opposite us sat the young man with his girlfriend from Paris. They sat next to each other, engaged in a casual conversation, a bit bored, like people for whom leisure is a social duty. Two boxes to our right sat two elderly women with three young girls. The young man greeted them and they reciprocated with a friendly nodding of their heads. ‘It is his mother,’ said the consular official, ‘and the young girls are his sisters.’

I found it strange indeed, that one should present ones girlfriends with such aplomb. ‘My god, what do you want? Nobody finds anything wrong with it. One keeps these ladies like racing horses. It is part of good form.’ ‘And these girlfriends never complain?’ ‘Most of them know exactly the habits of this country. Many have already come several times. Should, for whatever reason, the relationship come to an end, one sunny morning the young lady will receive magnificent jewelry and a small letter which will inform her in elegant French that the next Messagerie Maritime steamer sets sail on such and such a day. A ticket for the journey and a transfer to a Paris banker for a handsome sum will be included. So far, nobody has had to complain.’

That was the society that sat on the balcony in the shackled boxes. Downstairs on the ground floor sat the ‘people’. Neck and neck the red Tarbush of the Christians, the white turbans of the Druzes, Mutwasis and Muslims are cramped together peacefully. They get up to wave to acquaintances, move in between the rows and chairs, conduct the ceremonial of greetings which consists of touching forehead and heart as a sign of devotion and finally kissing on the cheeks in a ceremonious and patriarchal manner... 11

This account of the moral hypocrisy of Beirut’s notables is shot through with a rare dose of foreign male envy and a pervading sense of exclusion as the local elites “do not allow them to gain a durable foothold in their society.” Therefore, we may well treat the account as a more than allegorical representations of Western phantasies about ‘the Orient’ that – as we shall see - generally marked European travel literature. Instead, I would argue, it represents a lived reality of Beirut’s social hierarchy and class structure.

To our observer the drama is not played out on stage but in the audience of the theatre. This vignette of social life in fin de siècle Beirut invokes Erving Goffman’s approach to social interaction as dramaturgical staging of the self to explain the structure and dynamics of everyday life. 12 More, the city as a whole was at one and the same time the place and the milieu, the theatre and the stake of complex social interactions. 13 Henri Lefebvre sees in this
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kind of theatrical interplay the pure form of "third space [where] bodies are able to pass from a 'real', immediately experienced space [popular, cross-communal conviviality versus the elite's omniscient detachment] to a perceived space [the spatial practices of the pit and gallery]." The burgeoning venues of entertainment in late Ottoman Beirut facilitated a publicly legible social hierarchy. The theatre's gallery demarcated Beirut's al-khassa from al-'amma – the upper from the lower class. It represented the exclusive zone of intra-elite ogling, whose secret violations of the moral order were concealed from the crowd below. The 'crowd's' practices, in turn, were structured by ritualised forms of sociality. Only from the perspective of the topographically remote elite did this practice appear as undifferentiated heterogeneity.

7.2. The Invisible Cage: Locating Social Evil and Urban Vice

Social thought of Ottoman and local elites in Beirut after 1860 was not dissimilar to that of British public moralists of the time, who identified London's poor as a root problem to society, and were one in the belief that there were "savage tribes 'lurking at the bottom of our civilization,' which if not tamed and disciplined would ultimately overthrow it." The 1867 Ottoman police law had stipulated that beggars were to be apprehended on sight and incarcerated. Yet, at least to one Russian resident of fin de siècle Beirut, beggars posed a constant menace as they asked for money, and 'invariably demanded fees of passages.' Disciplinarian policies through legal texts and their physical enforcement did not lead to the disciplined society envisaged by Ottoman rulers. Rather, boundaries of the permissible were constantly challenged and transgressed, while, as we shall see, Ottoman authorities adjusted imperial norms to local conditions.

Butrus al-Bustani's Nafr Suriyya appeared first in Beirut only weeks after the end of the civil war and ran eleven issues. In these pamphlets Bustani made passionate appeals to
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his fellow countrymen to overcome their sectarian differences, individual and communal self-interest and work together for a better and more dignified common future. In developing the ideal foundations of a harmonious society, human and spatial marginality were first identified and then acted upon. The social thought of Beiruti public moralists displayed an acute awareness of the interactive relation between society and the urban ‘milieu’. Public moralists increasingly turned the social life of Beirut into a new object of analysis and intervention.

In the first half of the nineteenth century European visitors to Beirut had felt secure in Beirut, particularly as the city was perceived as a sanctuary against the allegedly inherently violent nature of the ‘tribes of the mountain’. To Henri Guys, the Beirutis were a peaceful if primitive people, “their moral qualities have preserved something of their simplicity and their primitive purity.”19 And a few decades later Lewis Farley concurred, “life and property are perfectly secure in Beyrout. Murder, robbery, and other crimes, so frequent in European cities, are here unknown.”20

However, moralists in Beirut begged to differ from these euphoric early foreign accounts. While before the “Pasha of Beirut [had] closed the only grogshop,” the protestant missionary Henry Jessup complained that by the turn of the century there were “120 licensed saloons, and Moslems of the two extremes of society, the Turkish civil and military officers and the lowest class of boatmen and artisans, drink as much as the foreign Ionian Greeks, and the native so-called Christian sects.”21 Jirji Zaydan was one such public moralist whose autobiography –written in 1909 – represents a pertinent commentary on the perceived social dangers in Beirut. Born in downtown Beirut in 1861 and educated in the Syrian Protestant College, he left Beirut for Egypt in 1883 to pursue a distinguished career as a journalist. Fear of local knaves was a recurrent theme in his memoirs. His criticism was all the more severe as he was born into a poor family (mutawassit al-hal, lit. “of moderate circumstances”) and came in close contact with the roughs and toughs of Beirut while working in his father’s restaurant off Sahat al-Burj. Subsequently he raised himself from his social background.

20 Lewis Farley, Two Years in Syria (London, 1859), 59.
through “hard work”, “perseverance”, “awareness of time” and discipline. Reminiscing about his youth as a restaurant boy, Zaydan complained:

There remained for company only the idle people who had no work that they enjoyed. These people would gather in my place; some would spend their leisure time during work between morning and evening here. Their talk differed from the talk of crooks only in form and expression: one would boast how he committed adultery taking possession of so-and-so, the wife of the honourable such-and-such... Another would show off with his abilities in fornication. Amongst them was a young hunchback whom I heard saying that his hunch was the result of immoderation. ... Such were the *mores* of the masses of Beirut.23

Nor did Zaydan have time for mass entertainment such as the traditional puppet theatre – the *karagöz*:

...[I]t was obscene, thoroughly loathsome, and indecent. No wonder, though, since it reflected the mores of the lowest classes in Beirut, and of those who were known in the usage of the townspeople as the crooks of Assur square – and spread to al-Burj square – whose only occupation was pimping, stealing and provoking the passers-by; they would run around almost naked, and would sleep on the streets....24

Zaydan’s negative view of the *karagöz* echoed that of the Ottoman reformers in Istanbul. Writing in 1866, the Tanzimat poet Namik Kemal considered *karagöz* a den of licentiousness. If the *karagöz* been “a school of divine recognition” as the dervishes called those coffeehouses where *karagöz* was performed, by the nineteenth century they were considered places of unrestrained immorality which was put to an end by public morality and Abdülhamid’s censorship.25

The roughs and toughs of Beirut (the *qabaday* and *rijal al-futuwa wa abna’ al-hawa*) elicited the young Zaydan’s fear and admiration. The latter were infamous in Beirut for their drinking bouts which ‘would be attended by the wise man and the ignorant, because the Beirutis have for a long time believed Araq to be of benefit before the meal and wine with the meal.’ Decent people would turn boisterous in the taverns.

Usually three or four would sit together to get drunk. One of them would order a *khamsiniya*. It would be poured for him and his friends until it was empty. Then another

23 Thomas Philipp, *Gurgi Zaidan: His Life and Thought* (Beirut, 1979), 11.
one would order a second, and so on until none owed the others anything. ... When the wine went to their heads, one would start singing a Baghdadi *ma’wul*. They would listen well to his song and would interpret from it something that he wanted from them, be it by way of praise and laudation or criticism and negative comments. It would then behove him or one of his friends or his companions to answer to the *ma’wul*. Provided the singing was done with good humour, the party would take a turn for the better. But if it consisted of criticism and insinuations, it would lead to quarrelling and eventually to the drawing of knives and unsheathing of sticks.26

Zaydan divided Beirut society into two classes (*tabaqatan*): the commoners, *al-’amma* ("riff raff, artisans, all the other people with menial occupations, and the small merchants") on the one hand and the elites, *al-khassa* ("people of the government and the rich") on the other. The Beirut lower class, *al-’amma*, was uneducated because of the few schools available to it. "Obscene expressions and indecent talk prevailed in their speech."27 Zaydan concluded his brief analysis of Beirut’s class structure by stating that there developed after the 1860 civil war a third, independent class amongst the Beirutis: the intellectuals, educated in modern Ottoman, and European missionary schools. They began to dress in western clothes and were considered effeminate and seen to be breaching traditions. Yet, Zaydan felt most at ease in this circle, partly because they, like him, abstained from alcohol and other urban ‘vices’.28 "This social group was determined to change the social norms from what they were to what they became, so that the contemporary morals of Beirut became comparable with the most advanced habits and customs of the Europeans."29 Like Bustani, Zaydan’s life work was to consist of educating society and attune individuals to the spirit of the age through history books and his Cairene journal *al-Hilal*.

Zaydan employed abstract values of contemporary European ‘civilization’ as pedagogical ideal-types which he viewed through what his American contemporary Charles Horten Cooley called “the looking-glass self”.30 However, foreigners in Beirut were themselves associated with many of the vices that surrounded young Zaydan:

26 Philipp, *Zaidan*, 146-47.
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28 Significantly, Zaydan distanced himself from his drunkard associates only after his attempts to blend in with the drinking groups ended with him throwing up heavily. Philipp, *Zaidan*, 151.
29 Ibid., 148-9.
30 Charles Horten Cooley (1864-1929) examined the ways in which the self is brought into the social world: "In a very large and interesting class of cases the social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one’s self – that is any idea he appropriates – appears in a particular mind, and the kind of self-feeling one has is determined by the attitude toward this attributed to that other mind. A social self
The term 'English language' was strange for the Beirutis to hear because the only characteristic of the English they knew was contained in the expression 'English drunkenness'. Frequently they would observe drunken members of the English navy in the streets of the city.... They would roam around in the city, eat, drink and most would be overpowered by drunkenness. When they were drunk they would quarrel boisterously in a language nobody understood. So the expression 'English drunkenness' was on everybody's lips in Beirut, implying excessive drinking.31

As outspoken public moralists, Butrus Bustani and Jirji Zaydan urged citizens to embrace new opportunities of learning, productivity and the public good. Bustani admonished those who wasted their time "in coffeehouses which are filled with youths and grown-ups who frequently visit them in order to kill time during the day and during the night they kill time at home playing dominoes and cards."32 Jirji Zaydan was even more explicit in an answer to a letter to the editor (which he probably also penned) which complained that "in some of your articles on leisure time you consider sitting in a café an ugly habit. We don’t understand what is so bad about this activity and those places. What breaches manners and culture?" Zaydan answered:

We are not saying that coffeehouses and their surroundings in public places are a breach of manners. What we have said and are saying is that staying in cafés for days on end is idleness and that this is particularly bad for the young given how difficult it has become to find work these days. After 35 you won’t find a job and the chances for the youth are little after 15. Between 20 and 25 is the best time of life, so why waste it sitting in coffeehouses drinking beer and playing backgammon? It is then that we determine our future and the rest of our life depends on it. You lose time and money if you gamble.33

For local merchants, more than for the Europeans and the Ottomans, it would appear, "time is now currency: it is not passed but spent."34 City-time and local, merchant work ethic
were becoming an invisible cage fundamentally structuring Beirut’s everyday life and measuring productivity and laziness, success and failure.5

*Fin de siècle* Beirut did indeed begin to acquire the reputation of a hard working city in which leisure and laziness clearly had no place. Observing the rhythm of the city, the perceptive Egyptian visitor to Beirut, Shaykh Muhammad ‘Abd al-Jawwad al-Qayyati, noticed in 1882 that

> the people in this city work from day to night, rushing from their shops to the port, buying and selling . . . . Indeed, they have no time for leisure, pleasure and personal passions. They did not revel in nocturnal activities. They are more devoted to socializing with friends and relatives than to get intimate with travelers and foreigners unless official functions like banquets, weddings make it necessary.36

These impressions confirm what the British resident Neale had noticed at mid-century. “Some of the grandees occasionally give balls... to which all of the elite of every religion and costume are invited.” The “latest polkas and waltzes were danced“ in the presence of “the pasha and some of the more distinguished Turks.” While the Europeans and Ottoman officials relished these occasions to the full, the Beiruti merchants tended to regard them as social duties:

> The natives merchants are seated in groups of three and fours in different parts of the room. The are not allowed to smoke in the ball-room, that privilege being enjoyed solely by the pasha and his friends, and they pay little attention to what is going on, conversing chiefly on mercantile affairs, and similar interesting topics. They look upon the affair rather in the light of a nuisance, and do not like being kept so late out of bed; but they come as a matter of civility, and being there, feel themselves in duty bound to remain till after supper.

> [In contrast a]fter smoking and dancing, and consuming whole gallons of very strong punch, the old [Turkish] fellows toddle home in a very merry mood, thanking their stars that it was not in their own harems that they just had witnessed dancing, as in their hearts they look upon the affair as very indecorous as regards the ladies. The Europeans, especially the younger men, remain till daylight, and it being then too late to go to bed, repair to their offices, where a great deal of soda water is consumed, and very little business done.37

---


7.3. Spatial Distribution in Ottoman Urban Management: Policing the City

In his foundational speech *al-hay'at al-ijtimāʿiyya* Butrus al-Bustani had declared in 1869 that the highest goal for the city authorities was to provide for safety and happiness.\(^{38}\) He both cherished and feared the melting pot of different “races” that was Beirut, as there were constant challenges to the potentially bright future of the city. Although security was “better than in other cities,” police presence in Beirut was considered to be both necessary and a sign of progress. At the same time, as the discourse of security took centre stage in public opinion, imperial legitimacy and municipal accountability came to be strongly equated with the ability of the authorities to maintain law and order. Thus by the end of Abdulhamid’s reign, there were 25 *corps de garde* posts – or police stations – located in the burgeoning peri-central districts of Beirut.

The distribution of *corps de garde* posts – or police stations – in Beirut had a profound impact on the location and the time constraints of cinemas, cabarets, casinos, taverns and alcohol shops. Policemen patrolled the streets to ensure that all the taverns and alcohol vending shops which mushroomed in Minet al-Husn, Zaytuneh and Sahat al-Burj between 1901 and World War I were closed at sunset.\(^{39}\) The task of the police was not just to secure public order and collect taxes from these establishments, but also to watch over public morality. To these ends they were assisted by municipal agents, *çavuş* in Ottoman Turkish, who made rounds through the quarters to check on appropriate dress code, proper parking and storage, and on alcohol consumption.\(^{40}\)

---

\(^{38}\) See chapter five.


\(^{40}\) George Young, *Corps de Droit Ottomane* 5. (Oxford, 1906/7), 156.
Underlying the forces of regularisation, registration and hygiene was the centralising state’s drive to make the cities of the empire accessible by establishing public security. The new spatial regularisations were reinforced by police laws and watched over by Ottoman police units. It is striking that in the old city itself there were no corps de garde posts, the nearest one being on Sahat al-Sur. One post was situated behind the customs office at the port and one east of Suq Tawileh in Santiyya/Zaytuneh. It is also noticeable that there were only three corps de garde on the coast, in Minat al-Husn at the ancient Port des Français, in ’Ayn al-Mreisse near the Druze fishing harbour and in Saifi/Jummayze at the Bay of St. Andrew. All of these natural inlets had been alternatives to the port which became highly estranged from the coastal population with ancestral ties to the sea ever since the port company monopolised access to the sea for commercial purposes.41

41 In 1899, Abdülhamid II issued an irade enforcing existing regulations, decreed that all fishing boats, foreign or native, required a licence of 10 piasters to fish in “Ottoman waters”. PRO, FO, 195/2049, June 13, 1899.
As for the *corps de garde* post marked on Zuqaq al-Blat (later, Rue Maurice Barrès), close to the Grand Serail, from contemporary physical evidence it seems to have accommodated higher Ottoman officers since the complex, that still survives today, consisted of two two-storied houses with an extensive annex for horse stables, so arranged as to frame a rectangular courtyard with a well in its centre.42

Two more *corps de garde* posts were placed on the main arteries east and west along the tramway lines to Nahr Beirut and the lighthouse respectively. But the highest density of Ottoman corps de garde were found in the southern, inland quarters of Basta, Bashura, Musaitbeh and Mazra’a at al-’Arab near the two southern tramway lines. These quarters were well-known trouble spots which were thought to necessitate a stronger police presence.43 However, in September 1903, all police presence in these quarters proved inefficient to quell riots between Greek Orthodox and Sunni groups. The riots spread from Mazra’a to Basta and caused grave tensions between Rashid Bey, the governor general of Beirut, who was rumoured to have close ties to the Sunni *qabaday* – or strongmen – and Muzaffer Pasha, the *Mutasarrif* of Mount Lebanon, who was accused of harbouring Christian outlaws. In the event, an estimated 15,000 Beiruti Christians fled to the mountains in fear of Muslim reprisals and, as a consequence, Rashid Bey was removed from office by the Porte.44 Ultimately the crisis was dissolved by cross-confessional negotiations between Sunni and Orthodox notables.

An article in the Beirut newspaper *al-Iqbal* revealed the serious difficulties the Ottoman police faced in maintaining public order in Basta. Although a *corps de garde* post was placed next to the tramway stop al-Nawairy, passengers successfully resisted paying the fare and demolished some carriages.45 Given the powerlessness of the Ottoman police, the tramway company had to close down the line for several days. To prevent wide-spread attacks in the area against its carriages the company had to employ local strongmen as guards. In a sense the company here functioned as a “corporate *za’im*” for the guards and, in order to become more efficient, it was absorbed into the local system of clientelism.46

44 M.A.E., Nantes, *Correspondance avec les Echelles, Beyrouth, 1912*, September 11 and 28, 1903. The feud seems to date back at least to early 1888, when public security was threatened by a series of stabbings and heavy-handed response by the Ottoman police. See chapter one.
45 Wali, *Bayrut*, 188.
46 Johnson, *Class and Client in Beirut.*
In terms of maintaining public order and security, the *corps de garde* system was often strained. Sometimes only manned with one guard, the posts tended to be ineffectual in quelling large-scale unrest. Occasional prison riots took days to subdue, even if they occurred inside the domineering Grand Serail.\(^{47}\) When 1,400 Ottoman soldiers returning from a military campaign in Yemen, passed through Beirut and were kept in the Grand Serail for a medical check up, they staged a mutiny for arrears in their pay in front of the Grand Serail. Unable to disperse them, the governor general was forced to give in to their financial demands. This decision earned him the contempt of the French consul. According to him, this was not how a modern administration deals with uprisings, as it would erode the government's authority and set a dangerous precedent.\(^{48}\)

Yet, overall the period between 1876 and 1908 was one of relative calm and social cohesion, despite the great riots of September 1903 and contrary to diplomatic scare-mongering. After occasional small-scale eruptions of violence in the *suqs*, order was quickly restored by the speedy arrival of patrols. On June 9, 1909 a consular dispatch reported on the first public execution in Beirut for 25 years.\(^{49}\) This French document considered the absence of state violence a sign of inefficiency and corruption on the part of the Ottoman government in Beirut, but one could, in fact, also read the infrequent use of capital punishment as an indication of an effective, if informal, system of social control.

### 7.4. Themes of the Night: Access, Security and Danger

Throughout the year, Beirutis had to get up very early in the morning. But daily routine in the summer differed greatly from winter months. In the heat of the summer business was conducted in the early hours of the day and late in the afternoon, with a long siesta in between either at home or in the coffeehouses near the workplaces. The limited daylight in the winter forced merchants and shopkeepers to conduct all their business before the afternoon sunset. With the sudden nightfall, nightwatchmen took to the street while workers, merchants, and school children rushed home before darkness closed in on the city. Then, the night ended as quickly as it began, as *muʾazzins* called for morning prayers well before the crack of dawn. Coffeehouses near the mosques and the port opened its doors in

\(^{48}\) M.A.E., Nantes, *Correspondence avec les Echelles*, 1912, January 12, 1904.
anticipation of their first customers and nightwatchmen extinguished the sparse oil lamps—the day had already begun.

For centuries, the diversity of religious rites and communal routines had punctuated everyday life in Beirut. For the heterogeneous Christian communities, Sundays interrupted the busy week of work and gathering for communion while, for Muslims and Jews, Friday was the day of rest and worship. In the wake of the Crimean War and the imperial decree of 1856, the Ottoman government allowed Christians more freedom to exercise their religious feasts in public. Maronites, Greek Orthodox and Catholics set about constructing churches and cathedrals. Church bells rang early in the morning and late at night with ever more self-confidence and vied acoustically with the minarets’ periodic calls for prayer.

But the night was far from ‘no-time’. Night and day were marked by polyrhythmic urban practices that varied from community to community. Beirut’s saint’s days, St. George and Imam Uza’i as well as the annual yawm rijal al-arba’in celebrations on the Ramlat al-Baida beach south of Ras Beirut were the city’s very own festivities. The European consulates organised fireworks on national remembrance days. In 1889, Bastille Day was celebrated for the first time in Beirut as in France.

Much anticipated by the Muslim population, the festive periods in the month of Sha’aban and Ramadan habitually defied the darkness of the night. More, during Ramadan, the day only began with the setting of the sun. After the breaking of the day’s fasting, the streets came to life late into the night, when relatives were visited, and people were drawn to the markets and coffeehouses nearby. But all too soon, the drummers would make their rounds to wake up the city for early-morning prayers and iftar breakfast. Once a year, social activity lit up the dark hours of the night, while the days were reduced to a time of anticipation.

During the nineteenth century, another kind of night gradually emerged in Beirut. As the night was systematically conquered in the wake of physical and technological changes in the urban fabric, a different rhythm of everyday life and new dimension of urban thought began to dominate Beirut. Technical advances were matched by a new relationship

---

between nature and culture. In Albert Hourani's words, the ideology of the city came to be distinguished from the ideology of the mountain in that "for the villager, rural society is created by God, urban by man."51 As elsewhere, urban culture in fin de siècle Beirut relied on the idea that the city was the centre of commercial, aesthetic and civilized life.52 Moreover, the association of urbanity with the social élite in contrast to the urban poor, the countryside,53 ‘barbarians’, and ‘foreigners’, coincided with the development of public spaces of sociability – shops, cafés, squares, offices and night time places of entertainment – in the wake of rising levels of material consumption.54 To Butrus al-Bustani's son, Salim, who worked closely with his father, as a coastal people (al-sahiliyyun), the Beirutis were exposed to both the benefits and dangers of contact with Europe. "While the people of the interior covet their customs more than the coastal people, the latter were used to mixing with foreign nations and adopting both beneficial and offensive customs and taking from foreigners knowledge and industry as others have done."

The image of the night as a site of danger came to be connected to the discourse of public morality that emerged in Beirut after the 1860 civil war. With the growth and prosperity of the city of Beirut and the changing habits and opportunities of its inhabitants, the night became a new problem zone for law, order and public morality that were particular to an urban environment. The night opened up for work and leisure through two watershed events whose transformation crucially determined Beirut's cultural history: the gradual erosion of the ancient city walls after 1840 and the introduction of gas lighting after 1887.

