

Ottoman Censorship in Lebanon and Syria, 1876-1908

Author(s): Donald J. Cioeta

Source: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (May, 1979), pp. 167-186

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/162125>

Accessed: 26-02-2018 12:03 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of Middle East Studies*

Donald J. Cioeta

OTTOMAN CENSORSHIP IN LEBANON AND SYRIA, 1876–1908

Since the first printed books and newspapers, official censorship has been the norm, not the exception. Although we often regard freedom of the press as an integral part of Anglo-American law, the principle was only established after 1688. The English press did not completely escape such press control measures as seditious libel prosecutions and confiscatory taxes until the 1860s.¹ Official censorship in the United States has been directed against left-wing agitation, alleged pornography, and most recently, exposure of national secrets. France and Germany have suffered various degrees of official censorship, including the most draconian. Russia has scarcely known any period in which both pre- and postpublication censorship was not practiced. In view of the universality of censorship, Ottoman censorship in Lebanon and Syria deserves close examination in its historical context instead of the unanimous condemnation accorded it heretofore.

The typical press regime developed in three stages. In the first stage, newspapers were official and editing was the same as censorship. Privately owned, but officially subsidized, newspapers came next. For obvious reasons, these were also self-censored. Finally, when newspapers became financially independent, whether by circulation revenues, private financing, or advertising, their potential power forced the state to decide between reliance on social consensus and enactment of press censorship laws to control the contents of the periodical press. The Ottoman Empire, like most of its contemporary states, chose the latter.

The various regions of the Empire passed through the stages of journalistic development at various times. With the appearance of the gazette *Takvīm-i Vekāyi* in 1831, Istanbul entered the first stage.² By 1853, Istanbul and Izmir had numerous privately owned political newspapers, published in seven languages. Virtually all were subsidized.³ The Crimean War brought the tele-

AUTHOR'S NOTE: A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 8th annual meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, 8 November 1974, in Boston. Part of the research was done while the author held a Fulbright-Hays Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship in 1973.

¹ Frederick S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476–1776* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), pp. 5–12.

² Several ephemeral French newspapers were published before 1831, but they were of little consequence. For a list of Turkish newspapers in the Ottoman Empire before 1881 see Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Gazeteciliği* (Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931), pp. 84–89.

³ Jean H. A. Ubcini, *Letters on Turkey*, trans. Lady Easthope (2 vols.; London: John Murray, 1856), I, 250–251.

graph and easy access to foreign news through Reuters, some of which conflicted with official Ottoman communiqués. A casualty of the increased flow of news was the first privately owned Arabic newspaper, *Mir'āt al-Aḥwāl*, edited by Rizq Allāh Ḥassūn. Ḥassūn was forced to stop publication and go into exile under threat of imprisonment. This was apparently the first suppression of a newspaper in the Ottoman Empire.⁴

Shortly thereafter, on 6 January 1857, the first Ottoman Printing Law (*Nizām-i Maṭābi' ve-Maṭbū'āt*) was decreed. Although the law was intended to regulate all printing establishments and their publications, it did not specifically mention the periodical press. It did, however, establish two principles that were basic to all succeeding Ottoman press laws and decrees, namely, licensing of publishers and prior censorship of all publications. Permits to operate a printing establishment in Istanbul were subject to review by the *Encümen-i Ma'ārif* (Council of Education) and by the Ministry of Police. In the provinces, the vali acted as the intermediary between the applicant and the two agencies in Istanbul. Having obtained a license, a printer was required to submit a copy of all publications to the council before publication. The council was to determine whether the publication contained anything harmful to the Ottoman state.⁵ Punishment for offenses was specified by the Penal Code of 1858, namely closure of the offending press and a fine of 50 gold *mecidi* (an Ottoman coin) for printing without a license, closure and a fine of from 10 to 50 *mecidi* for printing material harmful to the Empire or to anyone who served it, and small fines and imprisonment for distributing obscene or otherwise morally corrupting material. If someone was unjustly accused of a crime in print, the accuser was subject to the punishment for that crime. Other libelous statements were punishable by both a fine and imprisonment.⁶ The effect of this law was slight in Lebanon and Syria, although it did establish a procedure for controlling publishing. The presses operated by various Christian sects were virtually the only printing establishments in Syria in 1857 and they were not noticeably affected by the law.

In 1865, a law dealing specifically with periodicals was enacted. It required a license from the Ministry of Education for all newspapers and magazines. The license was issued in the name of a male Ottoman subject over thirty and of good character, who was designated the responsible director, 'al-mudir al-mas'ul.' He was responsible in both the civil and criminal sense for all articles in his publication. Upon publication, he was to submit a signed copy of the publication to the local governor's office. Periodical publications were required to print without charge government notices sent to them, including warnings and notices of suspension, as well as responses sent by any person mentioned in an article within two issues of their submission. A penal section of the law set punishments

⁴ Philippe di Ṭarrāzī, *Tārīkh al-ṣiḥāfah al-'Arabīyah* (4 vols.; Beirut: al-Matba'ah al-Adabiyah, 1913–33), I, 55 (hereafter Ṭarrāzī).

⁵ Gregoire Aristarchi Bey, *Législation ottomane* (7 vols.; Istanbul: Journal Thraky, 1873–1888), III, 318–319 (hereafter Aristarchi Bey).

⁶ Shams al-Dīn al-Rifā'i, *Tārīkh al-ṣiḥāfah al-Sūrīyah* (2 vols.; Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1969), I, 59–60 (hereafter al-Rifā'i).

of 10 Ottoman pounds per issue and suspension for publishing without a license; of 10 pounds for failure to submit a signed issue; and of 2–25 pounds for failure to publish public notices and replies. In addition, the penal section stated that any article that provoked a crime against the tranquillity and security of the Empire would be grounds for administrative suspension, that is, suspension by administrative fiat. Administrative suspension of up to a month could also be decreed for offenses against the sultan, his family or authority, his ministers or vassal governments, sovereigns or ministers of Ottoman allies, and diplomatic representatives accredited to the Empire. A special commission was to review all suspensions and levy additional fines or imprisonment if necessary. Penalties for libeling private persons, the courts, and the agents of government authority were to be decided by the courts. Three judicial suspensions were grounds for administrative suppression.⁷

In times of grave danger to the Empire, even the provisions of the Press Law were too confining for the Ottoman government. It reserved the right to take administrative action against those sections of the press which it considered 'a hindrance to the reconciliation of minds and to the coalescing of interests, or a means of stirring up troubles and of provoking antagonism among the different elements of the population.'⁸ Although this ability of the government to act independently of the Press Law may seem to have made the law's definition of the accepted bounds of journalistic behavior worthless, the law's administrative provisions were applied until 1908 in Syria, as was the principle that suspensions had to be for specific causes. The only major change in the law occurred when the revised Provincial Code of 1871 assigned the local administration of the law to the *mektûpçu*.⁹

Seven months after the promulgation of the Printing Law of 1857, Khalîl al-Khūrî founded Syria's first newspaper, *Ḥadiqat al-Akhhbār*. He published his newspaper with his own funds in Beirut until Fu'ād Paşa asked him to make it a subsidized, semi-official publication during the disturbances of 1860.¹⁰ Buṭruş al-Bustānî published his ephemeral *Nafîr al-Sûriyah* for a short time in 1860, but otherwise no newspapers began publication until after the Press Law of 1865 was in effect.