According to Hattox's study on medieval coffeehouse culture in the Middle East, "nightlife in the city was limited either to the tavern or gambling den, where one went at the peril of one's own soul, reputation or perhaps life. ... The coming of the coffeehouse signalled the beginning of an entirely new phenomenon. Perfectly respectable people went

---

51 Albert Hourani, "Ideology of the Mountain and the City: Reflections on the Lebanese Civil War," in his The Emergence of the Modern Middle East (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), 175.
out at night for purposes other than piety.” In Beirut, the opening of scenic, extramural, seaside cafés did precisely that. By migrating out of the ill-reputed port quarters, coffeehouses in Zaytuneh and further along the seashore started to attract people from all walks of life and effectively metamorphosed into respectable institutions. Before 1840, the numerous coffeehouses were located inside the walls as venturing out of the city proper was still considered dangerous, particularly at night. Nerval claimed that the Greek quarter, situated near the port in the immediate vicinity of the consulates and khans, where travellers, sailors and merchants found accommodation during their stays in Beirut, was “full of cafés and cabarets.” They were “composed of a dark chamber, a badly paved floor, tables in stone, and stools in and outside” where water-pipes were offered for 20 paras, and dancers occasionally performed to “animate the silence.” Many coffeehouses were registered as Muslim waqf property and were located near the Umari mosque, the port and other minor open squares in the city centre.

The intramural coffeehouses stayed open for up to an hour and a half after sunset and became more crowded in the evenings. Some of these places of leisure were generally seen as disreputable, not least by the foreign community, who held them to be a den of the “Maltese, a dangerous people infesting the Levant and provoking riots, stealing and all too often murder.” Most locals tended to look down upon the insalubrious conditions of the quarter and avoided the area altogether. “Two cafés labelled European have been opened there, but they are only frequented by sailors of all nations who belong to ships mooring in the port.” Echoing this local view of the disreputable foreigner, Guys relates the following story: When a plague had hit the city, an emir complained that there were too many dogs roaming the streets. A local shopkeeper, whose civic pride was wounded, replied: “His Excellency is right, but he must have noticed that they were in the main foreigners.”

The city walls had been a marker of inside and outside as well as night and day for centuries. As a well-fortified, if frequently attacked, port town, Beirut had a garrison inside

---

61 Ibid, 42.
the walls which served to maintain order. The gates were closed at sunset (save one, which stayed open some hours later). “Everybody dines at seven P.M.; and shortly after sunset, the promenade is deserted...the gates of the town are closed, and the busy hum of life subsides into calm and stillness, as night closes on the scene.”63 However, what appeared as an absolute barrier of nocturnal access to the city was in fact negotiable through inside knowledge of the informal urban administration. For the Europeans, according to Blondel, the curfew was not so much of an inconvenience. For when they acquired the password, they could enter and exit the city as they desired. Moreover, in case the sudden nightfall took a reveller by surprise, he could enter the city by boat for a small fee.64

More severe was the enforcement of personal lighting at night. Once inside the city, it was strictly forbidden to walk without carrying a lantern after dark.65 In an official address to the inhabitants of Beirut in early 1860, the governor of Sayda offered a strong warning “to bear lanterns on every walk in the suqs and the streets at night in order to ensure the maintenance of law and order in the city.” As if naturally connected, the notification made specific reference to the prohibition of night-time gambling.66 In the first municipal budget of 1868, one of the main concerns was to finance “the salaries of the night watchmen and street lighting which had been incomplete and whose improvement had been postponed because it required resources.” At the same time, the projected “increased revenue could put the services on a better footing, most notably the improvement of street lighting and the increasing of the number of night watchmen.”67 Night watchmen criss-crossed the city to enforce the law. Their efficiency was noted in the memoirs of Lewis Parley, the first clerk of the newly opened Ottoman Bank who we encountered in chapter one. In late 1857, one of his servants was arrested for not bearing a lantern after dark. He was brought to a police station and released only the next morning, well after an Ottoman man-of-war fired the canon shots that customarily marked the dawn of a new day.68

62 Guys, Relation d’un séjour, 27.
63 Neale, Eight Years in Syria, 222.
64 Blondel, Deux Ans en Syrie, 51, 72.
65 Ibid., 52.
66 Hadiqat al-Akhbar, January 17, 1860.
67 M.A.E., Nantes, Beyrouth Consulat, carton 332, (1868-1913), May 26, 1868.
68 Farley, Two Years in Syria, 114. On the canon shots, see Georges Rodier, L’Orient: Journal d’un peintre (Paris, 1889), 244.
Much changed for Beirut when the technological innovation of artificial lighting pushed the limits of the day deep into the night along the main traffic arteries. A Belgian company obtained the commission from Sultan Abdülhamid II in 1886 and started to erect lampposts on the main throughways of the city two years later. By 1906 over 1300 gas lamps lit up the main arteries at fifty-meter intervals. 1906 was also the year the company merged with another Belgian energy and transportation company to build an electric tramway network which was inaugurated three years later. In return for the authority to decide along what streets these public services were to run, the municipality and the provincial council agreed to cover the expenses. However, relations between the company and the municipality soon soured over allegations of mismanagement and outstanding debts. Sporadic gas worker strikes for better wages and fewer working hours further aggravated the company’s financial situation and its reputation in the city. At the height of the struggle the gas company switched off the lights in Beirut threatening to leave the city in the dark until municipal arrears were paid.

An incident related by our Austrian tourist in 1909 captures the stark contrast of dealing with the night before and after the gradual introduction of gas lighting in Beirut:

We leave the theatre and go home through the streets of Beirut which are gas lit only on every other corner. There is a throng of men under each of these gas lamps and as we pass them they are whistling a signal which is returned from the other end of the streets where the same groups of men in their dark coats are expecting us. This scenario accompanies us from street to street until we reach the hotel. “They are police signals,” explained the consular agent.

Far from being prevented and restricted, the nocturnal activities of our visitor came to be facilitated by the night watchmen who effectively provided a safe cordon of passage. Individual responsibility for one’s safety at night had passed into the hands of the state, here embodied by the night watchmen. In the process, the Ottoman state had come to assume control of time and space in a routine facilitating, rather than restrictive manner. Moreover, lighting had become a factor of order while, conversely, nocturnal insecurity was
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69 See Chapter 2.
71 See chapter two.
72 La Jeune Turquie, March 20, 1913.
73 Strobel, Romantische Reise im Orient, 42.
increasingly associated with the absence of light. As certain parts of the city were brightly illuminated, in other parts the night’s darkness grew more fearsome. Indeed, the arrival of artificial lighting brought out the contradictions within the city; the more brightly it shone in the centre, the more starkly did the outlines of the darker regions stand out.

Two incidents give a sense of the ambivalent nature of the process of appropriating the night as both a site of opportunity and unease. A prominent Russian resident in Beirut between 1896 and 1898 expressed the ambivalent perception of the night when he confirmed in his memoirs that there was ample nightlife even if late nights were dangerous, with frequent gunshots being heard in the distance. The ‘underworld’ may have been pushed out of sight by modern policing practices but not out of earshot. Consular reports from Beirut likewise identified the night as the temporal location of danger to the stability and security of the city. When an American consular official was ambushed in the city late one night, the “individual … had posted himself near a street lamp the better to ensure the correctness of his aim. [The chase proved futile as] the latter however disappeared into the dark of the night.” As the street lamp facilitated and exposed night revelry, so this episode highlights the ambivalent effects of artificial street lighting both as a spur of access and a source of danger for nocturnal leisure.

Before we turn to places of leisure, let us cast a glance at the people who professionally inhabited and operated the city at night. An increasingly frequent theme of the night was the danger associated with the burgeoning industrial workforce that operated the city. In April 1910, “at night scores of Christians were sitting peacefully in the cafés along the track in a Christian quarter, near a ‘caracol.’ Then a group of tramway conductors came by after their work. When a conductor recognized a man he had had an argument with earlier, he pulled out his revolver and shot at him. His co-workers followed suit, and the Christians responded equally.”

Disregarding the sectarian element in the narrative, the report reaffirms the night time tropes of police impotence (the ‘caracol’ near-by) and cafés as danger zones. With the emergence of small- and medium scale industries, as well as international infra-structural
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74 Dahir, Bayrut wa Jabal Lubnan, 118.
75 PRO, FO, 195/2140, August 27, 1903. Indeed a little earlier, the British consul had complained, “robbery with violence and murder are fast becoming matters of every day occurrence and … native Christians … dare not to go about in many parts of the city after dark.” PRO, FO 195/2140, July 16, 1903.
investment sites such as rail- and tramway work and factories. professions emerged that typically involved night labour: transport industries, water, gas and electricity companies, newspaper printing presses, hotels and restaurants, street cleaning, and cellulose factories. In addition, casual construction workers migrated from the surrounding villages in Mount Lebanon to the contractors’ collection points on Sahat al-Sur well before the crack of dawn and loitered throughout the day until picked.” Taken together with the traditional maritime industry – the pearl-divers and Druze fishermen along the shoreline of the Zaytuneh quarter – these night-time professions constituted “the professional strangers of the floating worlds of the periphery.”

7.5. Prostitution: Social Marginality in the Centre

Early in the nineteenth century the promiscuous European traveller had difficulty in realizing his fantasies. “Who would dare to penetrate these fortresses of maternal and paternal power, or rather who would not be tempted to dare? But alas! The adventures here are rarer than in Cairo.” By the early 1850s, Camille Rogier, a meagre painter and director at the French post office revelled in stories of his promiscuity in Beirut with his notorious friends Gérard Nerval, Gustave Flaubert and Théophile Gautier. After visiting Rogier, Nerval admitted to the high price of his conquests: “In Beirut I contracted VII shancres [syphilitic sores].” Such debauchery was the pinnacle of the bad habits and European vices against which Beirut’s public moralists repeatedly warned their fellow citizens.

At around the same time that the hotly contested 1884 Victorian Contagious Diseases Act introduced state regulation of sexual vice to London, prostitution came to be viewed as a nocturnal vice and as such a rallying point for urban discourses on morality, hygiene and state control in Beirut. The frequent displacement of Beirut’s brothels from one central quarter to another in the second half of the nineteenth century was very much a reflection of the dynamic growth of – and shifting centralities within – this city. It corroborates Merriman’s assertion that the notion of central and marginal places in cities is not solely
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77 For a Bonfils photograph of the Sur area entitled “Labourers waiting for work,” see Debbas, *Beirut Our Memory*, 81.
80 François Pouillon, "Un ami de Théophile Gautier en Orient, Camille Rogier; Reflexions sur la condition
definable in geographical terms. It was only in the late 1950s that the Lebanese government initiated concerted efforts to ban prostitution from the city centre and enacted exclusionary practices of social control. Only then was an attempt made to confine social and cultural marginality spatially. ‘Immorality’ was pushed, as it were, to the geographical periphery of Beirut’s outer city – ultimately with limited success.81

Before the urban expansion of the nineteenth century, the quarters of the public women, the suq al-‘ummumiyya, were located around the Khan al-Arwam inside the city walls. Gradually the ‘suq’ settled in Saifi on the south-eastern side of Sahat al-Burj. The soldiers of the French expeditionary force in 1860 were such rampant customers that apparently both Beirutis and foreign residents were shocked.82 After the enlargement of the port of Beirut in 1895, some of the maisons de tolérance, the officially licensed brothels, moved to the vicinity of the city’s growing administrative and commercial centre. According to a one time head of the guild of porterage, “the bazaar, as it was called since then, established itself in suq al-khammamir [the wine sellers’ market], between the Petit Serail and the port east of the Muslim cemetery, before it was moved to the quarter of Sayfi in 1913.”83 With the return of the French army in 1920 the maisons de tolérance moved to an area then popularly known as wara’ al-bank (‘behind the bank’) or al-Manshiyya behind the former Ottoman Bank building east of Sahat al-Burj. According to the accounts of an old Beirut, at that time “the number of public women [al-mumsat] was around 850 Arab women from Syria, Palestine and Lebanon and no less than 400 foreign girls, Greek, Turkish and French.” According to al-Sayyid Sha’ban, the most famous prostitutes were considered great stars who offered their services in public houses that were the property of respected local families such as the Shartuni, Sa’ad, Wakim, Salim, Mer’i, Sinnu, Fadahallah, Farah, Sa’ab, and – no less – the Greek Orthodox Waqf.84
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82 Thanks to Beirut historian May Davie who has shared this information in a private correspondence.
83 Antoine Barud, Shari‘ al-Mutanabbi: hikayyat al-bigha’ fi Lubnan (Beirut, 1971), 5. At around the same time, the cemetery was destroyed to make way for the development of the expanding port facilities. See also Bahjat Jabr, ‘1913 bidayat al-asr al-dhihabî fi Lubnan li-agdâm minhâ’ in an-Nahar, March 28, 2000.
84 Ibid. French medical journals in the early 1920s put the number of registered prostitutes for all Lebanon at an unconvincingly low 242. See Elizabeth Thompson, Colonial Citizens: Republican Rights, Paternal Privilege, and Gender in French Syria and Lebanon (New York, 1999), 87.
The majority of prostitutes, however, were social outcasts who had arrived from the outskirts of Beirut where, according to Neale "hundreds of boys and girls earned in the silk factories a ready livelihood by working as reebers."85 These workplaces were ‘manned’ in the main by unmarried women, the ‘ambilat’ or ‘banat al-karhane’ (‘workers’ or ‘girls of the silk spinning mills’). According to Akram Khater, by 1880 thousands of unmarried village women and girls worked in factories away from home on the mountain slopes above Beirut. They were initially sent to earn money in the factories to sustain their families’ honour by subsidizing their agricultural revenue in adverse economic conditions. Yet, as the Maronite clergy and the patriarchal system considered female labour immoral in a factory where they would come into contact with men, these women suffered social stigmatisation.86 Some of the female workers who – through their occupation – had achieved economic self-sufficiency at the expense of having become unmarriageable left the mountain for the promises of the nearby city.

In Lebanon, the term karhane survived long after the demise of the silk industry. A karhane in Beirut became synonymous with ‘brothel’ while ‘bint al-karhane’ was an appellation for a woman of ill-repute.87 Whether the link between the ‘banat al-karhane’ in the rural silk factories and the urban brothels was actual or metaphoric, it appears that their image in the respective rural and urban societies marginalized them on the grounds of their assumed threat to the moral order. Both types of women were – to borrow the term for working women in nineteenth-century France – femmes isolées. The term suggested ‘that all such working women were potential prostitutes, inhabiting a marginal and unregulated world in which good order – social, economic, moral, political – was subverted…. [T]he ambivalent causality (poverty or bad morals?) was less important than the association itself because there was only one cure for sexual license and that was control.”88 In Mandate Lebanon and Syria the devastating and traumatic experiences during World War I severely affected the role and the image of Lebanese women. Hundreds of female orphans and widows were housed in work houses so as to protect them “from debauchery, to which

85 Neale, Eight Years in Syria, p. 209.
87 Barud, Shari’ al-Mutanabbi, 28. Thanks to Samir Khalaf for pointing out this transposition of meaning. According to the Redhouse Ottoman-English dictionary, in Ottoman Turkish karhane had already this double meaning of workshop and brothel.
poverty ‘inevitably’ led them.”89 By the time French colonialism had established what Elizabeth Thompson defined as a paternalist welfare state, the causal link between poverty, immorality and marginality, once drawn by Bustani and Zaydan, entered the repertoire of gendered colonial intervention.

7.6. Zaytuneh - The Birth of an Entertainment Quarter

The coastal area of Zaytuneh became one of the three main places of leisure and of conspicuous consumption. Unlike the notorious quarters east of Sahat al-Burj, Zaytuneh became a respectable leisure quarter. Zaytuneh developed unencumbered by urban planning until World War I, unlike the pine forest and the Sahat al-Burj, which were planned as public promenades by the municipality and the Ottoman governors. Situated to the west of the old harbour and the city walls, Zaytuneh lay en route to Ras Beirut, an increasingly popular nightspot and, as of 1866, the location of the Syrian Protestant College. In the early twentieth century, Zaytuneh was one of three quarters of the consular district Minet al-Hosn, the other two being the predominantly Jewish quarter of Wādi Abu Jamil and the quarter around the Maronite church of Mar Elias near the former western city gate Bab Idriss.

This traditionally Druze quarter was perfectly located for the lower-budget customers of urban leisure districts, as it was within walking distance for officers, merchants and travelers. To the north, Zaytuneh lay in the immediate vicinity of the Ottoman imperial barracks built on the commanding Qantari hill in the mid-1850s. The establishment of the first hotels outside the city walls in the 1840s and 50s turned Zaytuneh into a commercial space for the respected pursuit of leisure. The sprouting hotels offered a new dimension of Beirut’s beauty: panoramic vistas, where the observer is not quite part of the scene, but distant from the quarters ‘infested’ with Maltese and Greek sailors. The Hotel d’Orient, owned by one Nicola Bassul, was “beautifully situated, commanding an uninterrupted view of the sea; and on the right, looking from the balcony, over the town and St. Georges Bay there is a picture of surpassing loveliness presented to the eye.”90 Likewise, the café of the

89 Thompson, *Colonial Citizens*, 86.
90 Neale, *Eight Years in Syria*, 222.
other major hotel at the time, the Belle Vue, "whence one of the most delightful views of the
town and the mountains may be obtained."91

For Beirut's flâneurs, Zaytuneh became fashionable. On its coastline, the new hotels, restaurants, the 'Bains Abdallah' and the (short-lived) Cinema Urbanorama on the sea were the centre of respectable popular leisure activities long before the construction of the Normandie Corniche and the famous St. George Hotel came to cater for the international haute volée from the 1930s onwards. Here, foreigners and Ottoman bureaucrats could live out their more sophisticated routines (newspaper-reading, playing billiards) as this kind of leisure became a marker of social distinction. Local flâneurs could distinguish themselves from the images of both Levantine toughs and merchant workaholics of the port area while respectable foreigners distinguished themselves from the notoriety of Sayfî, the stigma of 'foreign dogs' and 'English drunkards' but also from the missionary connotations of catholic and protestant austerity and zealotry.

7.7. Regulating leisure: Containing or Exploiting Marginality?

Urban transformation has all too often been viewed from the perspective of state planning, the processes of which are quite distinct from popular social developments on the ground. It is assumed by some urban historians who view the city as an artefact that the urban fabric is a canvass on which the state can impress the representation of its political, economic or cultural power.92 In this view, the population is considered a passive if stubborn recipient of urban improvement. So far in this chapter we have discussed the informal social dynamics of Beirut and the ways in which daily routines and the pursuit of leisure by 'low' and 'high' society shaped (and filled) the expanding space of the city. In what follows, attention will be directed at the ways these social practices determined urban regulations for Beirut that emerged throughout the reform period of the Ottoman Empire. What the discourse on public morality did in curbing urban vice by appealing to social harmony, individual self-restraint and a new culture of time awareness, the Ottoman urban administration did through political intervention in the social life of the city.

91 Farley, Two Years in Syria, 55, 110.
92 For example Donald Olson, The City as a Work of Art, (New Haven, 1986); Lewis Mumford, The City in History (London, 1961).
In Beirut, brothels became a burden to the urban self-view of a prosperous and healthy city. The first official (unheeded) recommendation for creating spatial confinements for prostitutes dates back to the publication of an Ottoman sanitary enquiry in 1897 conducted by Benoit Boyer, a resident French doctor. The report had established with apparent dismay that many of the prostitutes of Beirut did not reside inside the public houses but arrived at their workplaces only after sunset. The thought that these ‘creatures’ were living among decent citizens was unbearable to Boyer as he, in line with the scientific knowledge of the age, believed their presence infested the salubrious living quarters with hygienic and moral corruption. It little alleviated Dr. Boyer’s disgust that, at the time of his sanitary survey of Beirut, the municipality carried out compulsory, monthly sanitary check-ups on the 200 to 220 known prostitutes, charging up to two mecidiye - the equivalent of eight francs and roughly a week’s rent. Instead, he postulated that a designated zone of exclusion for the forty odd scattered maisons de tolérance be implemented and visually set apart from the urban fabric. But it was not until 1921 when growing concerns about the hygiene of the French army stationed in Beirut and Damascus drove the colonial state to issue stricter regulations for prostitutes and entertainers whose work became tightly monitored.

The Ottoman state was concerned with raising revenue from the burgeoning places of pleasure rather than the oft-assumed religiously motivated rejection of dens of iniquity on Islamic grounds. At the same time, local newspapers demanded stricter licensing and earlier closing hours for coffeehouses “because of the dangers of moral corruption and bad atmosphere.” In 1878, new Ottoman police laws, taxes on coffeehouses and casinos, and alcohol vending regulations were issued. Street vendors and other wandering professions were forced to register their trades with the municipality. Ten years later, Sultan Abdülhamid issued an imperial irade that obliged Ottoman municipalities to install a fire-proof deposit for storing all imported petrol and alcohol. The amount of alcohol allowed for each shop was limited to 3 quintaux (c. 150 litres) and all local shops and bars were required to pay storage

---
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taxes to the municipality. Needless to say, in coastal cities like Beirut this legislation only revived the contraband trade and frequent battles erupted between smugglers and the police in the decades leading up to WWI. Yet, alcohol generated considerable municipal revenue. In the 1913 municipal budget, taxes on alcohol, gambling together with petrol, amounted to about a fifth of the annual revenue.

With growing European intervention in the Middle East, coffeehouses, taverns, theatres and later cinemas became locations of political and cultural threats to public order that seriously challenged Ottoman claims to urban control in Beirut. When a group of French actors was invited by Beirutites to perform an anticlerical play by the fashionable French author Eugène Sue, students and staff of the French Medical Faculty in Beirut demolished the theatre before being rounded up and evicted from Beirut. Like theatres, cinemas posed a political threat to Ottoman authority. A little after the incident at the theatre, Beirut’s first cinema on Sahat al-Burj showed a film on Moroccan resistance to French occupation. French consular reports warned of ‘gallophobe’ sentiments in the city and of a cross-Mediterranean conspiracy against the French mission. As a remedy, they suggested setting up pro-French cinemas in Beirut and the Levant to counter the bad influence of the Cinema Pathé which – despite its French origin - was operated by an Italian, a certain Crisofalli who, in turn, rented his films from Kramer’s, a German distributor in Izmir. Under the French mandate, cinema continued to flourish on central public squares, especially on Sahat al-Burj, where they became “the trendy entertainment for the elites.”

Regulations pertaining to spatial confinement of alcohol and prostitution reflect to a certain degree Ottoman urban policies. In the first instance, the very tax laws passed on the consumption of alcohol, on gambling and prostitution attest to a largely pragmatic approach to administering public morality. In the second instance, how Ottoman authorities dealt with places of leisure also constituted the beginnings of enframing strategies, public intervention

98 *Courrier de Smyrne*, November 24, 1888.
99 In the 1913 municipal budget, the tax revenue on gambling amounted to 25,000 piasters, petrol and alcohol 150,000 piasters. In: *Bernier Private Papers*, Chambre du Commerce, Marseille.
and state responsibility over society that were to be elaborated during the colonial paternalism of French rule after World War I.

7.8. The battle over licenses

Before the era of Beirut’s urban expansion, closing times played no important role in the prescriptions and comments that dealt with the regulation of nocturnal life. Night was private and a time of rest after the curfew. There were strong barriers that made it difficult to migrate between night and day, but these were physical. By contrast, the systematic introduction of ‘closing time’ for specific establishments (rather than the city as a whole) represented a different measure of state imposition – a prohibition – on society that became necessary as nocturnal activities challenged and tested Ottoman state authority over the city.

Much of Michel Foucault’s work on society’s marginals rests on the assumption that marginal members of a society tend to emerge from the past into ‘history’ only by virtue of being recorded when coming into contact with authority. In Beirut this is valid for those small and medium-scale foreign entrepreneurs who applied for licenses to open establishments of leisure in the first decade of the twentieth century, even if in terms of resources and nationality they were comparatively privileged individuals. These sometimes well-connected individuals would have remained anonymous if they had not quarrelled with the French and Ottoman authorities in Beirut over licensing and curfews for their night spots. In the opinion of public moralists and the Ottoman administration, their enterprises required surveillance and control in order to prevent potential immorality, disorder and violence. From correspondence between French and Ottoman officials it emerges that the persistent applicants were a nuisance to both sides.