Although the Press Law regulated newspapers, it did not hinder the founding of new publications in Beirut during the 1870s. On the contrary, possibly stimulated by the flow of news from the new Reuters–Havas telegraphic agency in Alexandria, numerous political and literary publications were founded, including

⁷ Aristarchi Bey, III, 326.

⁸ 'Notification officielle concernant la presse locale (12 Mars 1867)' as quoted in *ibid.* See also Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 145–147.

⁹ In earlier times the *mektûpçu* had been the general secretary of the vali; in the nineteenth century, he was also the director of the official newspaper and printing press of the vilayet as well as the censor of all publications. He also handled any official contacts with foreign powers in the vilayet. 'Abd al-'Azîz 'Awaḍ, *al-Idārah al-'Uthmāniyah fi wilāyat Sūriyah, 1864–1914* (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'arif, 1969), p. 91.

¹⁰ Ṭarrāzi, I, 58; al-Rifā'i, I, 61–63.

the Bustānī family's *al-ġinān* and *al-ġannah*, the Jesuits' *al-Bashīr*, *al-Taqaddum*, *Thamarāt al-Funūn*, *Lisān al-Hāl*, *al-Zahrah*, *al-Naḥlah*, *al-Najāḥ*, and *al-Muqtataf*.¹¹ Obtaining a license took some time, but it was otherwise almost a pro forma matter.

In the early years of journalism in Beirut, prepublication censorship did not cause publishers much trouble. In fact, it probably was seldom required of periodical publications. There were only three suspensions before 1876 noted in literary sources, none involving disputes about censored material. The first case occurred early in 1871, when Louis Sabunji published an attack on the Bustani family and their publications in *al-Naḥlah*. Although the Press Law stipulated that libel was to be dealt with in the courts, the Bustanis chose to use editorials to persuade the vali to stop the attacks. The vali ordered Sabunji to cease, but he persisted. Finally, with exhortation from the Bustanis, he suspended *al-Naḥlah* indefinitely. Sabunji immediately started *al-Najāḥ*, but the vali suspended it too as an illegal attempt to revive a banned publication. It was allowed to resume publication only after Sabunji turned it over to another editor. The Bustanis were thus partly responsible for the first suspensions in Beirut, although they were later staunch defenders of press freedom. The third suspension before 1876 was also of *al-Najāḥ* in 1874, but its effect was mitigated when the newspaper's editor was given a license to publish *al-Taqaddum* a few months later.¹²

The laxness of censorship in Beirut was partly because the city's newspapers were neither so influential nor so controversial as to threaten the tranquillity of the Empire, at least not before 1880. Ahmad Fāris al-Shidyāq's *al-ġawā'ib*, published in Istanbul, was the Empire's most important Arabic newspaper. As a result, officials in Syria did not bother to develop administrative procedures for censoring periodical publications. Books could be sent to Istanbul for approval, but obviously this was not practical for daily, weekly, or even monthly periodicals. The Press Law did not describe the day-to-day details of newspaper censorship; it only assigned legal responsibility for the contents of publications and provided a postpublication mechanism to assure that newspapers were staying within the defined limits of journalistic behavior. Without a prepublication censorship regime, journalists were free to publish what they wished.

The first steps toward a systematic, strict censorship regime in the Empire came after the accession of 'Abdül Ḥamīd. Following the Russian declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire, the Press Law was suspended in the Empire by an order authorizing the immediate suspension or suppression of any newspaper without stating the cause.¹³ Among Arabic newspapers, *al-ġawā'ib* bore the

¹¹ For the details of the Reuters–Havas wire, see Graham Storey, *Reuters* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1951), pp. 42, 94. For lists of newspapers and magazines founded in Syria and Lebanon, 1858–1929, see Ṭarrāzī, IV, 4–73, 107–141.

¹² 'Awwal ta'īl idāri fī al-ṣiḥāfah al-Bayrūtīyah yusibu majallat al-Naḥlah,' *Awraq Lubnānīyah*, III, 2 (Feb. 1957), 55–58.

¹³ *Kanz al-raghā'ib fī muntakhabāt al-ġawā'ib* (7 vols.; Istanbul: Maṭba'at al-Jawā'ib, 1871–1881), VI, 81.

brunt of this more stringent censorship. By controlling its contents, the Ottoman government could control much of what was published in Beirut, for Shidyāq's newspaper was the most important source of news from Istanbul for most Beirut journalists.¹⁴ Ottoman officials also kept a close watch for signs of agitation and subversion in the newspapers published in Egypt and Europe by journalists of various political persuasions, especially after a vigorous journalistic controversy in Beirut on the need for stricter censorship of imported publications resulted in the banning of *al-Ahram*.¹⁵ As the Arabic newspapers published by dissident Ottoman exiles in Europe began entering the Empire in greater numbers after 1880, the Ottoman government revived an earlier practice of asking European governments to prohibit the distribution of banned newspapers through the foreign post offices in the Empire. Since these post offices were considered privileges granted by the Sultan, not capitulatory rights, European governments complied with the Ottoman requests. Among the banned Arabic newspapers were *al-Nahlah* (1880), *Hurriyah wa-Istiqlāliyah* (1881) and *al-Khalīfah* (1881) published in London; and *al-Huqūq* (1880), *Munabbih* (1881), and *Kawkab al-Mashriq* (1882), published in Paris. Numerous Turkish newspapers were likewise banned, as were newspapers in virtually every major European language.¹⁶ The reason for these bannings was obviously to quarantine the Empire from the subversive and disturbing views of the exiled journalists.

In Beirut the war brought the organization of a systematic censorship administration, headed by Khalīl al-Khūrī, no novice to either the literary or practical side of journalism. He had been editor of *Hadiqat al-Akhbār* since 1857 and was a noted poet besides. No publication could escape his thorough administration, and no hidden meaning could escape his learned eye. Beirut's journalists considered al-Khūrī a respected colleague, not an adversary. As a result al-Khūrī was able to prevent the publication of objectionable articles instead of punishing journalists after they broke the law. Not only did this conform to the government's desire to keep harmful material out of circulation, but it gave journalists a chance to avoid suspension.¹⁷

While al-Khūrī probably relied on informal means to restrain Beirut's journalists, he also established a formal administrative procedure for prior censorship that was followed by succeeding censors. Shortly before publication, two proof copies of periodicals were printed and delivered to the government office. (For a daily newspaper, they were delivered by 10 A.M. on the day of publication.) A clerk read the proof and marked both copies with suggested deletions and changes in wording. He then sent them to the mektūpçu, who could approve or reject the clerk's changes. One proof was returned to the editor and the second

¹⁴ Ibid., VII, 109–111, 183.

¹⁵ *Thamarāt al-Funūn*, no. 134 (22 Nov. 1877), p. 4 and no. 139 (7 Dec. 1877), p. 3 (hereafter *TF*).

¹⁶ A detailed correspondence on this subject is in FO 78.4950, 'Stoppage of Newspapers by British Post Offices in Turkey 1879–1884.'

¹⁷ Salīm Sarkīs, *Kitāb gharā'ib al-maktūbjī* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Salām, 1896), p. 11 (hereafter Sarkīs); Ṭarrāzī, I, 55–60, 102–105.

was kept in the office for comparison. The editor made the necessary changes and substituted new articles for deleted ones. Two new proofs were printed and the censorship process was repeated until the entire publication had been approved. After publication, the responsible director signed the first three copies and sent them to the mektûpçu for comparison with the corrected proof and for forwarding to Istanbul for postpublication review. Prior censorship did not necessarily protect a publication from suspension or suppression.¹⁸

Although the existence of so complicated a system of censorship would seem to have stifled free expression, in fact, journalists in Beirut continued to enjoy almost complete freedom for several years after al-Khūrī had established systematic censorship. Between the accession of ‘Abdül Ḥamīd in the late summer of 1876 and the appointment of Midhat Paşa as vali of Syria in November 1878, al-Khūrī was left largely to his own devices because of the short tenures of those appointed to the post of vali. He issued only one suspension during this period. Midhat Paşa did not attempt to limit the freedom of Beirut’s journalists; on the contrary, ‘the editors of the local newspapers were allowed to speak so freely . . . that everyone was suprised to see the press allowed to use this liberty. . . .’¹⁹ Only when the newspaper *al-Ḥannah* advised its readers to oppose a monetary reform by refusing official currency and by withholding taxes did Midhat Paşa resort to suspending a newspaper. Fortunately, Beirut’s population was enlightened enough to tolerate the controversies of a free press at a time when the more conservative cities of Damascus and Aleppo would not support an independent newspaper. Aleppans, in fact, virtually forced their vali to suspend two newspapers published by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Kawākibī because of their objections to his editorial views.²⁰

When Aḥmet Ḥamdī Paşa replaced Midhat Paşa as vali of Syria in August 1880, Beirut’s journalists were quickly notified that the Printing and Press Laws would be enforced. It was believed that this crackdown had been ordered by Sa’id Paşa, the şadr-i ‘aẓam (grand vizier), but Ḥamdī Paşa undoubtedly endorsed the policy. In any case, Khalīl al-Khūrī issued 21 warnings and suspensions during Ḥamdī Paşa’s five years as vali, 11 of which were issued between June 1881 and July 1882. al-Khūrī was consistent in his warnings and suspensions; they reflected official concern with the disturbing events in Egypt, with the danger of communal strife in Syria, and with giving the Sultan proper respect (see the appendix). Despite the relatively large number of warnings and suspensions, al-Khūrī applied the Press Law leniently, considering he was probably directly supervised by Ḥamdī Paşa. Warnings were more common than suspensions and many of these warnings were issued to all newspapers, not to

¹⁸ Sarkīs, pp. 20–23.

¹⁹ FO 78.3130, Memorandum by J. Abcarius, enclosure in a letter from John Dickson (Acting Consul General, Beirut) by E. J. Goschen (Ambassador, Constantinople), 3 July 1880.

²⁰ *TF*, no. 221 (24 March 1879), p. 3; no. 148 (28 Feb. 1878), p. 4; and no. 252 (7 Oct. 1879), p. 1.

specific offenders. After Ḥamdī Paşa's death in Beirut in August 1885, al-Khūrī resumed a more lenient policy of censorship. Even at its most stringent, al-Khūrī's censorship did not seriously limit the freedom of Beirut's journalists. Even the most vehement critic of Ottoman censorship admitted that Beirut's journalists enjoyed almost complete freedom until 1889, although they had to avoid a few sensitive topics.²¹

The creation of the vilayet of Beirut in 1888 removed the city's journalists from the supervision of Khalīl al-Khūrī, who remained mektūpçu of the vilayet of Damascus, and exposed them to the censorship of a series of mektūpçular of varying competence. Some were ignorant of Arabic; many were excessively harsh and capricious in their application of the law. While the administration of the new vilayet was being organized, censorship may have been tightened, but Salīm Sarkīs claimed that he enjoyed nearly complete freedom as editor of *Lisān al-Ḥāl* until an incident in July 1889. After the death of the first vali of Beirut, it was reported in Beirut's newspapers that Ra'uf Paşa, the Minister of Public Works, would be the next vali. Because Ra'uf Paşa had the reputation of a reformer, the editors of *Lisān al-Ḥāl* wrote a long article praising him and had it approved by the censor in anticipation of his appointment. But Ra'uf Paşa was appointed to another post and 'Azīz Paşa was appointed vali of Beirut. When both men arrived in Beirut, *Lisān al-Ḥāl* printed only the most perfunctory praise for 'Azīz Paşa along with the long article about Ra'uf. *Lisān al-Ḥāl* was suspended by a decree from the Ministry of the Interior, but was subsequently reinstated by a favorable court decision. Two weeks later, Kemāl Bey, reputedly a harsh censor entirely ignorant of Arabic, took the post of mektūpçu. Sarkīs left Beirut a few months later, claiming that he was leaving because the censorship had become too much to bear.²²

The vagueness of the Press Law left a great deal to the discretion of Kemāl Bey and his successors. None had been journalists before becoming mektūpçu. They were bound by orders from Istanbul and from the vali, of course, but not by the precedents of their predecessors. For a certain offense one mektūpçu might suspend a newspaper and another would merely issue a warning. A censor who knew Arabic well would judge words by their context, while his less knowledgeable successor would delete certain words out of context on the chance that they might have some objectionable meaning. A story told of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Qabbānī, the loyal and conscientious editor of *Thamarāt al-Funūn*, illustrated the frustration editors felt when dealing with the mektūpçu. al-Qabbānī, irritated at a rash of suspensions, asked the mektūpçu to give journalists some concrete guidelines, some law that they could follow. The mektūpçu tapped his head and replied that the law was in his brain. Muḥammad Kurd 'Alī recalled that one could never anticipate what the censor would allow. Sometimes he would delete an article that the editor had expected to be approved, and vice

²¹ Sarkīs, pp. 11–13.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13. Sarkīs says that the incident happened in 1885, but it actually occurred in 1889.

versa.²³ The result was that editors never knew what to expect. To be safe, they expected the worst, that is, if any word, phrase, or subject had been deleted in the past, it would be deleted in the future, or if not deleted, would provide grounds for suspension.