In order to deal with the troubling influx of “merchants of fortune” to Beirut, the local authorities were furnished with a powerful mandate in 1899 when the governor’s request for permission to expel fraudulent foreigners was granted by the imperial government. Nonetheless, foreign entrepreneurs proved very resourceful and flexible. If a bar in one location was rejected by the Ottoman governor on the grounds that it was too near to a mosque or a police station, or was in a residential area, the applicant tried for another spot in

the city. One Louis Payan (Payon?) was a particularly obstinate entrepreneur. When his 1901 application to open an alcohol-vending café in Zaytuneh was rejected because it was too close to a police station, he proceeded illegally to open a cabaret which sold alcohol in Ras Beirut two weeks later. Three years later he restarted his cat and mouse games and applied to sell alcohol in a shop in front of the municipal garden only to return to the authorities to ask permission to open a café on Sahat al-Burj some months later.106

The Ottoman authorities were not against such places per se but recognized the strain they put on the local police force, especially at night. As the variety of night entertainment increased to comprise bistros, café-buvettes, café-concerts, casinos and bars, so the licensing laws and regulations for closing times became more differentiated and detailed. This variety cannot be captured merely by looking at the normative legal texts.107 It brought about case-to-case negotiations and outright haggling between the applicants and authorities. One example of ‘horse-trading’ in the battle over licenses was one Marie Pin’s request in 1901 to stage late night orchestral music and a small circus in the gardens of her restaurant-brasserie. The governor’s response epitomizes the ‘creative’ Ottoman approach to licensing: “After consultations with the president of the municipal council, I have arrived at the following decision: a month ago M. Camille Trouyet opened a casino near Bab Idriss where he hosts music bands without paying his dues. We must insist that you make him pay the arrears before we can allow you to open yours upon the promise to pay on a daily basis.”108

The owners of nocturnal establishments would continue to try to register their businesses in categories that allowed longer openings. In turn imperial authorities would react by imposing higher taxes on new late license categories. In early 1912 news reached Beirut from Istanbul that a new law came into effect to close cabarets at 9 or 10 o’clock, depending on their location, while casinos were permitted to stay open until one in the morning.109 This ruling effectively stipulated that tax collection and classification into cafés, cabarets, bistros, taverns, casinos, etc. be left to the discretion of the local authorities.

105 BBA, YMTV, 172/138, 30. 9. 1315 (1899).
107 The new police law of 1907 was published in the Bayrut Vilayeti Salname, 1908, 167-190.
108 M.A.E. Nantes, Consulat Beyrouth, carton no. 340, July 11. 1901. The files contain the original correspondence.
109 Ibid. May 28, 1912.
Conclusion

This chapter has examined the production of marginality in Beirut in the context of a city constantly growing and changing. Under these dynamic conditions, it is necessary to explore a social phenomenon like marginality as signified against its notional opposites – morality and order – through its multiple signifiers, local public moralists, Ottoman institutions, and European residents. Social activities were labelled as marginal precisely because they occurred in central places that were envisaged to represent more enlightened urban images for Beirut. As in other Mediterranean cities, ‘deviant’ activities like drunkenness and licentiousness were perpetrated as much by locals as by foreigners.

We have traced how the night emerged as a new time for work and leisure as well as a site of danger as a result of, or concomitant to, Beirut’s urbanization. This process emerged as notions of progress and time awareness entered the intellectual consciousness between the beginning of the breakdown of the city walls in the 1840s and after the introduction of gas lighting in 1888. We have highlighted the venues of leisure and pleasure that determined quality and location of urban transformation in fin de siècle Beirut. Leisure emerged as respectable pleasure. Alcohol consumption, games, gambling and entertainment in bars, theatres and brothels facilitated new modes of sociality but were singled out as metaphors and manifestations of the ‘vice of the city’ by contemporary urban intellectuals and Ottoman bureaucrats alike.

We dealt with the Ottoman government’s approach to establishing social order and spatial control in Beirut through licensing and opening regulations as well as policing and hygiene surveillance. As with the post-1860 discourse on public morality, the discursive practices of Ottoman rule were informed at the political level by the desire to control those social forces that were deemed a threat to a modern Ottoman order in fin de siècle Beirut. On the fiscal level, imperial rule over the urban milieu was informed by the necessity to generate revenue. This ambivalence led to negotiations and redefinitions over places of leisure between proprietors and the authorities and affected, in the process, Beirut’s spatial organization.

Neither local intellectuals nor the Ottoman authorities objected to the vices they so painstakingly identified on ‘conservative’ grounds. For their part, the Ottoman government’s
reactions were less those of austere Muslim rulers defending the alleged purity of an idealised Ottoman past than those of officials guided by pragmatic case-by-case considerations. In Zaydan’s memoirs, it is noticeable that his objections underlay a sense that deviance was an obstacle to social change rather than change being judged as a cause of that deviance. It is in this sense that – to paraphrase Raymond Williams – much of the anxiety and instability the intellectuals and the Ottoman authorities tried to overcome, as well as much of the physical squalor and perceived disorderliness, were also “a consequence not simply of rapid expansion but of attempts to control that expansion.”110 The mental concepts and the material aspects of morality and marginality were constantly engaging in reciprocal signification in Beirut’s expanding urban space where central and marginal places, teeming trade and lewd leisure, shared the same geography.

110 Williams, The Country and the City, 145.
Openings: “Beirut how you have changed - Beirut how we have changed”

Nizar Kabbani

The city is the place of simultaneity. Ideas, structures, rhythms and practices interrelate with an intensity that renders a concluding synthesis difficult. In order to disentangle the intertwining dynamics of fin de siècle Beirut, this thesis started off by seven sets of questions. These correspond to the seven chapters of the thesis but they also cross its thematic structure. This study has introduced the year 1888 as a landmark date in the modern history of Beirut. In the first part of this thesis, the narrative of build-up to, and subsequent effect of, the creation of the province of Beirut demonstrated both the significance of this date and the emergence of an ever-larger social elite which brought about this watershed event.

Beirut’s literary elite – journalists, novelists and editorialists – was a driving force behind the making of a modern port-city. Recurrent urban themes in newspapers and public speeches – hygiene, sustainable economic growth, education, urban improvement and public construction – coalesced into a future-oriented master narrative that was produced by members of the literary and cultural revival movement, the Nahda. Fear and promise structured how many Beiruti intellectuals conceived of time and space. What has become clear in the course of the thesis is that the historical and geographical imaginations of intellectuals fundamentally shaped the physical environment. Printed texts demanding urban improvement and social hygiene affected, both directly and indirectly, the planning, building and maintenance of public squares, schools, hospitals and large infrastructural projects such as the port enlargement or the Beirut-Damascus railway. Fin de siècle Beirut was molded by a literary elite many of whom used their privileged position on provincial and municipal councils to convert ideas into reality.

Modern Beirut was also a child of the ‘benevolent reforms’ of the Tanzimat period before it matured into a provincial capital during Abdülhamid II’s rule. The imperial government and the sultan personally played a formative role in shaping Beirut as a modern city and a provincial capital.

Administrative correspondence between Istanbul and Beirut as well as detailed book-keeping evinced both a remarkable degree of imperial knowledge of daily activities in the
province and the systematic seeping of imperial power into everyday life of Beirut. Imperial knowledge and proximity meant not only power but also access and accountability.

During the protracted struggle for the creation of the province of Beirut, access to the Ottoman parliament, the Grand Vizier and Abdülhamid proved decisive in tipping the scales in Beirut’s favour against rivaling Ottoman and Damascene lobbyists. Within the administrative framework of the provincial capital, and particularly through the provincial council, Beiruti notables were able to impose their will and vision on Beirut’s administrative hinterland. Within Beirut, local merchants-cum-bureaucrats were able to manipulate Ottoman imperial and provincial authorities to invest funds and efforts into the transformation of the urban fabric. Success and failure in urban politics depended on imperial patronage and local clienteles in equal measure. The rise of the Malhame brothers, exceptional though it was in scope, was a demonstration of the many paths of political networks and patronage within and without existing bureaucratic structures.

There existed a causal link between the Beirut’s creation as a provincial capital and the investment of international capital in the city’s infrastructural development. The 1890s ushered in a fundamental transformation of urban space in Beirut. The port and railway construction secured Beirut’s structural economic advantage over rivaling towns in the Eastern Mediterranean, while the tramway and the gas lighting companies revolutionized inner-urban mobility. Urban space, time and distance became marketable commodities that significantly restructured the practices of everyday life. As a consequence, certain groups became alienated from their customary work and place in the city by the effects of Beirut’s ‘capitalisation’. Strikes, demonstrations and boycotts were physical attempts to claim the right to their city and their livelihood. Such industrial action elicited political support from certain local lawyers and, during Hamidian rule, from the sultan personally. After a brief ‘liberal’ period of Young Turk government, the CUP abolished pro-labour regulations and Beirut’s workforce lost its bargaining power against investment companies.

Although the productive and, indeed, ‘constructive’ power of Ottoman rule was heralded through public construction, conception, planning, architectural style and financing of these projects often originated in Beirut itself. Moreover, the physical Ottomanisation of the landscape did not lead to a superimposition of a ‘modern Ottoman’ on a ‘traditional Arab’ city. Rather, the process of planning and construction led to a convergence of imperial
and local levels. The urban fabric defied a clear separation of Ottoman domination and Beiruti subjection. Nevertheless, through recurrent rituals of commemorations which turned opening ceremonies of public buildings into great social spectacles, the urban fabric of capital Beirut served as a platform for inscription of imperial authority and the Ottoman will to power. Monumental Ottoman buildings and public squares and streets named after sultan Abdülhamid were not seen as an alien imposition as they contributed to the realization of local elites’ ideas of a ‘City Beautiful.’ On the contrary, Ottoman reform was backed by urban notables both in theory and in practice. Public construction effectively cemented Ottomanism as a state ideology.

Everyday life in fin de siècle Beirut was the space onto which Ottoman imperial rule and local literary discourses projected modernising norms and forms of social order. As such it emerged as a highly contested arena of the conflict between spaces of the perceived, the conceived and the lived. Marginality was produced as the obstacle to temporal conceptions of linear progress, healthy and salubrious spaces and security concerns. Local literary elites and Ottoman authorities shared normative projections of law and order. The solution was not to tackle the roots of social inequality that led to marginalisation but rather spatial containment, physical suppression and social stigmatisation.

Shared values and norms, socio-economic status and wealth united political and literary elites, Ottoman bureaucrats and urban notables, into a self-contained bourgeois class with shared political and economic interests and a distinct class-consciousness that was expressed in this elite’s political and economic relations to the expanding space of the city. Class relations were intertwined with and sustained by interconfessional elite collusion. Through networks of patron-client dependencies, this collaboration contained urban conflict which turned sectarian through elite crisis management.

After the demise of evolutionary histories there remain (at least) three ways to approach particularly urban history. Between a devil of deconstructionism which shatters the all too familiar past, and a deep blue sea of a nostalgic search for authenticity, solace and solution in the ways of the past, this third, critical history of Ottoman Beirut has attempted to restore the subjectivity of the historical subject – city and people – in all their contradictions.
The territorial boundaries of the province of Beirut ceased to exist on September 29, 1920. In a hastily drafted Arrête No. 320, General Gouraud officially closed the 32-year-long chapter of the province of Beirut just hours before the French mandate officially began. In the driest of officious languages, the French High-Commissioner, Henri Gouraud, quietly committed this late Ottoman territorial construct to the scrap yard of history. History had moved on and so had the Beiruti agendas. Even the 1936 movement “people of the coast” no longer based their short-lived agenda on the boundaries of the province of Beirut the way the 1913 Reformists had done.

Any parallels between the current fin de siècle Beirut and that of the nineteenth century are neither coincidental nor intended, but merely inevitable. As Nizar Kabbani deplored in the 1960s – writing from his apartment in Qubbat al-Qantari, the new, old ‘capitol hill’ of independent Lebanon – Beirut changed its inhabitants and they in turn changed the city of Beirut. But the relation between city and citizens remains as close as it remains tense. After the recent 15-year civil war, a deep-rooted, ‘civilised’ middle class struggles to retain Beirut and its ‘inherited space’ against the capitalist projections of a new global city at the destructive hands of an international investment company. Communal conflict continues to be contained and managed by political patronage in the sectarian frame of crisis management. And the vast majority of Beirut’s inhabitants, forced to squat in the squalor of the urban fringes, are denied the right to that city – ‘inherited’ or ‘projected’; denied access to even the most basic urban services, such as running water, sewage and electricity. Studying the modern history of Beirut may help to understand the internal rhythms and the extent of human attachment to the city as well as warn against the consequences of social injustice inherent in imposing abstract elite projections onto the diverse lived reality of Beirut’s inhabitants.

---

ANNEXES
Names of the 1865-petition:


**Selected Biographies of Influential Ottoman Bureaucrats**

Born in 1824, **Mehmet Rashid Pasha** was trained by Mehmet Ali in Cairo until the Ottoman vassal sent him to Paris. He may well have been the patron of Beirut’s early predominance of Egyptian-born municipal presidents. After his studies, he came back to Istanbul and worked at the Translation Bureau. He became a protege of Fuad Pasha who promoted him to the governorate of Izmir during the period of application of the 1864 Provincial Law. He assumed the governorate in August 1866. He was a very active as well as popular governor. One of his main occupations while in Syria was to pacify the outlying districts in Hawran, Jabal Nurayri and the Belqa. To this effect, he was commended by consular reports as well as *Hadikat al-Akhbar* for extending the telegraph network to the remote regions of his province. During his four years in Syria, his modern tastes and interests attracted him to prolonged stays in Beirut, especially in the summers of 1866 and 67. During the latter winter, he convened the landmark provincial assembly in Beirut mentioned in chapter one. He introduced the Ottoman yearbooks to the province. His reign was also the prime time of the *jam‘iyya suriyya*. He integrated *Mutasarrifiyyas* of Homs and Tripoli into the province of Syria. Gross, Max, *Ottoman Rule in the Province of Damascus*, 125ff.

**Abd al-Latif Subhi Pasha** was born on the Morean peninsula in 1818. During the Greek war of independence, his father settled in Egypt and became an Egyptian official in Syria under Ibrahim Pasha. Subhi Pasha was educated in Arabic and when his father moved to Istanbul in 1849 after the death of Mehmet Ali Pasha, he entered the Ottoman bureaucracy where he quickly rose to become a member of the Tanzimat board of judicial ordinances and minister of Awqaf and education before Mahmud Nadim Pasha made him Vali of Syria in October 1871. When he was recalled to Istanbul by the new grand vezir, he became once more minister of various resorts, including Awqaf, education, finance and trade. Acc. to Sa’id Pasha’s memoirs (vol. 2, 7) he initiated the directorate of mines and forests and an engineering school and placed it in the ministry of finance in 1883. He became a noted scholar of Arab and Islamic history, numismatics and as Turkish translator of Ibn Khaldun’s al-Muqaddima published as *miftah-ul-‘ibr*. See Babinger, p. 368-70. As “a gentleman and an honest Turk”, Subhi Pasha’s governorship (until Feb. 1873) was short-lived but successful in its policies to extract outstanding debts from rural shaykhs and bedouins. He completed the chain of castles in the Syrian desert intended to integrate and settle the nomadic...
population. But his hands were tied by Nadim Pasha's career roulette and the introduction of provincial inspectors and spies (journalists) which affected many of his staff. See Gross, 186-90.

**Mehmet Kamil Bey** was Grand Vizier when Beirut became capital and probably swayed the sultan's decision in its favour as he was friends with a number of Beirut notables from his stints as governor of the mutasarrifiyya of Beirut in the 1860s and 70s where he was a member of the Syrian Scientific Society. He was given his first major assignment as governor of the district of Damascus at the time Beirut was annexed. Born in Cyprus in 1832, his father took him to Egypt in 1845 where his talent for foreign languages earned him entrance into the Khedival Language school and worked for Abbas Pasha in Cairo. After a special mission to Paris, he deserted his Egyptian master and entered the Ottoman bureaucracy in Istanbul. He married a granddaughter of al-Jazzar Pasha in Tyre. Gross, 373 and Babinger, 393-4. This son, Mehmet Munib Bayur, was born in Beirut in 1868 and entered the Mülkiye Mektebi (Cankaya, 367) and was employed in the Ministry of Interior for Tribal and refugee affairs. For fifteen years Mehmed Kamil Pasha served in various Ottoman offices in Syria, including the Daftarkhan in Sidon in 1864 and the governships of Beirut, Aleppo and Jerusalem. His marriage to a granddaughter of al-Jazzar Pasha and his brother's governship in Acre at the time of the creation of the Wilaya of Beirut linked him further to the region.
### Members of the Commercial Court of the Province of Beirut, 1888-1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year Mahkame Tuccaret</th>
<th>Ra'is</th>
<th>Permanent Member</th>
<th>Permanent Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year Mahkame Tuccaret</th>
<th>Ra'is</th>
<th>Permanent Member</th>
<th>Permanent Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
<th>Temporal Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Members of the Chamber of Commerce of the Province of Beirut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year Chamb Com.(+Agr)</th>
<th>Ra'is</th>
<th>Mushawir</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year Chamber of Commerce</th>
<th>Ra'is</th>
<th>Mushawir</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1322 – 1904 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324 - 1906 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326 - 1908 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Year</th>
<th>Ra'is</th>
<th>Mushawir</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1322 – 1904 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324 - 1906 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326 - 1908 Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Arslan Dimashqiyya</td>
<td>Haj Muh Tayyara Ef</td>
<td>Abd al-Rah Na'mani</td>
<td>Salim Salam</td>
<td>Abd al-Qadir Jarudi</td>
<td>Salim Masaddiyya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members of Intellectual Societies and Institutions

The members of the urban council under Egyptian rule (1830-1840):


“Syrian Oriental Society”, 1847-52:


“Young Maronite League”, 1859-61:

Mansur Tayyan, Na'um Qaykanu, Ya'qub Thabit, Habib Qashura, Mansur 'Ada, Yusuf Shantiri, Bishara Fara'un, brothers Khadra, As'ad and Ibrahim Malhame.

“Syrian Scientific Society members”, 1867-69:

Ottoman members: Yusuf Kamil Pasha, later president of the supreme council; the future grand vezir Kamil Pasha; Mustafa Fadhil Pasha, Mehmet Rudhdi Pasha, later Minister of Finance; Safwat Pasha, later Minister of Education; Franko Pasha, governor of Mount Lebanon, 1860s.


“al-Maqasid” - Islamic Benevolent Society, 1878-80:

“Beirut Reform Committee”, 1913: “The members first met in their club and then presented their manifest to the governor general in the Grand Serail”:


Greek Orthodox: Amin Abu Sha’r, Jirji Baz, Jirji Mi’ mari, Hana al-Shami, Wadi’ Fayyad, Petro Trad, Jirji Rizqallah, Elias Jirji Trad, Shaykh Iskander al-‘Azar, Sa’id Sabbagha, Wadi’ Abi Rizq, Sa’id Abi Shahla, Jean Tuweini, Mikha’il Ghabril, Salim Ibrahim Trad, Jibrin Butrus, Charles Debbas.


Greek Catholics: Habib Fara’un, Rizqallah Arqash, Najib Jirjis Dahhan, Abdalhh Khayr, Shukri Ghalayini, Khalil Zayniyya;

Protestants: Dr. Ayyub Tabit, Ramiz Sarkis,

Syrian Catholic: Filip Tarazi, Najib Musali,

Latin: Musa Freije, Shukri Abud,

Orthodox Armenians: ?

Jews: Salim Halim Dana, Ibrahim Rufa’il Hakim.

1915/6 Beirut Martyrs:

Shaykh Ahmad ‘Abbas al-Azhari (1853-1926)

Ahmad ‘Abbas (also: al-mutarjam) was one of the most influential educators in late Ottoman Beirut. Of modest background, the modern Ottoman and Islamic school system offered him access to social and religious status which he then used to found new schools in Beirut.

His father came to Beirut with Ibrahim’s Egyptian arms, married into the Beiruti al-Shami family and stayed after the withdrawal in 1840. His son Ahmad was admitted into a Kuttab in 1858 where he was exposed to the Koran teachings of some leading local ‘ulema of the day, al-Nasuli, al-Dassuqi and Isma’il Tantawi. In 1863 Ahamd ‘Abbas entered the newly-built Rüşdiye state school which was directed by Hassan al-Banna. Here he was taught Arabic language and calligraphy by Muhammad al-Hut. Abdallah Khalid and, from Tripoli, Ibrahim Ahdab and ‘Umar al-Unsi.

When Emir Muhammad al-Arslan met Ahmad ‘Abbas, he urged his teacher al-Unsi to send him to Cairo’s al-Azhar school. Although he went to Egypt with his fellow student Khudr Khalid shortly afterwards, Ahmad ‘Abbas was forced to return to Beirut to help out in his father’s shop. Only generous stipends from concerned Muslim notables such as Husayn Bayhum and Beirut’s Naqib al-Ashraf Abd al-Rahman a!-Hut convinced his father to allow Ahmad to continue his studies at the renowned mosque.

After six years of Arabic language, literature and science, Shafi'i and Hanafi jurisprudence and Islamic philosophy under the teachers of al-Azhar, al-Marsafi, al-Ashrafi, al-Ashmuni, al-Gharr, Munqara, al-Afghani and al-Babi al Halabi, he received al-Azhars teaching diploma. His habit to return to Beirut during the semester breaks and discussed what he had learnt with Beiruti ‘ulema made him an important intermediary in the social, religious and political networks that began to flourish between Egypt and Syria in the late nineteenth century.

When Ahmad ‘Abbas returned to Beirut in the early 1870s, he was recruited by Butrus al-Bustani to teach Islamic religion and philosophy to the Muslim students of his recently opened al-Madrasa al-Wataniyya. In 1875, cholera hit Beirut and the school was temporarily closed. Unemployed and in financial straits, Ahmad ‘Abbas was forced to open a fruit and vegetable store in central Beirut to make ends meet. This spell did not last long. When Muhi al-Din Bayhum, a cousin of ‘Abbas’ earlier benefactor Husayn, saw that the shaykh was working in a small shop, he was appalled and Emir Mustafa al-Arslan found him employment in the Dawudiyya school. There Ahmad ‘Abbas taught students of Druze notable families until in 1880 he was offered a job in the administration of the Maqasid society. In 1882 he taught at the new military school, or Rüşdiye, before he became director of studies under Husayn al-Jisr in the newly opened, secondary school, al-Madrasa al-Sultaniyya in Qabr al-Wali, Beirut. When Ahmad ‘Abbas resigned in 1886 in dubious circumstances, he opened Beirut’s first public library, al-Maktaba al-Uthmaniyya. Owing to his friendship with his former al-Azhar teacher Ahmad al-Babi al-Halabi and connection to the Egyptian printing world, ‘Abbas started a successful book-selling business.
At the same time, Ahmad 'Abbas continued to give classes at Beirut’s great 'Umari mosque and hold a circle of meetings over eight years. Since his student days in Cairo, Ahmad 'Abbas inclined towards the Shadhliyya order of Sufism under shaykh 'Ali Nur al-Din al-Yashrati, but it is unclear whether 'Abbas actively spread the ideas of his Egyptian mentor in Beirut.

In 1893 Ahmad 'Abbas and his friend 'Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani held a meeting in which the idea for a new college was born. They decided that such a project had become necessary in order to cater for the growing demands in the field of Islamic education. Al-Qabbani secured the capital and two years later, al-Madrasa al-'Uthmaniyya was founded. Following the school’s increasing financial hardship, Ahmad 'Abbas went to Istanbul in 1913 and successfully lobbied for an imperial grant from the Ottoman government. After World War I, the school reopened under the new name of Kulliyat al-Islamiyya.1

His greatest coup, discussed in chapter 6 was the school of Arts and Industry – al-Maktab al-Sana'i – in 1908.

Butrus al-Bustani (1818-1883)

Born into a prominent Maronite family in 1818, he was educated at the prestigious ‘Ain Warqa school and was amongst the first generation of converts to protestantism. Although he was targeted by the American missionaries to become minister and although he held the position of American consul in the late 1850s (which allowed him to gain financial self-subsistence to pursue his intellectual career), he kept a significant distance to the mission.