Newspaper editors thus came to follow their own informal lists of unmentionable words, phrases, and subjects, based on specific cases of censorship or suspension rather than on official directives. By 1908, the specific cases on which the lists were based had been forgotten. Several of these lists of forbidden words, phrases, and subjects were published after the Young Turk coup.²⁴ None mentioned specific examples of censorship or gave the dates when the various examples had been censored, both of which are necessary for studying the development of Ottoman censorship in Syria. Specific cases of censorship must be taken from Salīm Sarkīs's polemic against censorship or from the official warnings, notices of suspensions, and editorial comments published in Beirut newspapers.

The largest category in Sarkīs's list of incidents of censorship was that involving the misuse of titles, hardly an earthshaking issue. 'Sulṭān,' 'khalifah,' 'amīr,' and 'mālik' were deleted or changed by the censor in several cases, as were words ignorant censors misread, including 'mulk,' 'Mallūk' (a family name), 'Sulṭānī' (a family name), and 'mā laka.' The pope was denied his title of the successor of Peter, 'khalifat Buṭrus,' the Abbasid caliph, 'khalifah,' al-Ma'mūn became a mere ruler of the city of Baghdad, and Amīr Muṣṭafā Arslān was reduced to a bey by the censor's red pen. These words were not always forbidden, however, because journalists did use 'malik' and 'malikah' for European kings and queens throughout 'Abdül Ḥamīd's reign. Also, the sultan of Zanzibar was called 'amīr' in the Ottoman press during his visit to Istanbul in 1907. Despite the numerous cases of prior censorship involving the misuse of titles mentioned by Sarkīs, very few newspapers were actually suspended for such offenses (see the appendix). Although misuse of titles was a common target of censors, the published lists of forbidden expressions did not reflect this.²⁵

The most frequently mentioned forbidden subject was that of assassination, presumably because 'Abdül Ḥamīd feared being killed. Both European and Ottoman sources said that mention of the assassination of any royal person or head of state was absolutely forbidden, without any qualifying dates or circumstances.²⁶ Since assassinations occurred throughout 'Abdül Ḥamīd's reign, the language used in reporting them may help answer Sulaymān al-Bustānī's

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 47. Muḥammad Kurd 'Alī, *Mudhakkirāt* (2 vols.; Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqqa, 1948), I, 51.

²⁴ Sulaymān al-Bustānī, *Ibrah wa-dhikrā aw al-dawlah al-'Uthmāniyah qabl al-dustūr* (Cairo: By the author, 1908), pp. 27–34 (hereafter al-Bustānī); 'al-Inqilāb al-siyāsiyah al-'Uthmāniyah,' *al-Hilāl*, 17, 1 (1 Oct. 1908), 32–34; 'al-Alfāz wa ashyā' al-latī kānat mamnū'ah fī al-'aṣr al-Ḥamīdī,' *al-Manār*, 10, 15 (1912), 796–797.

²⁵ Sarkīs, pp. 26, 29, 30, 33, 59; *al-'Id al-mi'awi li-naql al-Maṭba'ah al-Amirkāniyah ilā Bayrūt* (Beirut: al-Maṭba'ah al-Amirkāniyah, 1934), p. 17; 'Ziyārat Amīr Zanjibār li-Dār al-Khilāfah al-'Uzmā,' *TF*, no. 1648 (18 Nov. 1907), p. 1.

²⁶ Lewis, *Emergence of Modern Turkey*, pp. 183–184; Edwin Pears, *Life of Abdul Hamid* (New York: Henry Holt, 1917), p. 197; Gerçek, *Türk Gazeteciliği*, pp. 77–78.

question: ‘How many newspapers were suspended or suppressed for . . . telling of the murder of a minister in China or a prince in Africa?’²⁷ The two most commonly cited examples of the censorship of news about assassinations were those of President Sadi Carnot of France, who was killed on 24 June 1894 and Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, who was assassinated on 1 May 1896. *Thamarāt al-Funūn* reported that Carnot had passed away suddenly instead of saying that he had been stabbed to death.²⁸ The same newspaper said that Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh had met his end while on the way to the mosque. The next line of the report, however, said that the perpetrator of the deed had been arrested and was suspected to have had an accomplice.²⁹ al-Bustānī mentioned the assassination of King Umberto of Italy, killed on 29 July 1900, as an example of censorship. *Thamarāt al-Funūn* said only that death came upon the king.³⁰

On the other hand, the assassination of Czar Alexander II on 13 March 1881 was reported in detail, as was that of President James Garfield on 2 July 1881. The newspapers of Beirut reported an attempt on the life of the King of Romania on 11 June 1888 and an attempt on the life of Premier Crispi of Italy on 7 October 1889. Two additional assassinations which the newspapers did not mention were those of President William McKinley on 6 September 1901 and of King Alexander of Serbia on 11 June 1903. There were only passing references to their deaths. These examples indicate that assassination of important leaders became a forbidden topic sometime after October 1889. Only actual reports of the assassination were forbidden, for the words ‘iḡhtyāl’ and ‘mughtāl,’ meaning assassination and assassinated, continued to be used. For example, the Empress Elizabeth of Austria was called ‘al-imbirāṭūrah al-mughtālah,’ the assassinated empress, in her obituary, although no account was given of her murder on 10 September 1898.³¹

It was also alleged that ‘Abdül Ḥamīd’s fear of revolution resulted in the censoring of words dealing with revolts, revolution, or republics. ‘Thawrah,’ revolution, ‘ḥarakah,’ movement, and ‘ikhtilāl,’ disturbance, were forbidden because they could be associated with revolt in one sense or another. ‘Jumhūrīyah,’ republic, and its root ‘jumhūr’ were also allegedly banned, as was ‘ḥurīyah,’ freedom. Again, no qualifications were attached to these allegations.³² An examination of two newspapers shows, however, that ‘al-jumhūr’ was used in official decrees as late as 1885 and that ‘thawrah’ was used to describe a revolt in

²⁷ al-Bustānī, p. 27.

²⁸ Sarkīs, pp. 30–31; *TF*, no. 984 (2 July 1894), pp. 3–4.

²⁹ al-Bustānī, p. 32; *TF*, no. 1078 (11 May 1896), p. 1.

³⁰ al-Bustānī, p. 32; *TF*, no. 1293 (6 Aug. 1900), p. 7.