His phenomenal intellectual and literary output spanned from teaching, translating, editing, writing schoolbooks, initiating literary clubs and societies2, founding the native evangelical church (against considerable missionary resistance) and the supra-confessional school al-Madrassa al-Wataniyya (1863), running newspapers like al-Jenan (1870-1884), and editing an Arabic dictionary (Muhit al-Muhit, 1862-1877) and the Arabic Encyclopedia (Da’irat al-Ma’arif, 1875-1883). Tibawi marks out five broad phases Bustani’s biography. The early period until roughly 1850/51 was marked by a close relationship with the mission, especially his mentor Eli Smith. He was concerned with learning foreign languages, both classical and contemporary, teaching at the protestant seminary in ‘Abye, translating amongst others the bible into Arabic. This phase can be summed up as the reproduction phase in Butrus al-Bustani’s life. From 1846 when he founded the first literary club to the death of Eli Smith in 1857 was his emancipatory or experimental phase when he started publishing on issues like slavery and the role of women. This period marked his literary beginnings with writings on the Arabic language, the history of Beirut as well as a revisionist article on the death of As’ad al-Shidyak, the first convert to protestantism who was killed for it. The civil war in 1860 really marked the independent or original phase when he used his rising status to open the interdenominational school in Zuqaq al-Blatt, edited classical Arabic texts, embraced Ottomanism,

2 Majma’ al-Tahdhib or al-Jami’a al-Suriyya HI-‘Ulum wa al-Funun, founded 1846, al-‘Umda al-
published a lengthy treatise on human society. With the foundation of his “horticultural newspaper trio” (al-Jinan, al-Jinnah and al-Junaynah).

Khalil al-Khuri (1836-1907)

Khalil al-Khuri was born into a Greek orthodox family in the mountain town of Shuwafat in 1836. His family moved to Beirut after the withdrawal of the Egyptian army from Bilad al-Sham in 1840. At school he was taught by Nasif al-Yaziji and learned French and Turkish at an early age. While jobbing at a merchant house, he began to write prose and poetry. Later he taught at the American missionary school in ’Abaya.

With financial aid from the Mudawwar family, al-Khuri established a printing house, al-matba’at al-Suriyya and published the first Beirut newspaper, Hadikat al-Akhbar from 1858 to 1907. This newspaper was considered at the time as the official Ottoman organ and the “Syrian voice”. Al-Khuri benefitted from close relations with Fuad Pasha and for the duration of his life was employed in the Ottoman administration, first as state censor in the province of Syria and after 1888 as foreign relations’ officer in the province of Beirut.

Among his most influential publications were the 1860 al-‘asr al-jadid (”the new age”), Kharabat Suriyya (“Ruins of Syria”).

Khalil Sarkis (ibn Khattar, 1841/2-1915)

Born in ’Abaya, he received his primary education under Thompson and Khalil al-Khuri at the American seminary. After the civil war of 1860 he established the al-Ta’arif printing press with Salim al-Bustani whose sister Louise (1850-1925). He lived in the quarter of Zuqaq al-Blat and was a near neighbour of his in-laws. Later he separated the Adabiyya press from al-Ta’arif when he began to publish Lisan al-Hal on October 18, 1878.

In 1892 Sarkis traveled to Istanbul, Europe and the US and published his memoirs a year later in Rihlat mudir al-Lisan Khalil Sarkis ila-l-Ustana wa Uruba wa Amrika. He was a member of the Syro-Ottoman delegation to the Chicago World Expedition and was the official chronicler of the German Emperor’s visit to “the Holy Land” in November 1898, published as al-Shám qabl mi‘at ‘Am; Rihla al-Imparatur Guillaume II al-Almani ila Filastin wa Suriyya ‘am 1898. Other publications include Tarikh Urshalim (1874), Safar al-Dama’ (1896). He was an Arabic teacher at the Ecole Royale Italienne in Beirut.

1 ‘Arabiyya, founded 1860, and al-Jam’iyya al-‘Ilmiyya al-Suriyya, founded 1867.
2 “Khitab fil-hay‘at al-ijtima‘iya” (1869). The 40 odd page article was later reprinted in excerpts in his newspaper al-Jinan.
Family Biographies of Beirut’s Municipal Members; 1868-1908

1 Ahmad Pasha Abaza
Geographical and confessional background: The Abazas migrated from Egypt to Saida during Zahir al-Umar’s reign. Ahmad came to Beirut with Ibrahim Pasha’s Egyptian forces in the 1830s. The Abazas were Sunni, originally probably of Cherkessian-Abkhaz origin.

Ottoman Career: Ahmad was a career bureaucrat and the first municipal president in 1868. Later – in 1878 – Ahmad went on to become qaimaqam of the Beq’aa. Rashid Khalil Abaza was the qaimaqam of Marj’ayun, Subhi Abaza was a Turkish teacher at the Maqasid school in Saida, a playwright and author of historical studies. Ahmad was the third highest ranking local bureaucrat in the province of Beirut, 1892.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ahmad was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, 1867-9.

2 Zion Abu Shand
They were the only Beirut Jew on the municipal council. Nothing is known of this family. Zion was probably a candidate for Wadi Abu Jamil, a quarter where many Jews settled in the late 19th century. This quarter west of the city centre became a popular residence for well-off Beirutis in the 1880s. In the 1890s, the Jewish residents built a synagogue in the quarter. The leading Jewish notable family of the time was Musa Dana’s, a general trader in 1889, and involved in the Israelite school of Wadi Abu Jamil.

3 Niqula ’Ajuri
Geographical and confessional background: Originally Maronites or Greek Orthodox from ’Ajur, north of Aleppo (hence the family name), the Beirut branch had relatives in Zuq Mikha’iil and in Ghadir, Kisrawan.

Occupation: The ’Ajuris were registered as general traders in the Beirut directory in 1889.

Ottoman Career: Niqula was a member of Beirut’s Provincial Council in the mid-1890s, an elected member of the court of appeal in 1888 and a committee member of the Ottoman Agricultural Bank in the 1900s.

4 Ahmad Bakri al-’Ariss
Geographical and confessional background: One of the Sunni families in Beirut who claim origins from Morocco. In the 18th century, the family built a well-fortified mansion, Burj al-’Ariss, south of the city centre in Basta Fawqa (or Bashura). In the court records of the 1840s, they appear registered in Suq al-’Atarin.

Occupation: the ’Ariss were a family of ‘ulama and learning. Before WWI Murad ’Ariss was dean of the religious teaching at the ’Uthmaniye school in Beirut. Ahmad Bakri was the career bureaucrat in the family, al-Hajj Ahmad Bakri was also the head of a Beirut merchant guild.

Ottoman Career: Ahmad Bey ’Ariss (father?) was a member of Ibrahim Pasha’s ten-man urban council between 1833 and 1840. Later was a member of the Ottoman police in Beirut.

5 ’Abd al-Qadir al-’Ariss
Unclear relations to Ahmad Bakri, possible a paternal uncle.

Involvement in public life in Beirut: ’Abd al-Qadir was a petitioner for Beirut’s administrative autonomy from Damascus in 1865.

6 Yusuf ’Araman
Geographical and confessional background: Originally Greek Orthodox from the Hawran, they moved to Beirut sometime before the 19th century.

Residence and family connections: The ’Aramans owned diverse properties in Beirut. In his youth, Jirji Zaydan lived in an ’Araman residence. ’Affa ’Araman married Abu-Raji Bustrus. Jibrin Tuwayni married Hanna ’Araman’s daughter. Yusuf’ ’Araman was the head of the family in the 1880s.

Occupation: The ’Araman family was registered in China-, silver-, glassware (Nasrallah and Wadih ’Araman). ’Araman & Dabbas, Jibrin and ’Araman & Qamar were general traders in 1889. Later family members were in construction supplies. Elias ’Araman owned a pharmacy in Musaytbeh in 1908. Najib ’Araman was a representative in the emerging oil business after WWI.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Mikha’iil and Abdallah ’Araman were members of the initial Syrian Scientific Society of the 1840s.

7 Bishara Arqash
Geographical and confessional background: The Arqashs were prominent Maronites in late 19th century Beirut but nothing is known prior to their residence in Beirut in the early nineteenth century.
Residence and family connections: The Arqashs were registered in a house “near the arcade of Bayt Dandan” on land belonging to the Zawiyya al-Majzub waql inside the old city (where the Parliament is today). After the construction of Suq Ayyas, Bishara Arqash moved his banking offices there.

Occupation: The Arqashs were registered as wholesale manufacture merchants in the Beirut director) of 1889. Lutfallah Arqash was a well-known calligraphy artist in the 1870s. Bishara founded a bank at the turn of the 19th century.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Bishara was a member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9 and was a member of the municipal railway committee of 1890. Rizqallah Arqash was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

Ibrahim Bey al-Aswad (b. Brumana, 1851, d. 1940)

Geographical and confessional background: The Aswads are Maronites, originally from the Hawran, who migrated to Damascus in the late 17th century. Then they moved to Ba'albak, and later to Jubayl. In the early 19th century five brothers (Ibrahim, Nadir. Abu Nasir, Ghusn (Rubayz) and Abu Farah) constituted the heads of the extended family of the Aswads.

Residence and family connections: The eldest of the Aswad brothers Ibrahim was born in Brumana where his father, Najm Elias al-Aswad (1798-1883), had close ties to the emirs of Mount Lebanon. Ibrahim’s father was a member of the Administrative Council of the Mutasarrifiyya of Mount Lebanon. Ibrahim Bey (Izzetlu) moved to Beirut in order to study under al-Bustani in the Madrasa al-Wataniyya in the 1860s, where learnt Ottoman Turkish and studied fiqh under Bishara al-Khuri.

Occupation: Ibrahim Bey was registered as a manufacture merchant in 1911.

Ottoman career: Ibrahim Bey entered the Ottoman administration as a young scribe of Turkish under Franko Pasha. Under Rustum Pasha he became scribe in the executive council. After two years he was elected to the Administrative Council of Mutasarrifiyya. He probably moved back to Beirut in the late 1880s, and in the early 20th century became a director of education in the Province of Beirut. In 1913, Ohannes Pasha appointed him district governor of the Kura which earned him promotion and a host of medals from the Ottoman government which later sent him to Paris on a scientific committee.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Barely 15 years of age, Ibrahim al-Aswad’s name appears on the petition of 1865 to sever Beirut from the administration of Damascus. He opened the Lubnani Press printing press in 1891, was the editor of the journal al-Lubnani, the author of the directories Dalil Lubnani, and published the history book Tanwir al-Azhan fi Tarikh Lubnani in 1925.

Muhammad (Pasha) Ayyas

Geographical and confessional background: Sunni family from Damascus who first resided (muqim) and in the late 19th century settled (muwattan) in Beirut. Muhammad’s father, Jamil Ali Pasha Ayyas, took him and his brother, Sa’id Bey, to Beirut. The Ayyas emerged as Muslim notables and large property owners in Beirut. They lived in the Ghandur building in Suq al-Tawila when the municipality undertook street piercing measures through the old city in 1894.

In 1878 Muhammad Ayyas developed Suq Hamada into and Suq Ayyas and built wikalat Ayyas in its centre. It appears that this complex collapsed in May 1901, causing the death of 27 and 14 wounded. Investigations into this biggest housing disaster before WWI concluded that the foundations were not strong enough to hold the three-floored house. It was believed that the municipality had warned Ayyas that the houses were too weak but that he did not heed the advice. It seems that the reputation of Muhammad Ayyas was forever destroyed by this tragedy. The press declared that “he is known be of avaricious character, and to have boasted of the cheap construction of his houses.” Salim Ali Salam’s memoirs maintain that “The man was practically illiterate and could in no way carry such a responsibility [as being municipal president].” He died shortly after he was nominated interim municipal president in 1911 and Samil Salam took over.

Occupation: Muhammad Ayyas was a textile merchant and a shareholder in the municipal railway and port projects in the 1890s before the French companies took over. He had businesses ties with the Ghandurs.

Ottoman career: Muhammad Ayyas was on the provincial education committee at the turn of the 19th century. In 1908, when Nazim Pasha fired 'Abd al-Qadir al-Dana, Muhammad Ayyas was entrusted with the Municipality as its eldest member.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ayyas and brothers donated 2,500 piasters towards municipal development schemes in Sahat al-Burj in 1878.

Muhammad Khayri Ayyas

Possibly the same person as previous entry; or a Brother?

Abd al-Rahim Badran
Geographical and confessional background: The Badrans are Sunnis from the Diyabakr region who arrived in Beirut sometime around the turn of the 18th century.

Residence and family connections: They were registered in Suq Bazarkhan in the 1840s. Badran was born in 1840. In the sources his name varies between 'Abd al-Rahman and 'Abd al-Rahim. 'Abd al-Rahim's father, Husayn Badran was a leader of the Sa'adiyya Sufi order. The Badrans held property in Bashura and Btina, (near the sulhantiyya school) which they sold to British missionary schools in 1903.

Occupation: Salim and Khalil Badran were registered as pavers on Barracks Street in 1911. Yusuf was a pharmacist on the Damascus Road in 1908 and the owner of the Hotel de Marseille in 1922.

Ottoman career: 'Abd al-Rahim was an Ottoman career bureaucrat. He left the municipal council (replaced by As'ad Malhame) and the presidency of the commercial court when he was elected to the Ottoman Parliament in 1877. In 1900 he became the provincial inspector for Baghdad. The only other member of the family in the Ottoman administration was one Muhammad Badran, the treasurer of the council of education in 1888 and a member of the provincial court of appeal in 1892.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: 'Abd al-Rahim Badran was a member of the Syrian Scientific Society in 1867-69. The British consul characterised him thus: "He is well-known to me and I have the highest opinion of his capacity and integrity. He was for about five years qa'imaqam of various places in the province of Diabakr and has during the last five months filled the post of Moslem member of the [court of appeal] in Beirut. As a Moslem he is most liberal in his ideas, tolerant and conciliant towards the Christians...He is thoroughly convinced of the necessity of reform in the Ottoman administration." The inspector Muhammad and Abd al-Rahman donated 600 piasters to the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj in 1878.

Geographical and confessional background: The Barbirs are Sunnis originally from Hijaz and Egypt. The forefathers were merchants in Damiyyat, in the Nile Delta, before some moved to Damascus in the middle of the 18th century. The founder of the Beirut branch, 'Abd al-Latif Barbir was the father of Shaykh Ahmad al-Barbir (1747-1811) who was qadi of Beirut from 1774 until his death and a well-known man of learning. Hasan Barbir was on the advisory council of Ibrahim Pasha in the 1830s. Shaykh Muhammad was Beirut’s mufti in the second half of the 19th century. Generations of Barbirs were venerated for their integrity and even if the family's business did not flourish as that of other Sunnis, they remained political, social and cultural heavyweights until well into the 20th century.

Residence and family connections: Abd al-Latif arrived in Beirut, residing first in Khan al-Iskele in the Qaysariyya of Emir Mansur al-Shihabi. By the early 20th century, the Barbirs had their own Khan and a south-western city quarter named after the family. Since the times of Ahmad, the Barbirs were leading and respected 'ulama of Beirut. 'Umar Bayhum married the daughter of the mufti and qadi of Beirut, Ahmad al-Aghar (1783-1858). Ahmad’s father, Mustafa al-Aghar, came to Beirut from Egypt at the end of the 16th century and settled near the Umari mosque until WWI when Azmi Bey tore down the Aghar residence. Salim Salam’s marriage to Kalthum al-Barbir at the end of the 19th century was a landmark event in the city and paved way for the Salams rise in urban politics.

Occupation: The Barbirs were 'ulama and merchants with France since mid-18th century. 'Ulama became Ottoman lawyers (Bashir Barbir) and merchants became industrialists (Muhammad Barbir was the first to have imported sugar from Egypt to Beirut). Lesser branches were respected artisans. Hussayn and Hajj Khalil were notable guild masters of various trades.

Ottoman career: Shaykh 'Umar (1858-1920) and Mishbah planted the new Sanaya garden in 1908. Kamal was the inspector of the Beirut-Damascus-Hama railway. Amin was the secretary of Beirut’s Chamber of Commerce in 1892.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: 'Abd al-Qadir - son of 'Uthman - was one of five Barbirs to sign the petition for Beirut in 1865, together with 'Umar, Sa’ad al-Din, Muhammad and 'Abd al-Rahman Barbir. Bashir was a founding member of the Maqasid Society in 1878.
in his hands by the time this western quarter boomed as Beirut’s hotel district at the turn of the 19th century. His lavish mansion on Tariq al-jadid (later Rue Clemenceau) was a landmark building, protected by two dozen Albanian guards. The Bassuls were related to the Mizhir family, and married to the Hunaynas.

**Occupation:** The grandfather Salum Bassul was a British Dragoman. The Bassuls became hoteliers, silk merchants, bankers and real estate owners whose head office was in Suq al-Jamil. Khalil was registered as a general trader in 1889. Albert Bassul was a powerful politician after 1908 and during the French Mandate.

**Ottoman career:** Jirji Bassul was a property assessor in Beirut’s provincial administration in the 1890s. Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Sallum donated 500 piasters to the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj in 1878. The same year Edmond Bassul, Louis Bishara al-Khuri and Antun Qayqanu founded the Maronite Benevolent Society for the poor. Albert was member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

---

**Salim Bawwab**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Sunnis of probable Albanian origin.

**Residence and family connections:** In the 1840s the Bawwabs were registered in Suq al-Qutn, Suq al-'Atarin and Suq al-Nuriyya where they lived in a house owned by the Da'q family.

**Occupation:** Kais & Bawwab were registered flour merchant in 1889.

**Ottoman career:** Hajj Salim Bawwab was a member of the council of the provincial cadastral registry at the end of the 19th century. The pharmacist 'Umar Bawwab (Salim’s son) also became municipal member under the French Mandate.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Salim Bawwab was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

---

**Abd al-Rahman Pasha Baydun**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Extremely little is known about the Bayduns. They were Sunnis whose family name became associated with Shi'a politics in the mid-20th century.

**Residence and family connections:** Since at least the 1840s the Bayduns were registered in Beirut’s Suq al-Najjarin. 'Abd al-Rahman Baydun owned land in the eastern quarter of Rumayl which his son Hassan sold to the Greek Orthodox community in the second half of the 19th century.

**Occupation:** 'Umar, Yusuf and Anis were merchants in furniture and Oriental wares after WWI. One Ahmed Baydun was a guard at one of the Beirut consulates and a mason at the lazaretto who was also a notorious smuggler in Beirut.

**Ottoman career:** 'Abd al-Rahman was made Pasha in the 1890s and replaced 'Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani as municipal president in 1901. One 'Abdallah Baydun was a member of the chamber of commerce in 1888.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** 'Abd al-Ghani and Muhammad Baydun were petitioners for Beirut in 1865.

---

**Muhi al-Din Bayhum**

**Geographical and confessional background:** The Bayhum family split off from the 'Itani family early in the 19th century. Muhi al-Din’s father, Nasir, was the oldest son of Husayn 'Itani and the first to bear the name Bayhum. The 'Itanis were prominent officials in Beirut’s administration. In the mid-eighteenth century the 'Itanis were port masters and heads of customs. The Bayhums were the most powerful family in Beirut throughout the 19th century and were related to a large number of Sunni notable families in Beirut and Damascus by the beginning of the 20th century (e.g. the Da'qûqs, 'Abids, and al-Jaza’iris). The Bayhums’ dominant political role was taken over by the Salam family who, originally, entered Beirut’s political scene as junior business partners to the Bayhums. During the French Mandate period, Zaynab and 'Adila Bayhum (1902-1975) were leading figures in Beirut’s women movement together with 'Anbara Salam, Ithihaq Qaddura, Julia Tu’ma-Dimashqiyya, Salma Sayigh and Nazik Abd.'

**Residence and family connections:** Husayn 'Itani Bayhum’s six sons (Nasir, Muhammad, Yusuf, Umar, Mustafa and Abdallah – here: 2. generation) were the founders of this 19th century Sunni Dynasty. The Bayhums originally from the shoemakers’ market before they moved to the newly constructed Suq al-Jamil area in the western part of the old city. Also they held property on the port premises which housed, among other institutions, the agricultural bank. Later the family constructed Suq Bayhum underscoring their dominance in the city. Towards the end of the 19th century, the Bayhums moved out to Zuqqaq al-Blat, to Musaybeh and Ras Bayrut. Muhi al-Din was a cousin of the poet Husayn Bayhum (1833-1881) and Muhammad Mustafa, the patron of a new mosque built in Basta Fawqa in 1879. In After Husayn’s death, Muhi al-Din emerged as the head of the family.
Occupation: The six Bayhum branches divided amongst themselves a growing business empire that stretched throughout Mount Lebanon and Bilad al-Sham. As “merchant notables” (Fawaz), this ‘2. generation’ entertained good relations with the emirs of the Mountain and in some instances eventually became money-lenders for impoverished al-Khazins. Some were directly involved in the silk trade. This generation’s sons entered the Ottoman administrative ranks more systematically (3. generation: eg. Muhi al-Din, Husayn, Muhammad Mustafa and Muhammad Abdallah), while the grandsons, such as Ahmad Mukhtar, Yusuf and Jamil (4. generation), became journalists and political activists.

Ottoman career: Muhi al-Din was municipal president briefly between 1877 and 78, then a member of Beirut’s sub-provincial council (al-majlis al-liwa) between 1879 and 1885, and he sat on the provincial education council from 1880 to 1885.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Of the second generation ‘Umar and Abdallah petitioned for Beirut in 1865. Muhi al-Din was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY of 1867-69. In the 1890s, he hosted a number of meetings in his house that discussed local planning initiatives.

Husayn Bayhum. (1833-1881?)

Residence and family connections: Husayn was ‘Umar Bayhum’s son. His father was an influential council member under Egyptian occupation and later sat on Beirut’s post-civil war welfare council (majlis al-i’ana). Husayn’s sons were ‘Umar, Rashid, Ahmad Mukhtar and Mahmud.

Occupation: Journalist, poet and leading figure of the Arabic nahda and early Islamic reform movement.

Ottoman Career: Husayn was elected to the Ottoman Parliament as the runner-up to the 1877 election because Amin Jundi declined to go to Istanbul. Previously, he sat on Beirut’s majlis al-liwa (1878) and when he returned to Beirut after Abdulhamid suspended Parliament he took the place of a Trad on the municipal council.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: He was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865, president of the Syrian Scientific Society in the 1868 and founding member of the Maqasid Society in 1878.

Muhammad Bayhum

Residence and family connections: Muhammad was the son of Abdallah and brother of Khalil, ‘Abd al-Qadir, Najib and ‘Uthman. The latter two were both younger than Muhammad and also entered the Ottoman bureaucracy while the older two helped in the father’s business. Muhammad Bayhum lived in a large mansion in Manara, Ras Bayrut.

Ottoman career: Muhammad was a member of the chamber of commerce between 1883 and 1892. With his brother ‘Uthman, he sat on the educational council (1884-5) which previously absorbed the Maqasid institutions and schools. Muhammad was active on the roads commission and member of Beirut’s first provincial council in 1888. Between 1894 and 1896 he was municipal president and received a host of Ottoman medals of achievement. Under his second term as municipal president during CUP rule, Muhammad Bayhum’s municipality was criticised by Lisan al-Hal for development plans that fenced in the public park on Sahat al-Sur. After the Young Turk Revolution, he was also a member of a special parliamentary committee to study the Ottoman press law.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: One Muhammad Bayhum was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865, but this could also have been his uncle. Muhammad Bayhum was also a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9.

Hasan Bayhum

Residence and family connections: Hasan was the son of Khalil Abdallah Bayhum and the father of Salih Bayhum.

Occupation: He was a grain merchant and lawyer and made headlines when he became the concessionaire of the Beirut-Damascus railway line in 1891. He was an occasional contributor to Thamarat al-Funun.

Ottoman career: A member of the Maqasid Society and the head of Beirut’s chamber of commerce in 1884 and again a member in 1899. He was on the court of appeal, 1906-08, a member of the provincial council, 1892-99, and the educational council. He received 1. class Ottoman medals for services to the Empire.

Mustafa Bayhum

Residence and family connections: Son of ‘Abd al-Rahman (a dean of the Ottoman school), brother of Hassan. His Grandfather, Mustafa, petitioned for Beirut (as did Abdallah, Mustafa’s son).

Ahmad Mukhtar Bayhum (1878-1922)
Residence and family connections: He was the son of the poet Husayn Bayhum and took over the family residence in Musaytbeh at the turn of the century where he was a childhood friend and neighbour of Salim Ali Salam. His brothers were 'Umar, Rashid and Mahmud Bayhum and his sons were Amin (b. 1899) and Sadiq. His marriage to one of Muhi al-Din Bayhum’s daughters cemented his brief family leadership.

Occupation: Involved in the family’s import-export business in Suq al-Jamil. His cousin and brother-in-law, 'Umar Bayhum, was a business associate with Zakariya al-Nasuli, another ally of the Bayhum-Salam network. This network of commercial, political and blood ties virtually owned the Syro-Ottoman Agricultural Bank and held vast real estate in northern Palestine.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: The leading member of the 4. generation of Bayhums, he was a noted journalist and political activist. He was also a dean of the Ottoman school of Beirut before WWI. He led the anti Habsburg demonstration on Sahat al-Burj in 1908. He was a delegate at the 1913 Paris conference and a leading member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913. Under Faysal’s government he became the director of general security in Beirut in 1918.

Muhammad Mustafa Bayhum
Residence and family connections: The son of Mustafa, the brother of 'Abd al-Rahman and 'Abd al-Ghani and the father of Jamil Bayhum (1887-1978), the Arab historian and cultural writer. His son Jamil and a cousin ' Abd al-Rahman graduated from the Ottoman school of Beirut (called Islamic College after WWI) and were noted for their trilingualism – Arabic, Turkish and French.

Occupation: Muhammad Mustafa ran the family’s import-export business in Suq al-Jamil with his brother 'Abd al-Rahman and their cousins Khalil and 'Abd al-Qadir Bayhum.

Niqula Bashbash
Geographical and confessional background: The Bashbashes were a wealthy Greek Orthodox family. In the 1880s one Yusuf Bashbash was the head of the family.

Occupation: Niqula was a general trader in 1889.

Najib Bashbash
The brother of Niqula he was elected in the municipal shake-up of March 1906 and was involved in al-Dana’s project for a hygienic city.

Habib Buwiri
Geographical and confessional background: Maronite family, with links to Alexandria. Little else is known of the Buwiris genealogy.

Ottoman career: Habib was a property assessor for the provincial administration in 1888.

Salim al-Bustani (1848-1884)
Geographical and confessional background: Originally the Bustanis hailed from from Dayr al-Qamar. His father, al-mu'allim Butrus, was born in Dbaye in 1818, but by the time Salim was born, the family had moved to Abaye his father taught at the American seminary school. Butrus had already converted from Maronite to Protestant faith and was involved in American missionary work with his friend and colleague Eli Smith (d. 1857). Although Butrus al-Bustani never travelled abroad, he was considered by Arabs and Europeans as one of the leading intellectuals of the Arab world. Butrus and Eli Smith translated, among other books, the bible into Arabic. The family was not wealthy, but Salim enjoyed a home surrounded by learning. He studied Arabic language and literature with Nasif al-Yaziji, as well as Turkish, French and English.

Occupation: In 1862, Salim succeeded Butrus as the dragoman at the US consulate in Beirut. Shortly afterwards he began to teach in his father’s Madrassa al-Wataniyya. Generally Salim helped his father in his work as publisher, teacher, journalist, and lexicographer. He was editor of al-Jinan and the founder of the Arabic historical novel.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1868. Salim made his widely read editorials in al-Jinan powerful tools of shaping public opinion. He was arguably the most important socio-political thinker in Beirut in the 1870s and the 1880s, treating such topics as Human Rights, the ‘Urabi Revolt in Egypt, the Franco-Prussian War, Religion, Education and the Spirit of the Age.

Salim Bustani is considered the founder of the Arabic historical fiction and thus predates Jirji Zaydan in this role. Although fictional, Salim’s novels contain digressions into pressing contemporary issues, such as social fragmentation, religious zealotry and insufficient provisions of schools in the country.

Habib Bustrus (al-saghir, d. 1886)
Geographical and confessional background: Originally from Greece, the Bustrus family moved to Enfeh near Tripoli in the 16th century before moving to Beirut. After a brief exile in Shuwayfat, the family moved
back to Beirut at the beginning of the 19th century. Under Sulayman Pasha’s rule (1805-1819) that witnessed the first wave of immigrants to Beirut from the Syrian hinterland that was threatened by Wahhabi incursions, the sons of Antun Bustrus invested their wealth in real estate during and after Ibrahim Pasha’s rule. Their first manison north-east of Sahat al-Burj cost a reported sum of 40,000 piasters.

Residence and family connections: The Bustrus were related by intra-confessional marriage to most Greek Orthodox families in the wealthy St. Niqula/Gemmayze quarter, such as the Fayyads, Sursuqs, Jubailis, Trads and Daghirs. Habib the younger’s son, Najib, was married to a Sursuq daughter as was his brother Abu Raji. Some members of the family temporarily emigrated to Egypt. When three of Antun Bustrus’ sons died in 1850, Musa took over the family’s affairs. In the 1860s, when Jibra’il and Habib were the heads of the family, the Bustrus invested in Beirut’s city centre and rebuilt streets, warehouses and markets which were thereafter renamed Suq Bustrus and Rue Bustrus and Wikalat Bustrus. The Bustrus also owned streets and markets in other cities in Palestine, such as Jaffa.

Occupation: The Bustrus were involved in the silk trade since at least the 1850s and bought a series of khans between Tripoli and Beirut from the emir Yusuf Shihab. Banque Bustrus was founded at the end of the 19th century. The family business in grain and textile reached out to Cyprus, Anatolia, Alexandria, Jaffa, Tartus, where the Bustrus became important landowners of olive groves and mulberry plantations. In 1910, the Wikala Bustrus housed the Shiha & Phara’un Bank and many of Beirut’s European traders. One branch of the Bustrus specialised in manufacture and textile. The cousins Fadlallah (in Egypt), Habib Jirji Abu-Raji (briefly London) and Salim bought tissues in Liverpool for the account of the family in Beirut which was in charge of distributing olive oil and soap to Egypt, where Fadlallah distributed it. The Bustrus held shares in regional investment companies (roads and ports). Their uncle Musa held branches in London, Manchester and Moscow. Salim de Bustrus was knighted at the Czar’s court in St.Petersburg at the turn of the 19th century.

Ottoman career: Musa Bustrus was a member of the Egyptian urban council of Beirut in the 1830s. Significantly, the Bustrus held no posts in the post-1860 Ottoman administration. Instead they were active in Greek Orthodox millet politics. Habib Bustrus was a long-term member of the council of twelve and was replaced in the 1880s by Nasrallah Daghir.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Habib al-saghir was a member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1868.

28 Jirji Habib (al-kabir) Bustrus
Residence and family connections: He was the oldest son of Habib, the older, and Habib al-saghir’s cousin. His grandfather was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865. His son Michel married a Na’ma daughter from Lattaqia in 1890 and was an honourary dragoman at the British consulate.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Involved in municipal infrastructural development plans for a port in 1890.

29 Nakhla Bustrus
Ottoman Career: He was a member of the chamber of commerce in 1888.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Nakhla was on the committee for Beirut-Damascus railway and supported street piercing projects in the 1890s.

30 Jibran Butrus
Geographical and confessional background: It is unclear when this Maronite family migrated to Beirut. It was related to the Janhus family.

Occupation: In 1910, a number of Butrus appeared in the Beirut Directory. Nakhla was a furniture merchant, one was in the manufacturing business and another was a partner in Banque Daghir.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Jibran Butrus was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

31 Muhammad ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Dana (1844-1910)
Geographical and confessional background: From an undistinguished Sunni background, ʿAbd al-Qadir became a shooting star of the late Ottoman time as self-made career bureaucrat.

Residence and family connections: ʿAbd al-Qadir’s father Ahmad was registered as joint shopowner in Suq al-Fashkha with Mustafa Qabbani and owned a house near the Saray mosque in harat al-yahud in 1843. ʿAbd al-Qadir’s career was helped by excellent contacts to Istanbul. The grand vezir Mehmet Kamil Pasha was considered his close friend.

Occupation: ʿAbd al-Qadir was a merchant who traded with France. One Muhammad Amin al-Dana was on the general trader registry in 1889.
Ottoman career: Abd al-Qadir was educated in al-Bustani’s Madrasa al-Wataniyya. He was virtually bilingual and translated a number of publications from Ottoman into Arabic and vice versa. In 1880 he became a member of a commercial court in province of Syria. He was president of Beirut’s chamber of commerce between 1888-1892. He was a long-standing member of the council of education, 1883-1899, sat on the commission for roads and throughways from 1899 to 1901, and acted as the official prosecutor of bureaucratic misconduct. In 1898, Abd al-Qadir was briefly appointed interim governor of Lattakia. Between 1899 and 1901 he sat on the Beirut’s Provincial Council. In 1906 he was swept to the presidency of Beirut’s municipality by massive popular support. But he fell victim to allegations of corruption by the municipal inspector Munih Efendi Ramadan. As a consequence al-Dana had to resign and the municipality temporarily split into two sectors. Abd al-Qadir was an ardent supporter of Abdülmecid and pledged his allegiance to the Ottoman state in an article on “Great Britain and Islam” in The Times (26th August 1906).

Abd al-Qadir’s brother Rashid was a board member of Ottoman Agricultural Bank in Beirut. One Bakri Sidqi al-Dana was on the council of education in the early 1890s.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Abd al-Qadir al-Dana was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9. He was a journalist and literati – he translated Cevdet Pasha’s Tarih Devlet-i Uthmani in 1891; a founder of the Bayrut Press in Suq Sursuq in 1885; the publisher of Bayrut Gazetesi (1886) with his brothers Muhammad and Rashid (1857-1902). He was also the first president of the relaunched Maqasid Society in 1907/8.

Muhammad Abu ’Umar al-Da’uq

Geographical and confessional background: the Da’uqs emerged as one of the most influential Sunni families in late Ottoman Beirut. They had legendary origins in Maghreb. Muhammad al-Da’uq’s great-grandfather was Beirut’s market officer (bazar pasha) in the 18th century.

Residence and family connections: The Da’uqs were registered in Suq Nuriyya and Suq Bazarkhan in the 1840s. The sons of the head of trades, ‘Ali, Salih and Ahmad, moved out of the intramural Bab Derkeh area to Ras Bayrut, Mutsaytbeh and Suq al-Tawila respectively. Later Ahmad, the head of the family at mid-century, built a large mansion and a mosque in Manara, lived in Burj al-Da’uq, Ras Bairut. The Da’uqs were linked by marriage to the Salams and had political and business ties with the Bayhums.

Occupation: Muhammad founded a commission house in Suq al-Tawila in 1868. His brother ‘Uthman was a steel merchant in 1889. The Da’uqs held the concession for Beirut’s first ice company in 1893. Muhammad took part in infrastructural projects in the 1890s.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ahmad al-Da’uq signed the 1865 petition to make Beirut a provincial capital.

Salim Bey al-Da’uq

Residence and family connections: Salim Bey was the second oldest son of Ahmad and the brother of Muhammad Da’uq.

Occupation: Salim was a metal and glass merchant in 1889.

’Umar Bey al-Da’uq

Residence and family connections: ’Umar Bey was the oldest son of Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Da’uq.

Occupation: ’Umar was a merchant in gold and jewelry and a clockmaker in Suq al-Tawila.

Ottoman career: ’Umar was a municipal inspector (mufattish), then municipal president in 1918, representative in the Sharifian government between 1918-20, and president of the Beirut chamber of commerce in 1922. Before WWI ’Umar became a dean of the newly-founded Ottoman school in Beirut. His younger brother Kamil was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

Elias Jirjis Dabbas

Geographical and confessional background: Part of this Greek Orthodox family was originally from Damascus from where Mitri Debbas fled to Beirut during the civil war of 1860.

Residence and family connections: the Dabbas were one of six families registered in the Greek Orthodox archbishopry as Beirutis whose leading figures in the 1880s were Khalil and Jirjis, Elias’ father.

Occupation: Dabbas & Araman were registered as general traders in 1889. Jirji Debbas was a consular agent for the US and one Dabbas Efendi was the dragoman for the Greek consulat.

Ottoman career: Jirji Salum Dabbas was a property assessor in the Ottoman provincial administration in 1888.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Elias (possibly his grandfather) and Khalil Dabbas were petitioners for Beirut in 1865. Bulus and Fadhlallah Dabbas were members of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1868.

Arslan Dimashqiyya
Geographical and confessional background: Sunnis originally from the Hijaz, migrated to Damascus and came to Beirut in the mid-19th century. In the last decade of Abdulhamid’s rule Arslan was one of the most powerful figures in Beirut.

Residence and family connections: The Wikalu Dimashqiyya near the port housed the offices of the Beirut chamber of commerce, the Khedival and Jolly lines. His son Badr (a graduate of Beirut’s Ottoman school in the 1900s) married feminist journalist Julia Tu’ma (editor of al-Nisa’ al-Jadida). Both were shunned by their respective communities and were forced to live in the ‘neutral zone’ near the Syrian Protestant College.

Occupation: Arslan was a landowner and export merchant. ‘Abd al-Rahman Dimashqiyya was a renowned calligraphist and a teacher at the Ottoman school in Beirut. Barraj & Dimashqiyya were cloth, silk and wool merchants. ‘Abd al-Ghani Dimashqiyya was a cobbler in Bab Idriss in 1922.

Ottoman career: Arslan Dimashqiyya was a long-term member of Beirut’s provincial council (1900-08), a general prosecutor, the president of Beirut’s Chamber of Commerce, (1904-08) and president of the public works committee at the turn of the 19th century.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Arslan was a founding member of the Maqasid society in 1878.

37 Ibrahim Fakhri Bey

Geographical and confessional background: He was the son of Mahmud Nami Bey, governor of Beirut between 1833 and 1840. Originally from the Caucasus, Nami Bey fled to Egypt around 1800 and became a member of Mehmet Ali’s educational mission to France to study military engineering. His son Ibrahim was born in Beirut in the 1830s or early 40s and was trained as an engineer abroad.

Residence and family connections: Nami Bey’s mother was one of the wives of Mehmet Ali Pasha of Egypt.

Occupation: Trained as an engineer, Ibrahim built Khan Fakhri Bey, designed the Petit Saray in 1882 and planned and funded a number of urban improvement measures in Beirut of the 1870s and 1880s.

Ottoman Career: Ibrahim Bey was the second municipal president of Beirut between 1877 and 1882. His term of office coincided with Midhat Pasha’s proactive two years as governor general of the province of Syria.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: He donated 300 piasters privately and 41,000 piasters as president urban development schemes on Sahat al-Burj. He developed the pine forest into a municipal park. He was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9.

38 Panayut Fakhuri

Geographical and confessional background: Maronite family with origins in Zahle, Bayt Shabab, Tripoli and Saida.

Residence and family connections: the Beirut branch shared common ancestry with the Malhames after the fall of Aqura in 1686.

Occupation: Panayut Fakhuri was registered as a general trader in 1889.

39 Milhim Fayyad

Geographical and confessional background: The Fayyads were Maronites originally from Dayr al-Qamar where they settled during the lifetime of the family’s forefather, Musa Abu Fayyad.

Residence and family connections: The Beirutis Fayyads had common ancestry with the Eddes. Some were descendents al-Hilu family. The Fayyads originally lived in Suq al-Qutn. Jabbur Fayyad, possibly Milhim’s uncle, invested in property in Shuwayyat. In the 1880s Milhim was considered head of the family.

Occupation: “The sons of Melhem Fayyad” were silk exporters (Ducosso). Niqua and Najib Fayyad, Salim and Jirji Lutfallah Fayyad registered as general trader in 1889. Jirji owned a pharmacy on Sahat al-Burj.

Ottoman career: Yusuf Na’ma Fayyad was member of the Provincial Council. His son Elias Fayyad (1872-1930) climbed the social ladder of the Ottoman bureaucratic hierarchy from head of police to member of the special courts and later to director of Education. His brother Dr. Niqua (1873-1958) was a director of Beirut’s telegraphs and postal service in the early 20th century. Khalil Fayyad was a property assessor in the Ottoman administration in 1900.

40 Wadih Fayyad

Wadih’s family relation to Milhim is unclear, possibly one of his sons, or a partnal cousin. He was married to Salma Bustrus, daughter of Habib al-Kabir Bustrus.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Wadih was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913.

41 Musa de Frayj
Geographical and confessional background: Hanna, the father of Musa, came to Beirut in 1860 via Palestine and Damascus. The Frayjs were Roman Catholics at Beirut’s Cappucin church and Ottoman subjects. Other branches were already established in Beirut before Musa’s branch arrived.

Residence and family connections: Niquia Frayj owned a share of waqf property around the Saray mosque until 1843. Musa married to extremely beautiful and fashionable daughter of George Laurella, Austrian consul and municipal member. The couple was at the heart of Beirut social life. Musa had two sons, Jean and Dr. Salim (a Syrian Protestant College medical school graduate). The Frayj residence in Zuqaq al-Blat was a landmark building at the time. The German consulate moved into the building in the early 20th century. The Frayj’s illustrious neighbours were the Nammurs, Farajallahs, Mukhayyishs, Hunaynas, Ziades, Chihas and al-Khuris. Together with the Phara’uns to whom they were related by marriage.

Occupation: The de Frayjs were land owners, bankers and investors, leading silk and cotton merchant. Salim Frayj was the third dragoman at Austrian consulate at the turn of the 19th century.

Ottoman career: Musa was a highly decorated Ottoman bureaucrat. He was active in municipal projects under Midhat Pasha and Fakhri Bey’s time. He donated 2,270 piasters to urban improvement schemes and in the mid 1890s was a member of the board of the gas works company. In the early 1900s, Musa obtained the concession for coal explorations in Jazzin.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Musa’s active political life spanned the period between the civil war in Mount Lebanon and World War I. He was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865, a member of the 1867-9 SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913 and he contributed regularly Bustani’s journal to al-Jinan.

Geographical and confessional background: The Ghabril family was either Greek Orthodox or Maronite from Hasbaya and Bayt Shabab who worked for the al-Khazens in the eighteenth century, and later as friends of the Shihabi Emirs.

Residence and family connections: They had common ancestry with the Naffa’s, Azzars, Ayyubs, Bitars. Occupation: Yusuf & Mikha’il were registered as general traders in 1889. Mikha’il Gobril was a stock broker in 1908.

Ottoman career: Mikha’il Ghabril was a member of Beirut’s commercial court in 1910.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ibrahim was a member of BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913. He was also the author of a local history of Bayt Shabab.

Geographical and confessional background: one of the Sunni families revered to have come from Morocco. They came to Beirut via Tripoli as a minor branch of the Mufti ‘Abd al-Latif Fatahallah (1766-1844). In the 19th century, the Fatahallahs declined in importance vis à vis the Gandurs. Mustafa al-kabir Ghandur-Fatahallah lived in a landmark mansion in the city centre. His children were involved in the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

Residence and family connections: originally the Gandurs resided in the Suq Nuriyya. In the second half of the 19th century they built Suq al-Ghandur and wikala Ghandur in Suq Ayyas near Sahat al-Samak which was demolished by the 1894 street alignment project.

Occupation: Hajj Hassan al-Ghandur was a merchant “with an extremely lucky hand”. Gandur & brothers were traders of European goods with a branch in Tripoli. Abd al-Basit, ‘Umar and Rashid Gandur were sweets and perfume merchants in Suq al-’Atarin and Suq al-Qutn. Sa’ad al-Din and Abd al-Ghani were manufacture merchants in Suq al-Biyatra. Some were grain merchants in 1908, and by the 1920s and 30s the Gandurs became the leading industrialist family of Lebanon.

Ottoman career: Sa’ad al-Din was head of the court of first instance, but no records of other family members could be traced.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Mustafa’s grandfather petitioner for Beirut, as was Sa’ad Ghandur.

Ottoman career: Musa was a highly decorated Ottoman bureaucrat. He was active in municipal projects under Midhat Pasha and Fakhri Bey’s time. He donated 2,270 piasters to urban improvement schemes and in the mid 1890s was a member of the board of the gas works company. In the early 1900s, Musa obtained the concession for coal explorations in Jazzin.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Musa’s active political life spanned the period between the civil war in Mount Lebanon and World War I. He was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865, a member of the 1867-9 SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913 and he contributed regularly Bustani’s journal to al-Jinan.

42 al-Khuri Ibrahim Ghabril

43 al-Hajj Mustafa Ghandur

44 Misbah Ghandur

45 Muhi al-Din Ghandur

46 Muhi al-Din Hamada
Residence and family connections: the Hamadas settled in Suq Bazarkan under Ibrahim Pasha’s rule. In mid-century, the family moved to Zuqaq al-Blat with the Bayhums. where the American mission rented another Hamada mansion for their school. Muhi al-Din’s father, ‘Abd al-Fattah Agha (d. 1858), was Bash Kapusc of Beirut in the 1830s and Mutassalim of Beirut in the 1840s and 50s. He initiated the reforestation of the Hursh region south of Beirut. Muhi al-Din had three brothers: Muhammad Bey, Sa’ad, and Hajj ‘Abd al-Rahman Hamada.

Occupation: Muhi al-Din Hamada was director of Khedival Line in 1911.

Ottoman career: Muhi al-Din was a career bureaucrat and became Beirut’s third municipal president, after obtaining the highest vote in the 1884 elections.

Sa’ad Hamada was the head of the Beirut chamber of commerce for twenty years. ‘Abd al-Rahman’s son, Khalil Pasha, was director of Awqaf in Istanbul in the Young Turk period. ‘Abd al-Ra’uf, Muhammad Bey’s son, was a doctor practicing in Bashura, Beirut, and in the municipal hospital together with Rafiq Baydun. Muhi al-Din’s eldest son was the director of the customs office in Beirut in 1903. Muhi al-Din took part in infrastructural committees in the 1890s.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Sa’ad Hamada was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865 and a founding member of the 1875 Jam’iyyat al-Funun. Muhi al-Din was member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

47 Bishara al-Hani (d. 1895)

Geographical and confessional background: The Hanis were Maronites originally from Ehden. Later they moved south to Ghazir and Zuq Mikha’il in the 16th century before settled in Beirut in the mid-19th century.

Residence and family connections: The Hanis were landowners and merchants. They built Suq Ra’ad & Hani in the eastern part of the city centre.

Occupation: Prominent merchants with a number of business ventures, Ra’ad & Hani and Hani & Azar brothers were general traders in 1889. Audi & Hani were cloth merchants in 1908. Abdallah Hani was a metal and glass merchant in 1908.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ra’ad & Hani invested 2,000 piasters in the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj in 1878. Bishara al-Hani was involved in the 1890-campaign to make Beirut the Syrian railhead.

48 Yusuf al-Hani

Residence and family connections: Bishara’s son and Najib al-Hani’s brother.

Occupation: Absentee landowner.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Yusuf al-Hani was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913 and was one of the ‘matyrs’ hanged by Jamal Pasha during World War I for high treason.

49 ‘Abd al-Rahman ‘Itani (d. 1897)

Geographical and confessional background: Originally the dominant family line of the Bayhums, the ‘Itanis were a long-standing Beiruti family with a legendary claim back to Spanish Andalusia from where they fled to North Africa and Istanbul after the fall of Granada. Ibrahim Pasha al-‘Itani became grand vizier under Suleyman the Magnificent at the beginning of the 16th century. Active in urban administration since the early 18th century, one ‘Itani was the Beirut portmaster in the 1750s. The ‘Itanis also shared common ancestry with al-Huss, Jallul and Ghandur.

Occupation: ‘Abd al-Rahman ‘Itani registered as general trader in 1889. Abd al-Qadir was a metal merchant in 1889. Ahmad ‘Itani had a paper factory attached to the Jesuit printing press.

Ottoman career: Najib ‘Itani was a member of the Provincial Council and tried to cultivate rice in Mount Lebanon. ‘Abd al-Rahman was a property assessor in the provincial administration in 1888. Shaykh Muhammad Yusuf ‘Itani was a leading figure in education and religious teaching at the end of the nineteenth century.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: ‘Abd al-Rahman was a petitioner for Beirut and member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9 while a generation later in 1913, Najib ‘Itani was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE.

50 Yusuf Jadday

Geographical and confessional background: This family had Greek Orthodox and Catholic branches, and descended from a small but long established family in Beirut. Some members of the family emigrated to Egypt at the end of the 19th century.

Residence and family connections: Yusuf Habib al-urthuduski was reported to have owned the most beautiful house in the Syrian regions (fi-l-aqtar al-shamiyya) in 1862, according to the poet al-Yaziji. His
mansion was the residence of a number of high Ottoman officials in the 1860s and 70. as Yusuf became the imperial lodger (nazil al-ustana).