³¹ ‘Maqṭal Imbirāṭūr Rāsyā,’ *TF*, no. 323 (21 March 1881), p. 1; *TF*, no. 339 (29 July 1881), p. 2; no. 685 (11 June 1888), p. 2; no. 752 (7 Oct. 1889), p. 3; ‘al-Imbirāṭārah al-mughtālah,’ *TF*, no. 1199 (26 Sept. 1898), p. 8; no. 1293 (6 Aug. 1900), p. 7; no. 1347 (16 Sept. 1901), p. 3; and no. 1436 (29 June 1903), p. 1.

³² General statements on the prohibition of these words are in ‘al-Ālfāz . . . al-Ḥamīdī,’ *al-Manār*, p. 797; al-Bustānī, p. 28; and Sarkīs, pp. 14, 21. Specific cases of censorship are in Sarkīs, pp. 30, 46.

China in 1887.³³ Supposedly, the mere mention of certain areas in the Ottoman Empire where there had been revolts, such as Macedonia and Armenia, was forbidden. *Thamarāt al-Funūn* mentioned Macedonia, however, in reporting events in that area in 1885. The same newspaper mentioned Armenia in its first article on an uprising in 1894. Thereafter, it used only the word 'al-Arman.'³⁴ The name of the deposed Sultan Murād was generally considered to be forbidden, despite a lack of concrete examples of censorship to prove the claim. The assumption was that Murād posed a threat to 'Abdūl Ḥamid while he remained alive, or at least put into question the legitimacy of 'Abdūl Ḥamid's accession. Although the aforementioned words and subjects may have been forbidden because they might have encouraged revolutionary activities, the prohibitions were obviously not enforced uniformly during 'Abdūl Ḥamid's reign, but commenced at specific dates.

The unsettled state of Egypt was clearly an important matter for the Ottoman Empire, particularly in its Arabic-speaking provinces. Sir Edwin Pears claimed that the events occurring in Egypt between 1878 and 1908 were 'never mentioned in any newspaper published in Turkey.' Pears was wrong about the contents of newspapers in both Istanbul and Beirut. Except for a short period during which Ottoman officials feared that accounts of the British military occupation might cause riots against British subjects, all Beirut newspapers published extensive and substantially accurate reports from Egypt, based on news in Egyptian, Turkish, and European newspapers. Some Beirut newspapers also had correspondents in Cairo and Alexandria. Warnings and suspensions involving reports on Egypt did occur during the 1880s, indicating official sensitivity about events there. Nevertheless, Beirut newspapers did publish the essential news about Egypt. When Salīm Sarkīs collected examples of censorship to prove the severity of the Ottoman censorship regime, the only case he could produce involving Egypt was a claim that the censor had deleted the fact that Lord Northbrook was a relative of Cromer and that Cromer had presented him to the khedive during his visit to Egypt in 1884. *Thamarāt al-Funūn* did report Northbrook's visit, his report to Gladstone, and the subsequent rejection of his recommendations.³⁵

There were many other subjects that were allegedly forbidden. None was proved by concrete examples of censorship, and doubt can be cast upon the claim that some were forbidden by published examples of the words. For example, *al-Manār*'s list of forbidden words included 'iṣlāḥāt,' reforms, 'waṭan,' homeland, 'Turk,' 'ittiḥād,' union, and 'junūn,' insanity, all of which occurred

³³ *TF*, no. 546 (7 Sept., 1885), p. 4, and the following issues; *Bayrūt*, no. 164 (24 Oct. 1887), p. 2.

³⁴ *TF*, no. 558 (7 Dec. 1885), p. 4, and no. 559 (14 Dec. 1885), p. 4. 'Mas'alat Arminiya,' *TF*, no. 1007 (10 Dec. 1894), p. 1.

³⁵ Pears, *Life of Abdul Hamid*, p. 197; Sarkīs, p. 28; *TF*, nos. 500 (13 Oct. 1884) to 509 (15 Dec. 1884) contain many articles on Lord Northbrook's visit to Egypt and his subsequent report.

in print late in ‘Abdül Ḥamīd’s reign.³⁶ Jurji Zaydan’s claim that anything dealing with popular literature, ‘al-adab al-‘umūmiyah,’ was not permitted was not true unless he gave the term a limited meaning. He was also clearly wrong in saying that it was forbidden to say, ‘al-baqiyah ta’ti,’ the continuation will follow. Numerous allegedly forbidden words were logical targets for the censor, though without specific cases of censorship it cannot be known if they were actually forbidden. Among these were ‘khala,’ deposition of a ruler, ‘rishwah,’ bribe, ‘mashrūṭiyah,’ meaning constitution or constitutionalism, and ‘īqaz al-‘Arab,’ awakening of the Arabs. Other words may have been forbidden in specific contexts, though again the lists provided no actual examples of censorship. Examples were ‘khilāfah,’ caliphate, ‘Uthmānī,’ Ottoman, ‘kawkab,’ planet, and ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd.’³⁷

One example of censorship in Sarkīs’s list was commonly cited by Europeans to show the absurdity of Ottoman censorship. When censoring a biblical text in Istanbul, the censor deleted a phrase from Paul’s third letter to the Galatians, ‘O you foolish Galatians,’ on the grounds that it slandered the citizens of Galata (a section of Istanbul). But for the most part Sarkīs’s examples of censorship are uniquely his. Honorifics were deleted from the name of Christ and his cross. A newspaper was forbidden to print Quranic texts or *ḥadīth* because the ephemeral nature of newspapers meant they would be trampled in the dust. Two love stories and one mournful obituary were forbidden because the mektūpçu was so emotionally affected that he believed the articles would excite the public too much. The word ‘khālid’ was deleted from an obituary because it was the vali’s name. *Lisān al-Ḥal* was prevented from printing the photograph of a noted anti-Ottoman journalist, William E. Stead. Because it was an insult to Italy, the mektūpçu forbade Sarkīs to call that nation ‘ummat al-ma’karūnī,’ the nation of macaroni. Sarkīs also claimed he had been told to refrain from publishing articles written by women, lest their minds become too open to outside influences. This was probably an isolated incident for there were magazines published by women in the Ottoman Empire, and newspapers in Syria published many articles on women’s intelligence and receptiveness to education after Sarkīs had gone to Egypt.³⁸ If all these acts of censorship seem capricious, Sarkīs complained about one case that had parallels in the most enlightened

³⁶ ‘Iṣlāḥāt fī al-Anādūl,’ *TF*, no. 1078 (11 May 1896), p. 1; ‘Ḥubb al-waṭan,’ *Riyāḍ Ṭarāblus al-Shām*, 1 (1892–1893), 16; ‘Ilm al-ijtimā’ al-basharī,’ *TF*, no. 1284 (4 June 1900), p. 3, and many following issues. For ‘Turk,’ see *TF*, no. 1450 (5 Oct. 1903), p. 2. See also ‘al-Ittiḥād al-waṭanī,’ *TF*, no. 669 (13 Feb. 1888), p. 2; ‘al-Junūn Funūn,’ *TF*, no. 1002 (29 Oct. 1894), p. 4, and the following issues.