Occupation: Yusuf’s son, Mikha’il Ghantus, was a dragoman for the Danish consulate and, according to Isa Ma luf, Yusuf’s descendents were among the largest merchants in Beirut in 1908. The families Jadday and Mi’ mari joined as traders in European goods in 1911. Iskander (master of the guild) and Bishara Jadday were leading Jewelers and goldsmiths.

Ottoman career: Yusuf had the second highest votes after Hamada in the 1884 municipal elections: other family notables (Nakhla and Spiridun) obtained Ottoman medals.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Yusuf Jadday invested 200 piasters in the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj in 1878. Yusuf’s cousin, the poet Salim Jadday (d. 1895) co-owned the journal al-Thuruyya in Cairo.

51 Misbah Jubayli
Geographical and confessional background: Yunis Nikula al-Jubayli – or Abu ‘Askar (d.1787), the family’s ancestor – established the first printing press in the St. George monastery in Lebanon in 1751. He helped built a number of Greek Orthodox churches in Beirut and later Ahmad al-Jazzar made him the director of the customs council. After Abu ‘Askar’s death his brother Nikula became head of the family before one Fadlallah took over in the 1860s. Nothing is known about Misbah personally.

Residence and family connections: In 1876, 23 Jubaylis were registered in the Greek Orthodox archbishopry, amongst them. The Jubaylis married into the St. Niqua/Jemmayze aristocracy and lived there.

Occupation: At the end of the 19th century, Salim Efendi, his sons and the sons of Nikula’s paternal uncle – especially Theodore Efendi were eminent merchants of silk. Mikha’il registered as general trader in 1889.

52 Rizqallah Khadra (1834-1904)
Geographical and confessional background: Originally from Bisharre, this Maronite family moved to Zuq Mikha’il in the early 18th century. Antun Khadra al-Zuqi was the founding father of this branch and made a living as supply agent for the emir As’ad Shihab. His son Nakhla was an engineer in the service of Amir Haydar Abi Lama (1843-54).

Residence and family connections: the Khadras were an early family offshoot of the ‘Aridhas. Close family ties with Yusuf Karam and As’ad Malhama led to his son Yusuf Malhama’s marriage to Khadra’s daughter Warda (Rose). The Khadra brothers were influential in Lebanon and France. The sons of Nakhla maintained close contacts with the French consul and the royalist Catholic circles. In the 1860s Dominique Khadra, who for a while was Karam Bey’s principle agent in France, was a dragoman under the French consul Bentivoglio and assisted Ernest Renan’s oeuvre Mission de Phénicie. Rizqallah Khadra was Karam Bey’s financial agent in Beirut.

The Khadras were agents for the influential Abbé Charles Lavigerie who organised relief work for the Oeuvre des Ecoles d’Orient in 1860. The Khadras oversaw the distribution of French donations to survivors of the 1860 civil war.

Occupation: Rizqallah registered a general trader in 1889.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Aged 18, Rizqallah became a member of the Beirut Oriental society in 1852 and owner of the General Press in Beirut. Rizqallah was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in the late 1860s. In the 1870s Rizqallah took part in committees for infrastructural projects in Beirut.

53 Mahmud al-Khawja
Geographical and confessional background: The Khawjas came to Beirut from Damascusas Ottoman officials in the course of the nineteenth century. Mahmud’s geographical background and residence patters represent an oddity, since they did not settle in Beirut permanently. Mahmud was municipal president in Damascus in 1898 – only six years after he sat on the Beirut municipal council.

Residence and family connection: The Khawjas lived in a mansion in al-Bashura.

Occupation: Mahmud ibn al-Sayyid Rashid Khawja and his brother Muhammad Ali al-Khawja were registered as general trader in 1889. Another brother, Muhammad Khawja, had business ties in Damascus with the Maronite dragoman at the German consulate in Damascus, Bishara Asfar.

Ottoman career: Mahmud al-Khawja was member of Beirut’s penal court of appeal in the late 19th century.

54 Nasrallah Khayyat
Geographical and confessional background: The origins of this Armenian Catholic family are unknown. The Khayyat’s appear to have lived in Beirut since at least a generation before Nasrallah was born.

Residence and family connections: Khalil Pasha Khayyat was a notable of Beirut. One family branch was from Zahle, and the Beirut branch was probably originally from Malta as al-Mu’ allim Yusuf Khayyat,
resident in Suq al-Qutn, was registered as al-Malti – the Maltese – in 1843. Family connections to As'ad Khayyat, the travel writer and Arabic teacher in Cambridge in mid-19th century could not be established.

**Occupation:** In 1889, Nasrallah Khayyat was a banker in Khan Shaqqak and a consular agent of Portugal. In 1908, he ran a large silk exporting company.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Elias Yusuf Khayyat was a petitioner for Beirut in 1865.

55 **George Laurella**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Of Italian-Austrian origins, his father Pietro was a medical doctor who was commissioned to investigate the plague that hit Syria in 1827/8. Pietro was the first to offer vaccination in Beirut. According to French travelers, he had been living in Beirut for 40 years representing all nations as consul in Beirut since 1808 before he mysteriously disappeared in 1841.

**Residence and family connection:** A certain Louis de Laurella was delegate of the Shuf (earning 23,000 piasters per year) and employed by Austrian Lloyd in 1862. Another Laurella is listed as the representative on Trieste insurance company in 1902. George Laurella’s daughter married Musa de Frayje in the 1880s.

56 **Nakhla Mudawwar**

**Geographical and confessional background:** This Greek Catholic family was originally from Hamamat in the northern district of Kura. They first moved to Zuq Mika'il at the end of the 17th century.

**Residence and family connections:** In the early 19th century the Mudawwars moved to Beirut where they became Ottoman trade representatives – or Avrupa Tuccari – in 1851. Six brothers, Mikha'il, Khalil, Nikula, Nakhla, Hanna, Nasrallah (?) settled east of the Beirut port in what became to be known as Hayy Mudawwar. Some were financial advisors to Maronite Mountain shaykhs of Kisrawan in family politics. This generation exemplified the way the emerging merchant bourgeoisie strategically placed itself in culture, politics and trade. According to contemporary French sources, “the six brothers are members of this government, each in their capacity: one administers the rural holdings, which are considerable; two others direct the complicated affairs of commerce and the correspondence; a fourth is in finance and the last two are in charge of the relations with the city and legal issues.”

**Occupation:** In the 1850s the Mudawwars experimented successfully with red-dye cochineal in and around Beirut and obtained the exclusive concession to cultivate their invention in all of Syria. Dr. Nakhla was municipal doctor in the 1870s and 1880s and owned a practice in Rumayl/Mudawwar. Ibrahim Mudawwar was also a medical doctor with a practice in Dahdah. Other Mudawwars were patrons of Arabic literature and education.

57 **Mikha'il Mudawwar (d. 1882)**

**Occupation:** In the 1850s, Mikha'il was a power broker in mountain politics. He was a vital link of communication between the Ottoman governor general, the Druzes and the Maronites. His anti-Maronite stance during the civil war brought him a smear campaign by bishop 'Awn. Meanwhile, his brother Niqula, was busy warning Tannus Shahin, the rebel leader from Rayfun, against crossing into the Druze qaimaqamate.

After the war, the Mudawwars abandoned the ‘politics of the mountain’ and focussed on urban politics and trade. Mikha'il traveled extensively in Europe. On return from Europe, Mikha'il invested in land in the Biqa'a, Acre and Tyre. In the 1870s, he was involved in water and irrigation projects on Nahr al-Kalb. The Mudawwars had business representatives in Haifa and family members on its city council.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** In 1858, Mikha'il co-founded and funded Hadikat al-Akhbar with Khalil al-Khuri. He was author of many books, a journalist and a petitioner for Beirut in 1865. His brother Nasrallah was a member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9.

58 **As'ad Malhama**

**Geographical and confessional background:** This family was probably originally Druze from the Abu Ghayth clan. The Malhamas claimed ancestry to the northern mountain village of ‘Aqura which was sacked in the 17th century during the power struggle between Ottoman and local factions. After dispersing from ‘Aqura, Jabbur Abu Ghaith took the name al-Malhama for his military achievements. Jabbur was also the Malhama who adopted the Maronite faith at the end of the 17th century.

A Syrian ‘Odyssey took the Malhamas to the Hawran, Tripoli and finally, at the end of the 18th century, to Beirut. In the mid-19th century some Malhames lived in Alexandria with other prominent Beirut Maronites, such as al-Khadra, Marza, Naqqash, Surati, Thabit and Hunayna.

**Residence and family connections:** When the Malhamas arrived in Beirut, they appear to have moved not into the city centre but to the ‘Shalfun’ orchards just south of the old city walls which after more settlement became known as Hay Dahdah or Hay Ghalghul. Close to Sahat al-Burj and as of 1863 the Damascus
Road, a number of notables related to the Malhamas (Bassul, Shalfun, Misk and Tarrazi) built their mansions in the orchards of this burgeoning quarter. It also became the residence of the Filles de la Charité and the Lazarists who built a charity complex consisting of an orphanage, a hospital and school bought from the Bassuls.

The Malhamas' property holdings in Beirut increased steadily in the second half of the 19th century. In the 1860s, As'ad Malhame extended his residence in Ghalghul to a luxurious two-story central hall house with fashionable triple-arched windows. Another Malhama property in Ghalghul, that of Bulus, became the residence of the Maronite bishop Tubiyya ‘Awn before the construction of the Maronite cathedral of St. George was completed in 1888. By the 1890s, the Malhamas had emerged as unusually dispersed property owners in Beirut. The As’ad branch owned family residences on the cliffs on the Eastern coastline in the quarter of Rumayl which became the residence of the British consul before the Hotel d’Angleterre bought it after 1908.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** A member of “Young Maronites” As’ad was involved in the politics of the Mountain during the civil war in Mount Lebanon. He was also a close ally and friend of Karam Bey whose revolt in 1866 he supported. After Karam Bey’s defeat and exile, As’ad and his Maronite allies turned their attention to the politics of the city. Having petitioned for Beirut in 1865, As’ad became involved in municipal politics and was appointed to the municipal council in 1878 having donated 2,000 piasters to the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj. As’ad Malhama endowed his fortune to a family trust for the education of the sons and daughters of the Malhamas. The first to benefit from his generosity was his nephew Salim Malhame. As’ad’s stipends provided for Salim’s early years in Istanbul before he became an influential bureaucrat at Yıldız Palace and the Minister of Agriculture, Mines and Forests in 1892.

**Niqula Manassa**
*Geographical and confessional background:* originally from Beirut and Tyre, they were protestants since the mid-19th century. Bishara Manassa was an Ottoman Medical School graduate in 1877.

*Occupation:* Niqula Manassa was registered as a general trader in 1889 and a textile merchant in 1908.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Niqula was a founding member of the Oriental Society in Beirut in 1847.

**Jirji Mi’mari**
*Geographical and confessional background:* Greek Orthodox originally from Saida, this family registered in the Beirut bishopry as second generation immigrant from Syria.

*Occupation:* Rubayz & Mi’mari were registered as general traders in 1889.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Jirji Mi’mari was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

**Muhammad Sa’id Bey Mukhayyish**
*Geographical and confessional background:* This Sunni family was originally from Damascus and settled in Beirut probably in the mid-19th century.

*Residence and family connections:* they built a large mansion in Zuqaq al-Blat that championed joint insignium of Ottoman and free mansion heraldry in 1897.

*Ottoman career:* Salim Bey Mukhayyish was showered with Ottoman medals of honour. Amin Pasha, his father, was on the Provincial Council in 1899 and 1904. The family entertained excellent contacts in Istanbul and had some role in the Grand Hotel de Pera.

*Occupation:* Mukhayyish Bros. were registered as general trader in 1889. Merchant Amin Pasha Mukhayyish & Bros, Mukhayyish & Karkash and Sa’id Mukhayyish registered separately as textile merchants in 1908 and traded with Manchester.

**Nakhla Bey Naffa**
Maronites originally from the Hawran, one branch moved with the Shihabis to Mount Lebanon, another was related to the Ghabril family. The Naffa’s were writers in the 18th century, and inventors and military technicians under Abdülhamid II.

**Jirji Naqqash**
*Geographical and confessional background:* This Maronite family moved from Acre/Saida to Beirut. Jirji’s father was Habib. Niqua, Jirji’s uncle was born in Beirut 1825 the year the family moved from Saida and died in Beirut in 1894.

*Residence and family connections:* In Beirut, the Naqqashs lived in Jemmaya and Hay Qirat, but they held properties on the southern side of Sahat al-Burj which later became Cinema Metropol opposite Empire
cinema. Jirji emigrated to Egypt at the turn of the 19th century. Niqula was a “Young Maronite” around 'Amin in 1860.

**Ottoman career:** Niqula Naqash was the brother of the famous playwright Marun Naqqash. He was also an Ottoman parliamentarian in 1877 where he lobbied for the creation of the province of Beirut. Niqula’s by-name was al-qammi or al-nizami for his translations of Ottoman laws into Arabic. Habib was a provincial assessor in 1888. Jean Bey and Dawud Naqqash received several medals from the Ottoman government.

**Occupation:** The family bought a large silk itizam in the 1840s and was registered as a minor silk exporter in Ducosso’s 1913 study. In the early 1870s, Jirji was dragoman of the Austrian consulnat in Beirut. Dr. Antun Naqqash had a practice on Tarik al-Nahr, in East Beirut. Niqula was a lawyer with an office in al-Qirat, Ashrafiyya. Jean Naqqash was also a lawyer supporting Beirut’s striking industrial worker in the early 20th century.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Marun was the founder of Arabic theatre. Niqula was the author of *Arzat Lubnan*, 1869. Their nephew Jirji was a journalist and co-founder of al-Mishbah in Egypt. Brothers Habib (and sons), Nikula and Yusuf signed the Beirut petition in 1865, as did Abd al-Rahman al-Naqqash from the Muslim branch in an otherwise Maronite family. Jean was member of BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

**Abd al-Qadir Na’mani**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Originally from Saida, some Na’manis moved to Beirut in the early 19th century. Nothing is known about Abd al-Qadir outside his municipal membership.

**Residence and family connections:** Upon arrival in Beirut, grandfather Husni Na’mani lived in Suq al-Iseke, near the ‘Umari mosque.

**Occupation:** The Na’manis were waqf administrators for two intramural complexes. Muhammad & Amin Na’mani were general traders in 1889. Abd al-Fattah Na’mani was a co-founder of the Beirut-Saida carriageway in 1902.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Muhammad and Darwish Na’mani were petitioners for Beirut in 1865. Abd al-Rahman was a founding member of the Maqasid society in Beirut and Muhammad in Saida in 1878. Hasan was a member of BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913 and defended the portworkers in the 1907 strike.

**Taha Nasuli**

**Geographical and confessional background:** The Nasulis were Sunnis of Anatolian origins with long-standing residency in Beirut.

**Residence and family connections:** Taha was the main ‘alim of the family in the 19th century. He moved to al-Zarif in the late 19th century and was a political ally of the Da’uqs and Salams.

**Occupation:** Between the 1890s and 1908 Shaykh Taha, Muhi al-Din Nasuli & Arakci and sons owned a Glass factory in Suq Abi Nasr off Sahat Burj. Nasuli & Kharma were general traders in 1889. Zakhariyya and Kamil Nasuli were textile merchants in 1908.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Taha was a member of the Maqasid society. Muhi al-Din Nasuli was the editor in chief of the official *Bayrut Gazettesi*.

**Sa’ad al-Din Pasha al-Qabbani**

**Geographical and confessional background:** The Qabbanis were Sunnis from the Hijaz and later Iraq who migrated to Acre in the late 18th century. When Acre fell to Ibrahim Pasha’s army, Mustafa Agha, the father of Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani, was sent to Egypt to recover. He left Cairo for Istanbul where the government lavished him with state insignia. He waited in Cyprus for Ibrahim Pasha to leave Syria and settled in Beirut in 1840.

**Residence and family connections:** Sa’ad al-Din Pasha was a brother of Mustafa Agha. Grandfather Ahmad Hussayan al-Qabbani left his family a waqf in the Suq al-Haddadin/port area. In the 1840s the Qabbanis lived in Suq al-Atar in the port. They were neighbours of Muhammad Salam and Abd al-Qadir al-Arish. One Dr. Hassan al-Qabbani had a medical practice in Basta Tahta in 1908.

**Ottoman career:** Sa’ad al-Din Pasha al-Qabbani was elected to Beirut’s Provincial Council in 1892. Sa’ad al-Din was forth highest ranked bureaucrat in the province of Beirut in 1892, after the Malhamas and Ahmad al-Sulh Pasha.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Sa’ad al-Din was a member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9. Muhammad ‘Ali al-Qabbani was an editor of Beirut’s *Rawdat al-Ma’arif* in 1908.

**al-Shaykh Abd al-Qadir al-Qabbani** (b. Beirut, 1847-1935)
Residence and family connections: Like other future municipal presidents, 'Abd al-Qadir studied at Bustani's Madrassa al-Wataniyya. Later he studied under the influential Beirut 'ulim Ahmad Abbas al-Azhari.

Occupation: Having been active in education, welfare, journalism and publishing for over thirty years, he established a public construction company in the early 20th century and entered the emerging oil business after WWI.

Ottoman career: 'Abd al-Qadir served on the liva (or sub-province) council for Beirut in the 1880s, and on the council of education from 1899. In 1906 he became its director. He was a councilor in the provincial court of appeals in 1888 and took part in local infrastructural planning committees in the 1890s. In 1898, he became municipal president an office he held for three years during which he led the planning for the construction of the Ottoman clocktower and the fountain on Sahat al-Sur for the silver jubilee of Abdulhamid II. That year he also supervised the city’s preparations for Emperor William II’s visit. He initiated the construction of the municipal hospital in Ramlat Zarif. Having suffered a sustained campaign against his integrity by leading 'ulama he was forced to resign his presidency to 'Abd al-Rahman Baydun and, in 1902, al-Qabbani was made director of public instruction by the governor general. He was considered closely linked to the Hamidian regime, and fell out of Ottoman favour under the Young Turks.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: He co-founded al-Jami iyyat al-Funun in 1874-5 with Hajj Sa'ad Hamada, and became editor-in-chief of the society’s journal Thamarat al-Funun. Beirut’s Maqasid society was founded in his house in Zuqaq al-Blat in 1878. He continued on the provincial board of education after it absorbed the Maqasid society in 1880. He supervised the building of al-Madrasa al-Sultaniyya in Beirut in 1896 and published a book on teachers’ training, Kitab al-hijja’ li-talim al-atfal which went through numerous editions. He was also the president of al-Jami a al-‘Uthmaniyya in 1909.

68 Muhi al-Din al-Qadi

Geographical and confessional background: There were Druzes and Christian al-Qadis, but this branch was Sunni. It is likely that al-Qadis share common ancestry with the Da’uos. Abu Sa’ad Da’uq had once arbitrated between two conflicting parties and the name al-Qadi stuck ever since.

Ottoman career: Muhi al-Din took part in 1890-meeting to make Beirut tête de la ligne of the railway at Muhi al-Din Bayhum’s and was on the 1895 committee for the old city’s street piercing project. Ahmad al-Qadi was property assessor in the provincial administration in 1888.

Occupation: Muhi al-Din was registered a general trader in 1889 was was ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Qadi. Hassan al-Qadi was a dean of the Ottoman school and a steel-merchant with Ahmad al-Qadi in the Young Turk period.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Nur al-Qadi was a member of the Decentralization Party in the 1910s.

69 Na’um Qaykanu (1824-1891)

Geographical and confessional background: A Maronite family from ‘Aqura like the Thabits and the Malhames. Some Qayquans moved to Tripoli some to ‘Ayntura and from there most members migrated to Beirut, while other branches settled in Kisrawan, Bilad Jubayl, Matn, Zaffa, the Biqa’a and Beirut. According to Antun Bishara Qaykanu (Usra Qayqanu), the family was one of the oldest in Beirut residing in Ghalghul as early as the 14th century before emigrating in the 15th. In the beginning of the 17th century, Yuhanna Qaykanu returned from Tripoli Beirut, in the service of the Abi Lama’ clan. After his grandson Shahin’s death, his widow sold the Ghlaghul property built four mansions with gardens outside the town, three of which were later donated as waqf to the St. George church. At the beginning of the 19th century, like many other rich Christian families, the Qayquans left Beirut for the mountain to avoid corsair attack and state taxation. Shahin’s three sons, Yusuf, Mikha’il and Jirjis moved to ‘Abadiyya (al-Fanar), north of Beirut to be closer to their properties in Beirut.

Residence and family connections: Yusuf was married and had 20 boys and girls. The most distinguished of which were Na’um who came to Beirut in 1838, and Nahkla (1831-1896). Both were trained at the prestigious ‘Ayntura school and became merchants in Beirut. Mikha’il’s most distinguished sons were Bishara (1851-1928) and Yusuf (1862-1936). Antun was of the first generation of local engineers, such as Yusuf Elias, Amin Abd al-Nur and Albert Naqqash involved in the construction of roads in Mount Lebanon.

Occupation: The Qaykanus drew their family wealth from being rentiers. Yusuf Qaykanu was a teacher at the Ecoles Royales Italiennes in Beirut, and Najib Qaykanu was a registered painter in Beirut.

Ottoman career: Na’um Qaykanu was a member on various courts in the provincial administration and had to resign from the Maronite league in order to be eligible to take municipal office.
Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Na'um supported port workers strike with Jean Be
Naqqash in 1907/8.

Yusuf Quyumcu

Geographical and confessional background: This Maronite family arrived in Beirut in the early nineteenth
century. It belonged to the parish of St. Elie (like Bassul. Hunayna. Nammur. etc). Yusuf was baptised
there.

Edmond Perthuis

Geographical and confessional background: The father of Gaston and Guy. two generations of French
entrepreneurs in Beirut. A staunch Orleanist, Edmond was opposed to Napoleonic intervention and
particularly general Beaufort in Mount Lebanon in 1860. His infrastructural development plans earned him
the local nickname “emir of the road.”

Residence and family connections: When the de Perthuis left Beirut in 1899 they sold their three villas in
Qantari.

Occuptation: director of the Beirut-Damascus road. representative of the Marseille-based shipping
company Messager Maritime. director of the “Companie Imperiale Ottomane de la Route de Beyrout à
Damas”, the “Companie des Chemins de Fer” and the Beirut port company.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Donated 227 piasters to the municipal development of
Sahat al-Burj in 1878 but was criticised publicly for trying to gain a monopoly on public transport at the
expense of the municipality.

Umar Ramadan

Geographical and confessional background: Sunnis of Anatolian descent. the Ramadans settled in Tartus
between the 14th and 16th centuries.

Residence and family connections: the Sunni branch lived in Suq Bazarkan in the mid-18th century. In 1843
the family registered a waqf endowment in the name of Umar’s father, Amin Agha Ramadan. His paternal
uncles Abd al-Rahman and Abd al-Ghani Ramadan were Beirutis Sayyids.

Ottoman career: Abd al-Ghani Efendi “had ten notable sons most of them in the Ottoman civil service”
according to an Egyptian traveler in the 1880s. Amin Agha Ramadan had been in the Egyptian urban
commission for Beirut under Ibrahim Pasha, while his son Umar Agha became member of the advisory council
in the province of Syria a generation later. Arif Bey Ramadan was a clerk in the grand vezir’s office.

Munih Bey was the municipal inspector and then the president of the eastern sector of the Beirut
municipality after the shake-up of 1909.

Occupation: Sa’ad al-Din Ramadan was registered as General Trader in 1889 and as textile merchants in
1908. A graduate of the Medical School in Istanbul Dr. Sami Sa’ad al-Din was a general prosecutor of the
province of Beirut.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Abd al-Rahman and Abd al-Ghani Ramadan were
petitioners for Beirut in 1865. Salim was a member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9.

Ahmad and Umar were active in funding the municipal development of Sahat al-Burj in 1878. Mahmud
Bey was one of the founding members of the Maqasid Society in 1878. Sa’ad al-Din was a member of
BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE, 1913.

Jirji Bey Rizqallah

Geographical and confessional background: the Greek Orthodox Rizqallah family claims ancestry to Malik
Abu Ghayth, lord of al-‘Aqura in the 17th century. After the Ottoman governor destroyed the town, they,
like the Malhames and other inhabitants, dispersed. Of the Saida branch. Jabbur Bey was a pharmacist at
the turn of the 19th century. Abdallah and his son Salim were rare Beirut-born Mukkiye graduates and
probably originally from Aleppo.

Residence and family connections: The Beirut branch was descendent from the Tuwayni family.

Occupation: Habib Rizqallah was the first local hotel owner in Beirut and a dragoman for the British
consulate in Beirut, and registered as general trader in 1889. Some Rizqallah descendents were working for
the Greek and Russian consulates in the late 19th century.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Rizqallah Tuwayni was a petitioner for Beirut. Jirji’s
brother Nikula was a poet and an editor of al-Ahram in Cairo.

Bishara Sabbagh

Geographical and confessional background: Greek Orthodox, originally from Homs, later Marj’ayun. In
the eighteenth century, the Sabbagh family moved from Acre where Ibrahim Sabbagh became the doctor of
Zahir al-Umar, to Shuwayr and later Beirut. Ibrahim’s grandson, Mika’il ibn Nikula (1775-1818) became a
noted chronicler but had to flee with his father and brothers to the safety of Egypt after the Ottomans
pousted Zahir al-Umar. Subsequently, the Sabbaghs worked for the Egyptian government and some returned to Beirut with Ibrahim Pasha’s army in the 1830s. Nothing is known of Bishara Sabbagh who appears to have been a junior figure in a generation of international entrepreneurs and bankers.

**Occupation:** Habib, Ibrahim and Elias were Greek Orthodox traders in Damascus and Beirut. Antun Bey Sabbagh (chairman), I. Sabbagh and N. B. Hani were directors of the “National Hotel and Residences Company” with a capital of £ 200,000 which built the Grand Hotel at Sofar. Ibrahim (d. 1909) and his brother Elias owned a bank with a capital of 5 million francs. Ibrahim was shareholder of the Beirut gas company and owned 4,000 shares of the Beirut-Damascus railway. He took over the gas company in 1903 and became its president in 1908. His brother Elias was vice-president in 1904 and became president after Ibrahim’s death. I. Sabbagh was on the boards of directors in the Banque Paris-Pays Bas.

**Ottoman Career:** Nasrallah Sabbagh was a board member of Ottoman Agricultural Bank in 1900s.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Jirji Dimitri and Niquula Sabbagh contributed to local investment funds for urban improvement in 1878. Jirji was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

**Sa’id Sabbagha**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Maronites, originally registered in Beirut’s Bab Dirka.

**Residence and family connections:** friends with the Tuwaynis and the Jahil family. Elias & Raful Sabbagh registered as cotton, silk, wool merchant. Lutfallah and Fadhul were merchants of goods from Istanbul.

**Occupation:** Nasrallah was the director of Beirut’s gas depot.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Sa’id was a journalist and a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913.

**Zayn Kamil Salam**

**Geographical and confessional background:** The Salams were the ideal-typical urban Sunni upstarts of the Young Turk era and the leading za‘im family in the 20th century, but this family branch is unaccounted for in Beirut’s historiography.

**Residence and family connection:** A possible genealogical trajectory is that Zayn Kamil was a descendent of al-Hajj Muhammad Salam. Muhammad Salam was a respected resident in the Zaqiyya al-Qutn in Suq al-‘Atarin and neighbour of ‘Abd al-Qadir al-‘Ariss, the Miqatis and the Qabbanis.

**Occupation:** Zayn Salam and Sons is registered as general trader in 1889. Salim Ali Salam and Brothers had a separate entry, as did the ‘alim ‘Abd al-Rahman (b. 1867 or 1871) and Mustafa Salam.

**Khudr Bey al-Shaj’an**

Nothing is known about about origin of the Shaj’ans. Probably Sunnis, they were not registered in the city waqfs as residents inside Beirut.

**Ottoman career:** One Muhammad al-Shaj’an was an elected member of the majlis al-liwa in 1882-3. Khudr Bey received Ottoman medals as a notable (wajih) of Beirut in 1908. He was member of the court of appeal in 1901.

**Occupation:** Muhammad Amin al-Shaj’an was a general trader in 1889.

**Jirji Na’ma Shuwayri**

**Geographical and confessional background:** originally Greek Orthodox from Aleppo, they dispersed to Damur, Hadath and Antelias.

**Residence and family connections:** in the 19th century, the Shuwayri clan was registered in Beirut’s Greek Orthodox arch bishopry.

**Occupation:** Niquula and Faddul Shuwayri were registered as genral merchants in 1889.

**Iskandar Sursuq**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Originally this Greek Orthodox family was from near Jubayl, and a branch of the ‘Awn family. The forefather, Jabbur Sursuq, migrated to Beirut in 1712. Jabbur’s sons were Fadhul, Mikha’il, Yunis and Nassur. The Nassur branch of the Sursuqs underwent the “most spectacular social climb in the nineteenth century” (Fawaz, 91). By 1832, his son, Dimitri (b. 1810s), had attracted the attention of the Egyptian government as “private merchant”.

**Residence and family connections:** Iskandar was the son of Elias Sursuq, a cousin of the main Sursuq branch and married Farida Tuwayni.

Shakir Khuri wrote in 1908: “the Sursuqs did not use to be as rich as they are today [1907], but the family earned its wealth in 1836 from their trade with Egypt” (415). Khuri continued: “The family is divided into six houses [Dimitri’s sons Nikula, Musa, Lutfallah, Khalil, Yusuf, Ibrahim – the other three sons died in infancy], all of them so rich that each one of them is said to have an [annual] income of 30-40,000 piasters.”
The leading Sursuq branch was that of Nassur (b. 1810s). Nikula, the oldest grandson of Nassur, was the head of the family in the 1860s and his younger brother Yusuf took over in the 1880s. Nikula Dimitri and his sons lived in Suq al-Arwam, inside the eastern part of the old town. They later built in its place the Suq Sursuq with the stones of the ruined castle of Fakhr al-Din. In the middle of the 19th century, Nikula and his brothers still lived under one roof in their family villa in Jemayze.

During long residencies in Cairo and Alexandria in the 1860s, the Sursuqs used their business wealth to cultivate friendships with the Egyptian Khedives Sa'id and Isma'il. The Sursuqs managed to procure major shareholdings in the Suez canal. When the brothers returned from Egypt (and Manchester) between the 1870s and 80s, Nikula (married to Marie Saffi), Musa (married to Ana Daghir), Lutfallah (married to Zafiyaa Bustrus), Khalil (married to Meha Debbas), Yusuf (married to Malaka Khuri) and Ibrahim (married to Katba Daghir) began building villas for their own families, effectively urbanising the area east of Sahat al-Burj with other in-married families (like the Jubayli and the Tuwaynis). Endogamous inter-marriage and strong business connections turned the eastern Jummayze/Mar Nikula quarter of Beirut into an elite residential quarter by the turn of the century. In order to perpetuate Greek Orthodox ownership in Jemayze there was a concerted effort among this intermarried elite to turn their property into Greek Orthodox communal waqf land.

The Hamidian generation of Sursuqs, like Jirji (1852-1913), the eldest son of Musa Dimitri and one of the leading politicians in Beirut in the 1890s entered Ottoman bureaucratic posts.

**Occupation:**
The Sursuqs were considered the wealthiest Beiruti merchants of the nineteenth century with investment companies and real estate holdings in numerous European and Eastern Mediterranean port-cities. Throughout the 19th century, subsequent generations of Sursuqs worked for foreign consulates in Beirut. First as Greek and Russian protégés they later worked as dragomans in the consulates of America, Russia, France, Germany and Iran.

**Ottoman career:** When in 1860-1 Fuad Pasha came to Beirut to reassert Ottoman rule over Bilad al-Sham, the Sursuqs signaled their Ottoman loyalty by flying Ottoman flags for the occasion from the top of their residences. Whereas the previous generation established the Sursuqs as an international merchant family, the generation born in the 1870s and 80s were placing themselves inside the Ottoman bureaucracy and received fashionable Ottoman ranks and medals. Alfred, Musa’s youngest son, was appointed secretary of the Ottoman embassy in Paris in 1902. Nakhla Musa and later Najib Yusuf were councillors of the Beirut chamber of commerce in the 1900s. Iskandar Elias was the treasurer of the Ottoman administration of Beirut’s port company. In 1908, Jirji Dimitri was the highest decorated Sursuq and a judge on Beirut’s court of appeal. Yusuf Dimitri was a member of the first Beirut Provincial Council in 1888. Later he was appointed as one of 12 Arab senators in Istanbul in 1914. Michel Ibrahim was a delegate in the third legislature of the Ottoman parliament in 1915.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Nikula and Lutfallah Sursuq signed the 1865 petition for Beirut. Dimitri was member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9. Iskandar Elias founded the Greek Orthodox benevolent society in 1868. Emilie Sursuq (the daughter of Khalil Dimitri) established the ‘Zahra al-Insan’ school in Beirut in 1880. Jirji Musa sat on the committee for the municipal port project. The ‘Khawajat Sursuq’ contributed to local infrastructural improvement and urban embellishment projects. Together with Muhammad Bayhum, Yusuf Dimitri was the president of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913. His son Albert Yusuf was a member of the Paris Arab conference in 1913.

80 **As‘ad Sursuq**
He was the eldest son of Jabbur, a minor family branch and was married to Salma Trad.

**Ottoman career:** As‘ad was elected to the provincial court of Justice in the 1900s.

81 **Nakhla Khalil Sursuq**
**Residence and family connections:** Like As‘ad, of the lesser Jabbur branch.

82 **Abd al-Hafiz Tabbara**
**Geographical and confessional background:** one of the ‘Moroccan Sunnis’ of Beirut, the Tabbaras came to Beirut in the 16th century and made a name for themselves as a family of ulama from the mid-18th century.

**Residence and family connections:** The Tabbara family consisted of six branches in Beirut. Mustafa Tabbara married Salim Salam’s aunt, Nafisa, and was also linked to al-Yafi shaykhs. The Tabbaras were prominent in intramural politics in mid-19th century Beirut where the family owned houses and a famous café near the port. At the turn of the century, Salim Tabbara was mukhtar for the intramural quarters of Raslan Fakhir and al-Dabbagh. They were business partners of the Ghandurs and the ‘Ariss. 340
Ottoman career: Muhammad Yahya Tabbara was council member on the Awqaf authority between 1904-08, as was Sa’d al-Din Tabbara. Another Muhammad Tabbara was an elected member on the court of first instance in Beirut during the 1890s and 1900s, as well as member of the boards of the Ottoman Agricultural Bank and the Sanaya school. Rashid Tabbara was a customs official.

Occupation: ‘Abd al-Hafiz Tabbara was registered as a textile merchant in 1908, and a manufacture merchant in Suq Ayyas in 1911 (as were his brothers and cousins. Hussayn Muhammad, Muhammad Yahya and Sa’id, and Hashim Tabbara). ‘Abd al-Hafiz became a medical doctor in the early 20th century.

His cousin, Ahmad Yahya, was a merchant in construction wood in Suq al-Hashab in the port. Misbah and Jamil Tabbara were graduates of the Ottoman school and became Beirut-based merchants.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: ‘Abd al-Hafiz was a journalist with Thamarat al-Funun. His father, Shaykh Ahmad Hasan, was a leading intellectual in late Ottoman Beirut. He founded al-Ittihad al-Uthmani and al-Islah. He was involved in educational work (the Sanaya and Ottoman schools) and a public critic of Austria’s annexation of Bosnia. Later he became a prominent member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE (with Muhammad Tabbara) before being hung on Sahat al-Burj for treason by Jamal Pasha in 1916.

Jabur Tabib
Geographical and confessional background: The Tabibs were Maronites originally from Aleppo. The forefathers Farah al-Tabib and his brothers settled in Dalbata and Shamlan around 1740 while Jabbur’s branch settled in Zuq Misbah in Mount Lebanon.

Residence and family connections: In Beirut, Jabbur Tabib was a business associate of Ibrahim Malhama, and married to Sabat, the sister of Rizqallah Khadra.

Ottoman career: Mikha’il and Jabbur Tabib were members of Beirut’s chamber of commerce in the 1890s.

Occupation: Jabbur Tabib was a banker with international clients and a silk exporter.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Jabbur was involved in the ‘Young Maronite’ movement in the 1860s, and engaged in Beirut’s port project in 1890.

Ibrahim Tayyara
Geographical and confessional background: Possibly originally from Egypt, the Tayyara family settled in Beirut in the eighteenth century.

Residence and family connections: The Tayyaras lived outside the city walls in Ra’a-s al-Naba’ early in the 19th century. Inside the city they shared a Sunni waqf with the Huss family.

Ottoman career: Hajj Ibrahim was decorated with Ottoman medals. His cousin Khalil Tayyara was a police commissioner. One Mukhtar Tayyara graduated from the Ottoman school in Beirut in 1906.

Occupation: Hajj Ibrahim & sons, Hajj Muhammad and Sa’d al-Din Tayyara were registered as general traders in 1889.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Ibrahim Tayyara was active on various committees for infrastructural improvements in Beirut.

Muhammad Tayyara
Residence and family connections: Unclear family relation to Ibrahim Tayyara – possibly a paternal cousin.

Ottoman career: Muhammad and Sa’ad al-Din were members of the Ottoman waqf administration in the 1890s. Muhammad was a leading councillor of the Beirut chamber of commerce in the 1900s, a member of the Beirut branch of the Ottoman agricultural bank, and a scribe of the Hijaz railway company in the 1900s.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Muhammad Tayyara was a founding member of the Magasid Society and a member of the provincial education council in the 1880s.

Yusuf Thabit
Geographical and confessional background: The Thabits are Maronites and originally from ‘Aqura. They settled in Saida, then Dayr al-Qamar, Bhamdun, Beit Shabab. They moved to Beirut by the end of the 17th century.

Residence and family connections: There were two Thabit branches. In the Protestant branch the most famous figures were Na’ama, Ayyub, the son of Ibrahim Pasha Thabit, and his son Salim (b. 1847) who was involved in Beirut politics in the 1910s and 20s.

The Hamidian generation of the Maronite branch was more numerous and powerful than their protestant cousins. Ya qub had three sons, Yusuf, Ibrahim and Philippe. In the 70s the Thabits built Suq Thabit and the Wikala Thabit next to Khan Antun Bey which came to house the Railway Company.

Ottoman career: Yusuf and his brother Ibrahim held no rank but were awarded several medals of the Ottoman mecidiiye and ‘uthmaniye orders.
Occupation: Many Thabits were employed in foreign consulates. As ad Ishaq Thabit was German consular dragoman. In the early 1900s, Yusuf (Ya’qub’s son) became the honorary dragoman at the French consulate.

Ya’qub and sons was a registered trading company in 1889, as was Khalil Ibrahim. Yusuf’s son Emil Bey registered was stock broker in 1908. Ibrahim lobbied for tobacco trade and for a port in Junieh. I. Thabit and Bishara Asfar were board members on Banque du Caire. In 1911 Jirji Thabit was registered as photographer, Habib as carpenter and Khalil as a glass merchant.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Na’ma was a member of the 1847 Oriental society in Beirut. His brother Ayyub and one Khater Thabit were SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY members in 1868. Their Maronite cousin, Ya’qub (Yusuf’s father) was also a member of the same society. Of the protestant branch, Na’ma and Constantine petitioned for capital Beirut in 1865. Of the Maronite branch, Ya’qub petitioned for Beirut in 1826.

Ya’qub Thabit was a member of the ‘Young Maronite League’ of 1860. Ibrahim was considered the politician and literat. He was a one-time president of the Maronite Benevolent Society and sat on the railway lobbying committee in the 1870s. He was involved in Beirut’s water supply from Nahr al-Kalb.

Ya’qub (ibn Na’ma) was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913 and later became president of “the League for the Liberation of Syria and Lebanon” in New York.

Philippe Thabit

Occupation: An agricultural engineer, Philippe and his eldest son, George Bey, were involved in a development project in Bir Hassan and in a water project in Dekweini at the turn of the century. One J. Tabet was involved in a further development project in nearby Uza ib’Jinah.

Geographical and confessional background: The Trad family were probably from the Hawran region. Later they settled in the Kura region and Dayr al-Akhmar in the northern mountains of Lebanon and the Biqa’a before moving closer to Beirut by settling in ‘Ashqut, Sarba, Shuwayfat and Baskinta. Shaykh Yunis Trad, the forefather of the Beirut branch, settled in Beirut in 1611 and supported Fakhr al-Din against Yamani attacks. The emir repelled the opposition at the battle of Qal’at al-Afnan. As a sign of his gratitude to Shaykh Yunis, Fakhr al-Din is alleged to have appointed him governor of Beirut.

By 1830, the Trad family were already involved in the lime production which according to Henri Guys generated 8.800 piasters annually. Like other Greek Orthodox traders, the Trad family had a well-structured family council which raised and educated the family’s orphans. The Trads endowed their some of their properties as benevolent charities to the Greek Orthodox community.

Residence and family connections: In mid-nineteenth century, ‘Shahin and Abdallah Trad’ were registered in Suq al-Qutn close to the port but they also appear to have had offices in nearby Suq al-Qazzaz. Greek Orthodox parish records considered Hanna Shakkur, Bulus Jirjis and Jerassimos Trad the heads of the family from the 1860s. Although the Trads were the most numerous Greek Orthodox family in Beirut, they had a well-structured family council which raised and educated the family’s orphans. The Trads endowed their some of their properties as benevolent charities to the Greek Orthodox community.

As with members of the Sursuq family, after their return from the “Klondike on the Nile” the Trad family began building their villas outside the old town on the eastern side of Sahat al-Burj. Marriage patterns suggest a preference to marry not only within the Greek Orthodox community but also to marry inside their residential quarter. As a result, Jemayze/St/ Nicolas became a tightly-knit elite quarter where Greek Orthodox and Maronite notables (the Fayyads, Sabas, Farahs, Shuqayrs, Bashbashs, Thabits, Jantas, Bustrus and Sursuqs, the Suratis, Jahshans, Daghirs, Jubaylis, Dahhans and the Jaddays) lived as neighbours and political allies (and rivals).

Ottoman career: Hana Shakkur Trad was active in urban improvement measures on Sahat al-Burj in 1878. In the mid-80s he was a member of the majlis al-liwa. In the 1890s, other Trads – notably Salim Bulus, Elias, Khalil and later Salim Ibrahim – were elected members in the court of appeal and served on the education council or in the commercial court. In Istanbul, Spiridun Trad was ‘aide-de-camp’ at the court of sultan Abdulaziz in the 1860s and early 70s. The Hamidian generation of Trads ‘hamstered’ Ottoman state medals. Hana’s cousin Mitri Ibrahim Trad was a director of the Ottoman Imperial Bank in Aleppo, Konya and Beirut.

Occupation: Since at least the 1840s, the Trads were exporters in grain and silk. They also started exporting textiles to England through one of their agents in Manchester and London in 1862. Like many other Greek Orthodox from the Jemayze quarter, the Trads had a strategic presence as consular agents and dragomans of various foreign diplomatic representations: Salim was dragoman at the Russian consulate (with Nikula
Sursuq and Jirji Tuwayni) and Iskander was dragoman of the Iranian consulate, under consul Iskander Sursuq.

Mikha’il and Jibran Trad were registered as steelyard merchants, while Trad & Hani had an à la franga taylor shop in the vicinity. Nikula Iskandar Trad was the local agent of La Victoria de Berlin, a general insurance company whose financial partners were the Shiha & Fara’un Bank. In 1912, Nikula Trad and Bank Trad (Jirji) were two registered bank houses close to the majidiya mosque on port land reclaimed in the 1850s.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Bulus Trad’s family seal was on the 1865 Beirut petition. Iskander Trad was member of SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in the late 1860s. Salim Ibrahim and Elias Trad were members of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913.

The Trads were not only a large merchant family, but in the Hamidian generation many family members belonged to the new Arab literary elite. Nassim Najib Trad. Kremski’s Arabic teacher, was “considered an oddball for studying Kant and European philosophy.” According to Kremski’s Beirut memoirs, “the Trad family is French-speaking, even amongst themselves, but have Egyptian singers and dancers for entertainment at home.” Kremski also observes in 1896 that “the Trads are in ascendency, while the elder family members care only about trade, the younger ones are keen to get Jesuit education.”

The journalist Najib Ibrahim Trad (b. Beirut, 1859, d. 1911) started his education at the Greek Catholic School in Zuqaq al-Biatt. After a stint at the Jesuit school he moved back to Zuqaq al-Blatt to the Scottish and English schools under Mr. Mott. He left school to become a trader in Beirut and Damascus, but returned to education and taught at a school in Homs. The leader of the Bahais, Abbas bin Bahá’allah invited him to teach his children in Acre before moving on to Alexandria where he worked for al-Ahram under the fellow Beiruti emigres Bishara Pasha and Salim Bey Taqla. Trad became editor of al-Taqaddum and al-Saffa in Beirut and founded al-Raqib and al-Basir in Alexandria. Before the 1881 ‘Urabi revolt in Egypt, he was a translator for Ahmad ‘Urabi. Najib Ibrahim Trad wrote a books on Roman and Macedonian history and translated one of Eugene Sue’s popular and anti-clerical novels, Le Juif Errant, into Arabic (al-yahudi al-ta’ih).

Iskander Farajallah Trad was a leading journalist in Beirut, Egypt and later in Latin America. He was the director of al-Mu’ayyad, an editor of Thamarat al-Funun, a correspondent for al-Taqaddum and Lisan al-Hal, the editor in chief of al-Mahabba and Brazilian newspapers. He was also a translator and he translated Schiller’s K abale und Liebe with Dr. Nikula Fayyad. Salim Bulus Trad and Salim Shihada published the philosophical treatise Diwan al-Fukaha in 1884. Other Trads were correspondants: Jirji Ishaq Trad (1851-1877) worked for Ahmad Faris al-Shidyaq’s al-Jarc wa ’ib and the local al-Nakhla. Abdallah Mikha’il Trad was a local historian who wrote about the Beirut archbishopry from the 16th to the 19th centuries. Jibra’il Habib Trad (1854-1892) and As’ad (1835-1891) were diwani poets. The lawyer Pietro Iskander Trad (1867-1947) was co-founder of the ‘Society for General Reform’ in the Mandate period.

**Jirji Trad**

**Occupation:** Jirji founded the bank Georges Trad &Co. in the 1850s.

**Ottoman Career:** Jirji Trad was a member of the majlis al-liwa between 1868 and 73.

**Habib Niqua Trad**

In the 1890s, Habib was active in municipal planning measures in Beirut.

**Najib Na’ma Trad**

**Ottoman Career:** Najib ibn Na’ma was elected to the provincial council between 1906 and 08 and was a member of the chamber of commerce between 1904-1908.

**Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut:** Najib Na’ma became vice-director of the 1908 municipal hospital in Sanaya under the directorship of Arslan Dimashqiyya.

**Jirji Bey Tuwayni**

**Geographical and confessional background:** Like the Trads, the Tuwaynis are Greek Orthodox originally from the Hawran region. Jirji Bey and his brother Lutfallah, were second generation immigrants from Acre where their father Namur had been close to ‘Abdallah Pasha. The Tuwaynis were forced to move to Beirut after the Pasha’s demise in the late 1820s.

**Residence and family connections:** Jirji built a palace in what became the Jumayzi quarter east of Sahat al-Burj where Lutfallah Tuwayni’s marriage to a daughter of shaykh Yunis al-Jubayli (the director of Beirut’s diwan under ‘Abdallah Pasha) was held and described in Lamartine’s travel accounts of Beirut in the 1830s. Jirji Bey was the head of the family since the 1860s and had four sons, of which Nakha was the most influential in Beirut politics. Jean Bey was Ottoman ambassador to London and Paris, Alfred married a Sarruf, and Gabriel married a daughter of Najib Bey Sursuq. Another branch, Faris-Iskander-As’ad, was
influential in “the politics of the Mountain”. Iskander Bey was director of foreign affairs, translator and general secretary to the mutasarrif. Na‘um Pasha. His close links to Na‘um implicated him in corruption charges in the late 1890s.