³⁷ Sarkīs mentions the publication of a book of popular proverbs and a narrative poem about two lovers, both of which might be considered popular literature (Sarkīs, pp. pp. 38–43). Zaydān may have been referring to his own novels, some of which were excluded from the Ottoman Empire. ‘al-Baqiyah ta’ti’ was used throughout ‘Abdül Ḥamīd’s reign. A late example is at the end of ‘Niẓām al-Būlis al-Jadīd,’ *TF*, no. 1660 (17 Feb. 1908), p. 7.

³⁸ There were several articles in the newspaper *Ṭarāblus al-Shām*, for instance, on women’s receptiveness to education. Some were reprinted in *Riyāḍ Ṭarāblus al-Shām*, 1 (1892–1893), 105, 117.

nations. Uncertified drugs could not be advertised in the Ottoman Empire until tested by the Ministry of Health.

More than capricious were those deletions resulting from a mektupçu's ignorance. A few absurd deletions by a mektupçu may have made him a laughing stock, but they also added another element of uncertainty to the journalists' task of producing their publications. A positive side of having an ignorant mektupçu was that journalists who could determine the limits of his knowledge could evade censorship by using obscure words or by changing words very slightly after censorship. Journalists also tried to make an ignorant censor look foolish by publishing bogus news reports. Sarkis boasted of having completely fabricated reports of a speech by the Kaiser and of some ridiculous political events that passed the censor simply because they contained no offensive words or expressions.³⁹

Other lists of forbidden expressions and subjects varied considerably from Sarkis's anecdotal list of specific cases primarily because he reported the cases known to him by experience or reputation in 1896. The other lists were compiled at the end of the 'period of tyranny,' after the coup in 1908. The Press Law had not changed substantially in thirty years, but the standards of censorship had. Virtually all of the allegedly forbidden expressions in the lists had been permitted as late as 1889, but most were forbidden in some context by 1908. Furthermore, most of those who compiled the lists had no personal experience with Ottoman censorship and may have relied on rumors. The understandable desire of Ottoman journalists to avoid suspension made the lists of forbidden expressions longer than they should have been and polemical exaggeration made them longer yet.

Ottoman journalists who stayed in the Empire and continued to publish may have seemed a timid lot to their colleagues in Egypt and Europe. But Beirut editors were willing to risk warnings, suspensions, and suppression in order to print what they wanted. Of the 97 warnings and suspensions issued in Beirut between 1876 and 1908, 26 were because the offending newspaper had not been submitted for censorship, or had published material deleted by the censor. Another 22 fell in the same category, but had more ambiguous wording, such as 'failure to comply with the basic principles of the Press Law.' These 48 offenses required a calculated decision by the editor to defy the censor, with the expectation that a warning or suspension would result. On the other hand, the warnings and suspensions for false news, for articles on subjects or in languages not included in the newspaper's license, for insulting or inflammatory articles, and for personal invective were probably unintended, for they were issued after the offending publications had been approved and published.⁴⁰

³⁹ Sarkis, pp. 45, 34. See the appendix for examples of warnings for changing words, adding sentences and ignoring the censor's deletions.

⁴⁰ The language used in the warning issued to *al-Aḥwāl* on 14 October 1900 indicates that 'violation of the basic principles of the Press Law' meant that the editor had not submitted something for censorship (see the appendix.)

The chronological distribution of the warnings and suspensions suggests that censorship increasingly involved matters of conscience after 1890. Before 1890, Beirut periodical publications received 33 warnings and suspensions, 24 for unintentional violations, 7 general warnings to all newspapers, and two for unspecified reasons. During the 1890s, 15 of 25 warnings and suspensions were for purposeful evasion of censorship. After 1900, 33 of 39 warnings and suspensions were for intentionally defying the censor. Beirut's journalists were willing to risk suspension in order to say what they wanted, though of course they hoped that such tricks as adding or removing dots on letters, using obscure words, and substituting sentences in approved drafts would not be detected.

The severity of Ottoman censorship has often been cited as the major reason for the migration of Syrian journalists to Egypt. But the most prominent Syrian journalists in Egypt went there before Ottoman censorship became stringent in the late 1880s. For example, the Taqlā family founded *al-Ahrām* in 1875 for reasons not related to Ottoman censorship. Likewise, Fāris Nimr, Ya'qub Ṣarrūf, and Shahīn Makārīyūs moved *al-Muqtataf* to Egypt in 1884 for reasons probably more related to the lack of intellectual freedom at the Syrian Protestant College than to Ottoman censorship.⁴¹ The list of Syrian journalists who went to Egypt before 1889 is long, and includes Adīb Ishāq, Jurjī Zaydān, Salīm 'Anhūrī, Salīm Fāris al-Shidyāq, Amīn Shumayyil, and Salīm al-Naqqāsh. Some went for the specific purpose of working as journalists and some went for other reasons but drifted into journalism. In any case, it is doubtful that any went because Ottoman censorship was too harsh before 1889. Syrian journalists did continue to emigrate after 1889, of course, and a somewhat greater number did go because of censorship. Salīm Sarkīs gave censorship as his reason for leaving Beirut, and Ibrāhīm al-Yāzīgī, Farah Antūn, and Rashīd Riḍā may also have been motivated to some extent by censorship, although the greater opportunity for educated men in Egypt was a stronger motivation.⁴²

Journalists in Egypt did not enjoy greater freedom than those in Beirut when *al-Ahrām* was founded, or indeed until 1885. Before the British occupation, suspensions were frequent, and after the occupation, there was a concerted effort to assert the right of the Egyptian government to censor the contents of both the Arabic and foreign language press. After a minor diplomatic dispute involving the suspension of the *Bosphore Égyptienne*, newspapers published by foreign nationals and protected subjects were exempted from administrative action under the Press Law. Because even local journalists could get protected status, and also because Lord Cromer did not believe the Arabic press was of any consequence, the Egyptian Press Law was seldom invoked between 1885 and 1909.⁴³

⁴¹ Nadia Farag, 'The Lewis Affair and the Fortunes of al-Muqtataf,' *Middle Eastern Studies*, 8, 1 (Jan. 1972), 73.

⁴² Donald Reid discusses the reasons for the emigration of Syrians in his *Odyssey of Farah Antun* (Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1975), pp. 20–23, 47. See also Jamil Jabr, 'Hawla ma katabahu al-Lubnāniyūn fī al-mahjar,' *al-Mashriq*, 64, 4–5 (July–Oct. 1970), 549–552.

⁴³ FO 78.3986, 'French Press in Egypt, Suppression of the *Bosphore Égyptienne*,

Whatever the differences between the Ottoman and Egyptian censorship regimes, they were not so crucial as the greater opportunities for journalists in Egypt. Although the 1897 census placed the literacy rate in Egypt at only 10 percent, Syria's was certainly not much higher. Syria's much smaller population therefore contained fewer readers. By 1878, Beirut was already a highly competitive journalistic center, while Egypt was largely untapped territory. Moreover a prosperous, literate Syrian business community in Egypt was willing to finance and read newspapers and magazines. Such publications were not at the mercy of subscription revenues as were their counterparts in Beirut, and provided opportunities for educated men to express their views while earning a living.

In book publishing, the same factors favored Egypt. In addition, book censorship in the Ottoman Empire was extremely time consuming, since the proofs of the book had to be sent to Istanbul for censorship before publication, however uncontroversial the book. Many books that could have been published in Syria were published instead in Egypt simply to save time. Censorship was definitely a hindrance to book publishing in Syria. In one case, a small publisher sold his press and contracted his printing to a larger press which handled the task of getting books approved.⁴⁴ The latest works of Arabic literature, however, continued to be read in Syria, although they were printed elsewhere. This was not new, for the Bulaq press had long dominated the publication of Arabic literature sold in Syria.

Ottoman censorship, viewed in the context of its time, does not seem to have been particularly harsh. Salīm Sarkīs tried to present a strong case against it, but the anecdotes he related seem trivial, compared with incidents of mob actions against newspapers in the United States or the imprisonment of journalists in Russia. The Ottoman Empire, like all states, limited to some extent the content of publications for reasons of national security, to protect public morale and order, to preserve public morality, and to protect individual reputations. Cynically viewed, these were equivalent to the repression of minority political beliefs, protection of the economic and political interests of those in power, and prudery. In Beirut, the ever-present possibility of murderous sectarian clashes, the strong moral beliefs of the various religious sects, the lack of an accepted code of ethics among journalists, and the external threats to the Empire would seem to have made censorship a necessity. The Ottoman censorship

Press Law in Egypt, 28 January–23 April 1885' contains the correspondence on the applicability of the Egyptian Press Law to foreign nationals. Of particular interest is Enclosure VIII to a letter from Lord Cromer to Lord Granville dated 24 April 1885, entitled 'État des arrêtés concernant imprimeries et la presse étrangères.' Cromer made it clear that the *Bosphore Égyptienne* was suspended at his request in a letter to Granville dated 28 January 1885. Kamal el-Din Galal, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Tagespresse in Aegypten* (Limburg: Limber Vereinsdruckerei G.m.b.H., 1939), p. 121. For a discussion of the Egyptian Press Law and its application see Mahmoud Fouad, *Le régime de la presse en Egypte* (Paris: Soc. de Recueil Sirey, 1912), pp. 13–15, 24, 49, 59–60; also, Khalil Sābāt, Sāmī 'Azīz, and Yunān Labīb Rizq, *Hurriyat al-ṣiḥāfah fī Misr, 1898–1924* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Wa'i al-'Arabi, 1972).

⁴⁴ *TF*, no. 1696 (2 Nov. 1908), p. 1.

regime in Beirut was best when it was administered by a journalist who could balance the rights and responsibilities of his colleagues. It never approached the ideal of absolute press freedom, but at its worst it was certainly not the harshest censorship regime in Europe. Nevertheless, no state was so severely criticized as the Ottoman Empire for suppressing views that were subversive to its existence.

PORTLAND, OREGON

APPENDIX

Newspaper suspensions and warnings in Syria and Lebanon, 1876-1908

Date ^a	Newspaper ^b	Action ^c	Reason	Period of suspension	Source ^d
Feb. 1878*	<i>al-Shahbā'</i>	S	An offensive expression	3 months	TF, 148:4
April 1878*	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	No reason given	4 months	Ṭarrāzī, II, 60 TF, 149:4
7 March 1879	<i>al-Yannah</i>	S	Incitement to tax evasion and a false report	Indefinite	TF, 221:3
7 Oct. 1879*	<i>al-I'itdāl</i>	B	Complaints about its contents		TF, 252:1
25 Oct. 1880	All newspapers	W	False news and rumors		TF, 303:4
29 Nov. 1880	All newspapers	W	Harmful and contradictory news		TF, 310:1
27 Dec. 1880	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	No reason given	15 days	TF, 311:1
7 June 1881	<i>al-Yannah</i>	W	False news about the government of Lebanon		TF, 348:4
23 Aug. 1881	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	W	Inciting religious fanaticism		TF, 347:4
27 Aug. 1881	<i>al-Yannah</i>	S	False news about the government of Lebanon	2 months	TF, 348:4
28 Aug. 1881	<i>al-Miṣbāh</i>	W	Prejudiced report on Lebanon		Same
12 Nov. 1881	<i>al-Miṣbāh</i>	S	Insult to the sultan's consort	2 months	TF, 357:1
14 Nov. 1881	<i>al-Taqaḍḍum</i>	S	Insult to the sultan	2 months	TF, 358:4
30 Nov. 1881	<i>al-Yannah</i>	W	Personal invective		TF, 360:1
17 May 1882	All newspapers	W	Rumors from Egypt		TF, 377:4
20 May 1882	<i>al-Taqaḍḍum</i>	S	Insulting the Druze sect		TF, 387:4
18 July 1882	<i>al-Yannah</i>	S	False news about events in Alexandria	1 month	TF, 391:1
24 July 1882	All newspapers	W	Disturbing news from Egypt	2 months	Same
5 Feb. 1883*	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	W	Personal invective		TF, 416:4
21 Dec. 1883	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	W	False and exaggerated news about Lebanon		TF, 460:1
2 April 1884	<i>al-Taqaḍḍum</i>	W	Upsetting news		TF, 474:1
3 June 1884	<i>al-Yannah</i>	S	Lies about Midhat Paşa and 'Abdül 'Aziz	2 months	TF, 484:1
21 Aug. 1884	<i>al-Bashīr</i> and <i>al-Muqatafa'</i>	W	A controversy about Voltaire involving personal invective and incitement to public disturbances		TF, 495:4

APPENDIX cont.