Occupation: The Tuwaynis owned a Wikala near the western gate of Bab Idriss. Jirji Bey was a major trader in Beirut and partner of the Sursuqs. Tuwaynis were large landowners in Northern Palestine and many were consular officials.

Ottoman Career: Jirji Bey was a highly decorated local Ottoman bureaucrat but held no official position. Jirji was a major local investor in infrastructural projects. He contributed 1,000 piasters to the municipal port scheme in 1879, sat on the railway committee in 1890 and donated personal funds to urban improvement projects on Sahat al-Burj. Jirji Tuwayni’s uncle Iskandar Bey was a member of the SYRIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY in 1867-9.

Elias Tuwayni

Residence and family connections: the son of Lutfallah, Elias married a daughter of Nakhla Bey Saba, who was the president of the welfare organisation al-muhibba wa al-salam. Their son Jean took over the family mansion in the quarter of Tabaris and was a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE of 1913.

Nakhla Tuwayni

Residence and family connections: The son of Jirji Bey, Nakhla married a daughter of Khalil Pasha Sursuq. Nakhla was an advisor to the Khedive Isma‘il while in Egypt. He was a highly influential politician in Beirut, too, and was respected by the Sublime Porte.

Occupation: Nakhla was registered as stock broker in 1908.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Member of various urban planning committees.

Jibran Tuwayni

Residence and family connections: member of a minor Tuwayni branch, son of Andraus and brother of Mikha‘il. Jibran was on urban planning committees in the mid-1890s.

Ottoman career: He was a prominent member of Beirut’s provincial council between 1896-1901.

Occupation and Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: He was a journalist in Paris where he founded al-Jurnal with Najib Trad. After a stint in Egypt he came back to Beirut as a Free Mason to found al-Ahrar and later an-Nahhar with Sa‘id Sabbagh.

Jirji Yarid

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: a member of the fourth generation of the Yarid family in Beirut, Jirji Ishaq became a well-known journalist in Cairo with al-Ibtisam and al-Sihham.

Na‘ma Zakhariyya

Geographical and confessional background: Originally from the Hawran region, the Yarids ancestors migrated to al-Salt at the end of the 18th century. The Yarid ancestors Yusuf, Tannus, and Hanna Yarid benefitted from close ties with al-Jazzar in Acre. One Yarid Kardush settled in Beirut and became the founder of the Beirut branch. Originally Greek Orthodox, the Yarids became Greek Catholics in the late 18th century.

Residence and family connections: In the 1840s, the Yarid’s were registered in Suq al-Qutn and Suq al-Najjarin. Relatives lived in Shuwayfat and Wadi Taym.

Occupation: Members of the second and third generation, Shahin and Butrus and his sons, Yusuf and Andraus, distinguished themselves through their wealth and the respectability.

Ottoman Career: A member of the third generation, ‘Izzetlu Basil Efendi Yarid was a member of the penal court in Beirut and Bishara Efendi was registered as a notable in Ottoman provincial yearbooks.

Jihr Yarid

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: a member of the fourth generation of the Yarid family in Beirut, Jihr Ishaq became a well-known journalist in Cairo with al-Ibtisam and al-Sihham.

Na‘ma Zakhariyya

Geographical and confessional background: Maronite, originally from Husn al-Akrad and later Kura. One branch went to Shuwayfat. The journalist Khalil al-Khuri, editor of Hadikat al-Akhbar was an offspring of this branch.

Occupation: nothing is known about Na‘ma Zakhariyya’s occupation. Shaykh Yusuf Zakhariyya (1883-1946) was, judge, district governor and professor of Islamic law at AUB in the 1920s.

Bishara al-Zand

Geographical and confessional background: From Kafr Shima and later Zuq Misbah. Like many Maronite members of the municipal council they claimed origins in the village of al-‘Aqura. Khattar Bey al-Zand was called by Muhammad Ali to come to Egypt to teach raw silk preparation.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: Aziz Bey al-Zand was editor of the Beirut journal al-Mahrusa.

Muhammad Zantut
Geographical and confessional background: Sunnis, originally from Saida.

Residence and family connections: The Zantuts moved to Bashura in the 1850s.

Occupation: In 1889, Muhammad Zantut was registered as a general trader and as a copper trader in 1908 while Bashir Zantut and brothers registered as iron and metal traders in 1908.

Involvement in public and intellectual life in Beirut: The Zantut’s were active in the Saida branch of the Maqasid Society in 1878. Nassuh Zantut a member of the BEIRUT REFORM COMMITTEE in 1913 and later of the Beirut Chamber of Commerce.
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**ID**: İradeler Dahiliye, 37280 (1865), 62749 (1878/79), 83417,(1888); 84805, 84806, 84828, 84845, 84851, 84933, 84965, 85003, 85106, 85152, 85238, 85254, 85407, 85838, (all 1888).
### Sicill-i Ahval: (list of one third of all individuals born in the province of Beirut on record)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sira</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father’s Name</th>
<th>Place and Date of Birth</th>
<th>Book/page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86730</td>
<td>Ali Tayyar</td>
<td>Osman Tayyar</td>
<td>Beirut, 1299 - 1881</td>
<td>148/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86859</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefiq Bey Abdülha Zade</td>
<td>Abdelgani Süleyman</td>
<td>Nabulus, 1270 - 1853</td>
<td>4/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87181</td>
<td>Ahmet Tefik</td>
<td>Haci Ali</td>
<td>Beirut, 1282 - 1865</td>
<td>52/473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87200</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefiq</td>
<td>Mehmet Raşit</td>
<td>Beirut, 1286 - 1849</td>
<td>54/487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87202</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefiq</td>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>Beirut, 1284 - 1867</td>
<td>55/161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87237</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefik</td>
<td>Mehmet al-Khuri</td>
<td>Beirut, 1287 - 1870</td>
<td>63/329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87360</td>
<td>Mehmet Ismail Tefvik</td>
<td>Tahsin</td>
<td>Akka, 1270 - 1853</td>
<td>86/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87414</td>
<td>Kasim Tefik</td>
<td>Haci Ismail</td>
<td>Sayda, 1299 - 1881</td>
<td>97/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87421</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefik</td>
<td>Ahmet Sanila</td>
<td>Beirut, 1280 - 1863</td>
<td>98/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87439</td>
<td>Mehmet Tavfik</td>
<td>Mehmet Emin</td>
<td>Beirut, 1293 - 1876</td>
<td>100/325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87572</td>
<td>Mustafa Tefvik</td>
<td>Ahmet Izzet Agha</td>
<td>Beirut, 1285 - 1868</td>
<td>126/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87732</td>
<td>Mustafa Tefvik</td>
<td>Husni Hallaq</td>
<td>Beirut, 1301 - 1883</td>
<td>159/471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87894</td>
<td>Mustafa Tefvik</td>
<td>Mehmet Şakir</td>
<td>Beirut, 1298 - 1880</td>
<td>196/413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87897</td>
<td>Tefvik Efendi</td>
<td>Guild member Abdul Kadir Ramazan Ağa</td>
<td>Beirut, 1300 - 1882</td>
<td>197/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87905</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefvik Bel’a</td>
<td>Muhieddin Ağa</td>
<td>Beirut, 1259 - 1843</td>
<td>123/333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97915</td>
<td>Tefvik Şahin</td>
<td>Guild member Mustafa Şahin A (deceased)</td>
<td>Beirut, 1302 - 1884</td>
<td>148/369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87918</td>
<td>Mehmet Tefik Şükri</td>
<td>Selim Şükri</td>
<td>Beirut, 1284 - 1867</td>
<td>126/479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87971</td>
<td>Toini Bey</td>
<td>Beitir Eşraf George Toini Bey</td>
<td>Beirut, 1290 - 1853</td>
<td>145/391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87983</td>
<td>Toma Gabriel</td>
<td>Abu Sade</td>
<td>Beirut, 1270 - 1853</td>
<td>99/171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88527</td>
<td>Vasif</td>
<td>Nablus Admin Council</td>
<td>Nablus, 1304 - 1886</td>
<td>186/103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88575</td>
<td>Vedi’</td>
<td>Beirut Guild member Said Efendi</td>
<td>Beirut, 1291 - 1874</td>
<td>70/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88638</td>
<td>Ahmet Vefik Bey</td>
<td>Ahmet Cemal</td>
<td>Beirut, 1304 - 1887</td>
<td>168/439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89167</td>
<td>Münçizade Yahya</td>
<td>Haci Mehmet Efendi</td>
<td>Beirut, 1252 - 1836</td>
<td>18/295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89182</td>
<td>Yahya Reşad Fuad Bey</td>
<td>Feltmaker Ahmed Nazim Bey</td>
<td>Beirut, 1277 - 1860</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89239</td>
<td>Yakup Efendi</td>
<td>Merchant Hoca Miḥail Haşin</td>
<td>Lazakiye, 1285 - 1868</td>
<td>139/117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89262</td>
<td>Yakup Efendi</td>
<td>Architect Edip Ağa</td>
<td>Lazakiye, 1272 - 1855</td>
<td>37/143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89472</td>
<td>Yusuf Yaşar Sabit</td>
<td>(Tabit)</td>
<td>Beirut, 1264 - 1847</td>
<td>65/419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89690</td>
<td>Yusif</td>
<td>Merchant Antuan Ef.</td>
<td>Lazakiye, 1282 - 1865</td>
<td>57/155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89695</td>
<td>Yusif</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>CL, 1278 - 1861</td>
<td>91/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89702</td>
<td>Yusif</td>
<td>Zahar</td>
<td>Nabulus, 1282 - 1865</td>
<td>181/477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89703</td>
<td>Yusif</td>
<td>Georgi</td>
<td>CL, 1297 - 1879</td>
<td>188/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89704</td>
<td>Yusif Abut</td>
<td>Antuan</td>
<td>Sayda, 1262 - 1845</td>
<td>100/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89710</td>
<td>Yusif Demir</td>
<td>Toma</td>
<td>Sayda, 1290 - 1873</td>
<td>88/243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89711</td>
<td>Yusif Demir</td>
<td>Imperial cadastry Chief scribe Luis Demir</td>
<td>Sayda, 1281 - 1864</td>
<td>200/113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89712</td>
<td>Yusif de Lando</td>
<td>Krishif de Lando</td>
<td>Beirut, 1288 - 1871</td>
<td>37/243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89726</td>
<td>Yusif Nime</td>
<td>Telegraph/Post office director</td>
<td>CL, 1295 - 1878</td>
<td>98/257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89732</td>
<td>Yusif Yaşar Sabit</td>
<td>Guild member Mensur Yaşar</td>
<td>Beirut, 1264 - 1847</td>
<td>65/419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89795</td>
<td>Yusuf Zaggag</td>
<td>Habip</td>
<td>CL, 1256 - 1840</td>
<td>1/404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89840</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>Merchant Haci Mehmet</td>
<td>Beirut, 1289 - 1872</td>
<td>122/215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89869</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>Chief gatekeeper Abdülhadi</td>
<td>Nabulus, 1270 - 1853</td>
<td>139/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89871</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>Abdültefan Efendi Elensar</td>
<td>Sayda, 1297 - 1879</td>
<td>146/469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89930</td>
<td>Yusuf Baz</td>
<td>Nadir Baz</td>
<td>Beirut, 1273, 1856</td>
<td>7/521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89970</td>
<td>Yusuf Cemil Bey</td>
<td>Yanya Vil. Telegraph/Post</td>
<td>Beirut, 1293 - 1876</td>
<td>68/125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
76023 Rizkallah, Selim  Aleppine Rizkallah  Beirut, 1289 - 1872  112,439
76542 Zeyneddin, Saad  CL. Ahmet Zeyneddin  CL. 1286 - 1869  93,339
76607 Sabit, Selim  Ibrahim Sabit  Beirut, 1249 - 1833  91,377
76642 Sabit, Mehmet  Mehmet Ali  Lazakiye, 1292 - 1878  158,211
76973 Sabri, Mehmet  Haci Kasim  Lazakiye, 1296 - 1878  105,273
77032 Sabri, Hasan Bey  Ahmet Ağa  Beirut, 1285 - 1868  120,361
77227 Sabri, Mehmet  Mehmet Nuri Ağa  Lazakiye, 1298 - 1880  184,101
77334 Sadettin  Kaymakam Mustafa Nuri Bey  Beirut, 1283 - 1866  85,129
77385 Sadettin  Emin Ağa  Beirut, 1307 - 1889  169,13
77402 Sadettin Hilmi  Guild member Osman Ağa  Beirut, 1297 - 1879  175,373
78039 Ahmet Saffudin  Abdurrahman  Lazakiye, 1295 - 1878  174,93
78044 Safur, Ataullah  Austrian consul in Hayfa’s dragman Nasrallah Ef.  Hayfa, 1312 - 1894  196,89
78061 Saït, Mehmet Bey  Ismail Bey  Sayda, 1262 - 1845  1,272
78069 Saït  Hasan  Beirut, 1262 - 1845  1,942
78075 Saït Bey  CL. Dr Halil Bey  CL. 1260 - 1844  3,276
78093 Saït, Mehmet  Niryzi  Tripoli, 1283 -  7,507
78166 Saït, Mehmet  Şeyh Mustafa  Tripoli, 1278 - 1861  38,193
78197 Saït, Mehmet  Şeyh Ibrahim  Beirut, 1282 - 1865  55,139
78212 Saït, Mehmet  Musa  Beirut, 1272 - 1855  65,387
78218 Saït  Al-Sayyid Mehmet McKati  Beirut, 1282 - 1865  69,41
78252 Saït, Mehmet  Mustafa  Tripoli, 1276 - 1859  84,313
78256 Saït, Mehmet  Sadedin  Beirut, 1278 - 1861  86,191
78350 Saït, Mehmet  Abdullah Niyazi  Tripoli, 1277 - 1860  136,119
78356 Saït, Mehmet  Haci Mehmet  Lazakiye, 1288 - 1871  138,7
78379 Saït, Mehmet  Mehmet  Tripoli, 1304 - 1887  147,283
78432 Saït, Mehmet  Mehmet  Nablus, 1303 - 1886  173,459
78440 Saït, Abdulhadi Zade Mehmet  Abdullah  Beirut, 1298 - 1880  178,383
78477 Caviş, Saït  Yusuf Caviş (Gr. Cath.)  Beirut, 1272 - 1855  137,83
78486 Huri, Saït  Asat Huri  Beirut, 1298 - 1880  133,9
78786 Salahettin, Abdullahatif Bey  Muslih Salehul-Batu  Nablus, 1300 - 1882  143,173
78854 Saliba, Hori  Merchant Hunna Ef.  Nablus, 1286 - 1869  101,47
79078 Saïl, Mehmet  Mustafa  Lazakiye, 1299 - 1881  120,325
79176 Saïl, Mehmet  Abdullah  Tripoli, 1267 - 1850  172,491
79214 Saïl, Mehmet  Akif  Lazakiye, 1309 - 1891  196,51
79457 Sezai, Saïl  Post official Osman Nuri Ef  Beirut, 1290 - 1873  69,349
79492 Sitti, Saïl  Mûderris Haci Husayn  Beirut, 1296 - 1878  169,449
79852 Sami, Ahmet  Mehmet  Tripoli, 1270 - 1853  60,283
79985 Sami, Mehmet  Mehmet Emin  Lazakiye, 1303 - 1886  155,351
80041 Sami, Mehmet  Mustafa  Tripoli, 1306 - 1888-9  200,117
80089 Saraftim, Kostaki  Saraftim  Beirut, 1282 - 1865  30,123
80119 Sarask, Nahle  Fuzul Saras Ağa  Beirut, 1281 - 1866  85,91
80120 Sarask, Ahmet Necib  Sarasak  Beirut, 1273 - 1856  77,17
80145 Huri, Sayyat  Halil Huri/Sifa Omer  Beirut, 1296 - 1878  181,427
80198 Selim Efendi  Veledi Ohanes  Beirut, 1287 - 1870  1,1054
80221 Selim, Mehmet  Ahmet  Beirut, 1287 - 1870  40,421
80226 Selim Efendi  Filip  Sayda, 1261 - 1845  58,31
80231 Selim, Mehmet  Mehmet  Beirut, 1274 - 1857  63,389
80301 Melhame, Selim  Unlicensed Advocate Bişara Yr  Beirut, 1265 - 1850/1 - 193  72,67 80 /11:
80306 Sosa, Selim Nikol  Ilyas  Beirut, 1234 - 1818  26,387
80308 Ramazan, Selim  Abdulghani Ramazan  Beirut, 1255 - 1839  1,240
80313 Sabit, Selim  Ibrahim Sabit - Maruni  Beirut, 1299 - 1881  91,377
80341/2 Selimüluece  Şeyh Ahmet Elez  Beirut, 1255 - 1839  59,213
80347 Nuhaszade, Mehmet Selman  Şeyh Abdurrahman Nekibülüesr  Beirut, 1299 - 1881  192,199
80656 Seyyed, Ahmet Haricizade  Mustafa  Beirut, 1294 - 1877  173,149
80870 Sezi, Salih  Osman Nuri  Beirut, 1290 - 1873  69,349
67368 Nuhul, Bişara  Habip  CL, 1299 - 1881  120,209
67384 Numan, Mehmet  Mustafa  Lazakiye, 1290 - 1873  124,425
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1.2. IRCICA, Yildiz Photographic Library

1.3. OBA: Ottoman Bank Archive, Istanbul

France

1.4. MAE, Paris: Archive du Ministère des Affaires Étrangère à Paris

CP: Correspondance Politique, Turquie, Vol. 473, 1887.
CCC: Correspondance Consulaire Commerciale, Turquie – Beyrouth, Vol. 9, 1868-1888; Vol. 10, 1888-1894; Vol. 11, 1895-6; Vol. 12, 1897;


1.5. **MAE, Nantes**: Archive du Ministère des Affaires Étrangère à Nantes

*CB*: Consulat Beyrouth, carton 91 1868; carton 96, 1869; carton 232, 1912; carton 240, 1891-1914; carton 253, 1905-1914; carton 279, 1880-1897; carton 313, 1882-1912; carton 330, 1863-1914; carton 332, 1868-1913; carton 340, 1887-1914; carton 348, 1905-1913; carton 361, 1904-1914; carton 363, 1907-1914.

*CE*: Constantinople-Beyrouth, Correspondances des Echelles, 1882, 1883-5; 1886-7; 1884-8; 1888; 1889-9; 1890-1; 1894-1911; 1912.

1.6. **Chambre du Commerce à Marseille**

see printed primary sources

Great Britain

1.7. **PRO**: Public Record Office, Kew, London.

Series FO 195/
1581, Beirut, Jerusalem, 1887; 1583, Damascus, 1887; 1587, from Sublime Porte, 1887; 1594-7, from Foreign Office in London, 1888; 1598-9, to Foreign Office, 1888; 1613 Beirut, Damascus, 1888; 1621-2 from and to Sublime Porte, 1888; 1648 Beirut, Damascus, 1889; 1657-8 from and to Sublime Porte, 1889; 1683, Beirut, 1890; 1694-5 from and to Sublime Porte, 1890; 1723, Beirut, 1891; 1733-4 from and to Sublime Porte, 1891; 1761, Beirut, Aleppo, 1892; 1771-2 from and to Sublime Porte, 1892; 1801, Beirut, Haifa, 1893; 1809-10 from and to Sublime Porte, 1893; 1843, Beirut, 1894; 1851-2 from and to Sublime Porte, 1894; 1886, Beirut, 1895; 1900, Beirut, 1897, 2024, Beirut, 1898; 2049, Beirut, 1899; 2056, Beirut, 1900; 2075, Beirut, 1900; 2097 Beirut, 1901; 2117 Beirut, 1902; 2165, Beirut, 1904; 2190, Beirut, 1905; 2217, Beirut, 1906; 2245, Beirut, 1907; 2277, Beirut, 1908.

Series FO, 226/

Germany


*FFA*: Fürstenberg Family Archives, Westfälisches Archivamt, Münster.
2) Printed Primary Sources

2.1. Contemporary (Arabic) Literature (years consulted)


*Al-Ahwal*, Beirut, (1908).

*Al-Barq*, Beirut, (1908).

*Hadiqat al-Akhbar*, Beirut, (1858-1868).

*Al-Jinan*, Beirut, (1870-1884).

*Al-Kashaf*, Beirut, (1927).


*Al-Mahabbat*, Beirut (1907).

*Al-Manar*, Cairo, (1903).

*Al-Mashreq*, Beirut, (1900-1920).


2.2. Memoirs and Manifestos


Sait, Mehmed (Kuçük), *Sait Pasha’nin Hatirati*, 2 Vols. (Istanbul: Sabah, 1328h [1910]).


Sami Bey [1894], *Al-qaul al-haqq*. (Beirut: Dar al-Ra’id al-‘Arabi, 1981, 2nd ed.).


Sarkis, Khalil [1898], *al-Shām qabl mi’at ‘Am; Rihla al-Impratur Guillaume II al-Almani ila Filastin wa Surjiyya ‘am 1898*, (Damascus: Dar al-Qadri, 1997, 2. ed.).


2.3. Travel Literature and Guides


Buckingham, James, *Travels in Palestine/ Travels among the Arab Tribes*, (London, 1827).


Busch, Moritz, *Die Türkei; Reisehandbuch für Rumelien, die untere Donau, Anatolien, Syrien, Palestina, Rhodos und Cypern*, (Triest: 1860).


D’Armagnac [1844], *Nezib et Beyrouth: souvenirs*, 1833-1841, (Beirut 1985, 2. ed.).


Fraas, O., F. von, *Drei Monate am Libanon*, (Stuttgart: Levy und Müller, 1876, 2. ed.).
Meyer’s, (Berlin, 1911).
Murray’s, (London, 1858, 1875, 1881).

2.4 Colonial literature

Boyer, Benoît, *Conditions hygiéniques actuelles de Beyrouth et de ses environs immédiats* (Lyon: Imprimérey Rey, 1897).
——— “Rapports Commerciaux des Agents Diplomatiques,” Annexe: 1893, no. 135; 1894, no. 159, no. 196; 1895, no. 290.
Congrès Français de la Syrie, 1919, 4 Vols.
Coze, Edourd, *La Syrie et le Liban*, (Etampes, 1892).
Hartman, Martin, *Unpolitische Briefe aus der Türkei*.
2.3. Ottoman Legal and Statistical Texts


Fa’iq, Ahmad, director if the provincial printing office, Beirut, *Salname - Beyrut Vilayeti*, 1310 (1890/1), 1318 (1899/00), 1319 (1900/1), 1322 (1903/4), 1324 (1905/6), 1326 (1907/8), 1.-6. volume.


Ergin, O. N. [1922], *Mecelle-i Umuri Belediyê*, (Istanbul, 19962. ed.).

Haqqi, Isma’il [1918], *Lubnan: mabahith ‘ilmiyya wa ijtima’iyya*, 2 Vols. (Beirut: Publication de l’Université Libanaise, 1970. 2. ed.).


Nawfal, Na’matallah, *Al-dustur*, (Beirut, 1301h [1883-4]).


3) Biographical and Reference Works


Basha, Qunstantin, *Tarikh Al Fara’un.* (Beirut. 1925).


Hishshi, Selim, *Duruz Bayrut wa tarikhilum,* (Beirut, 1985).


Itani, M., *Bayrutunna,* (Beirut, 1997).

Kamel, Leila, Salameh, *Un Quartier de Beyrouth; Saint-Nicolas, Structures Familiales et Structure Fonciers,* (Dar el-Mashreq; Beirut, 1998).


al-Shidyaq, Tannus [1858], *Akhbar a’yyan Lubnan,* (Beirut: Lahad Khater, 1974).


———. *Asdaq ma kana fi Tariikh Lubnan wa sa‘ha min tariikh al-siryan*. 2 Vols. (Beirut, 1948).


4) Unpublished Theses


Jihan Sfeir, *Approche Methodologique pour une utilisation des Registres du tribunal Châri de Beyrouth (1843)*, (Beirut, Mémoire de Maîtrise, 1995).


5) Printed Secondary Works

A

Abu Manneh, Butrus, “Jerusalem in the Tanzimat Period,” in WI 30 (1990), 1-44.
——— “Abdulhamid II’s Attempt to Integrate Arabs into the Ottoman System,” in Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period, edited by D. Kushner, (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 74-89.
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