Date ^a	Newspaper ^b	Action ^c	Reason	Period of suspension	Source ^d
19 April 1885	<i>al-Yamah</i>	S	False reports of disturbances in Damascus	Indefinite	TF, 552:4
12 April 1886	All newspapers	W	False reports about government actions		TF, 576:1; B, 5:2
12 Jan. 1887	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	False and insulting news about the Czar	1 month	TF, 615:4; B, 89:3
2 Feb. 1887	All newspapers	W	Disturbing and harmful political news		TF, 619:1
26 June 1887	All newspapers	W	Untrue reports on the Anglo-Turkish talks		TF, 640:1
26 Jan. 1888	<i>al-Taqaddum</i>	S	False news inciting people to riot	1 month	TF, 669:1; 674:1
27 March 1888	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	W	Excitement of religious controversy		TF, 676:1
3 May 1889	<i>al-Miṣbāh</i>	S	Failure to print the necessary titles and praises with the sultan's name	3 months	TF, 734:1; 744:1
3 May 1889	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	S	Offending the sultan	1 month	TF, 734:1; 739:1
16 May 1889	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	Harming the public interest (set aside by court action, 9 Sept. 1889)	Indefinite	TF, 736:1; 750:1
5 Sept. 1889	<i>Bayrūt</i>	W	Publishing a forbidden expression	Indefinite	TF, 746:1
19 March 1890	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	S	A disturbing article about the rights of Jews	Indefinite	TF, 778:4
4 Oct. 1891	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	No reason given	Same	TF, 856:2
23 Sept. 1891	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	S	Violation of the censor's warning	2 months	TF, 899:1
31 Dec. 1893	<i>al-Ahrwāl</i>	S	A false news report	Indefinite	TF, 963:1
25 Jan. 1894	<i>al-Miṣbāh</i>	W	Printing a deleted expression		TF, 967:2
30 March 1894	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	W	Violation of the censor's warning		TF, 976:2
6 April 1894	<i>al-Bashīr</i>	W	Printing something not in the draft copy		Same
"	<i>Bayrūt</i>	W	Violation of the censor's warning		Same
"	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	W	Same		Same
14 April 1894	<i>al-Ahrwāl</i>	W	Publication of two sentences not in the draft copy		TF, 977:1
3 May 1894	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	W	Violation of the censor's warning	Indefinite	TF, 980:2
21 Jan. 1895*	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	S	False news	Same	TF, 1013:1
"	<i>al-Miṣbāh</i>	S	Same	Same	Same
"	<i>al-Ahrwāl</i>	S	Same	Same	Same

APPENDIX cont.

Date ^a	Newspaper ^b	Action ^c	Reason	Period of suspension	Source ^d
28 July 1895	<i>Ṭarābius al-Shām</i>	S	For errors, perhaps because of a slip of the pen	2 weeks	TF, 1042:2
25 Sept. 1895	<i>Ṭarābius al-Shām</i>	S	No reason given	1 month	TF, 1048:1
28 Oct. 1896	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	S	Publishing deleted material	15 days	TF, 1104:2
22 May 1897	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	S	Same	2 days	TF, 1132:3
23 Sept. 1897	<i>al-Misbāh</i>	W	Publication of uncensored issue		TF, 1150:2
29 April 1898	<i>al-Arz</i>	S	No reason given	40 days	TF, 1183:5
18 June 1898	<i>al-Misbāh</i>	W	Publishing uncensored articles		TF, 1187:4
23 July 1898	<i>al-Bashir</i>	W	Publishing announcements not permitted by the terms of its license		TF, 1192:3
"	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	W	Same		Same
"	<i>Lisān al-Hāl</i>	W	Same		Same
26 May 1899	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	W	Publishing uncensored material, changing words and substituting sentences in the approved draft		TF, 1234:4
3 June 1899	<i>al-Maḥabbah</i>	W	Publishing deleted articles, starting forbidden controversies		TF, 1235:5
9 Sept. 1899	All newspapers	W	Publishing uncensored articles, changing words in approved articles		TF, 1245:5
13 Nov. 1899	<i>Rawdat al-Ma'arif</i>	S	Violation of the censor's warning	15 days	TF, 1259:6
3 Feb. 1900	<i>al-Misbāh</i>	W	Publication of uncensored material		TF, 1269:5
4 March 1900	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	W	Publication of French without a license		TF, 1273:5
11 March 1900	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	W	Publication of deleted material		TF, 1283:5
1 July 1900	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	S	Same	1 week	TF, 1290:5
5 Aug. 1900	<i>Bayrūt</i>	S	Violation of the basic principle of the Press Law	Indefinite	TF, 1293:5
14 Oct. 1900	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	W	Violation of the basic principle of the Press Law by publishing uncensored materials		TF, 1304:5

APPENDIX cont.

Date ^a	Newspaper ^b	Action ^c	Reason	Period of suspension	Source ^d
14 Oct. 1900	<i>Lisân al-Hâl</i>	W	Same		Same
21 Jan. 1901	<i>Thamarât al-Funûn</i>	W	Violation of the basic principles of the Press Law		TF, 1314:5
1 Feb. 1901	<i>al-Bashîr</i>	W	A false and uncensored article		TF, 1319:5
17 Feb. 1901	<i>al-Manâr</i> (Beirut)	W	Violation of the basic principles of the Press Law		TF, 1321:4
"	<i>al-Mahabbah</i>	W	Same		Same
9 April 1901	<i>Lisân al-Hâl</i>	W	An uncensored article		TF, 1327:5
12 May 1901	<i>al-Ahḡwâl</i>	S	Violation of the basic principles of the Press Law	7 days	TF, 1331:5
20 Nov. 1901	<i>Lisân al-Hâl</i>	S	Same	3 days	TF, 1359:5
"	<i>al-Aḡwâl</i>	S	Same	Same	Same
"	<i>Thamarât al-Funûn</i>	S	Same	7 days	Same
"	<i>al-Bashîr</i>	S	Same	Same	Same
18 Jan. 1902	<i>al-Aḡwâl</i>	S	No reason given	Indefinite	TF, 1365:5
24 Nov. 1902	<i>al-Mashriq</i>	S	Same	Unknown	Iq, 11:6
22 Jan. 1903	<i>Lisân al-Hâl</i>	W	Publication of an article which violated the principles of the Press Law		TF, 1417:5
8 March 1903	<i>al-Mahabbah</i>	S	Violation of the principles of the Press Law	4 days	TF, 1422:5
7 April 1903	<i>Thamarât al-Funûn</i>	S	Same	3 days	TF, 1426:4
13 Sept. 1903	<i>al-Iqbâl</i>	S	Publication of articles which violated the basic principle of the Press Law	14 days	TF, 1449:5; Iq, 53:6
30 Sept. 1903	<i>Bayrût</i>	S	Violation of the basic principle of the Press Law	15 days	TF, 1452:5
23 Oct. 1903	<i>Lisân al-Hâl</i>	S	Publication of articles which violated the basic principle of the Press Law	7 days	TF, 1455:6
"	<i>Hadîqat al-Akḡbâr</i>	S	Same	Same	Same
1 Feb. 1904	<i>al-Iqbâl</i>	S	Disregarding the censor's warning	Indefinite	TF, 1468:5

APPENDIX cont.

5 April 1904	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	W	Violation of the basic principles of the Press Law	TF, 1476:5
"	<i>Bayrūt</i>	W	Same	Same
12 April 1904	<i>Al-Miṣbāḥ</i>	W	Same	TF, 1478:5
31 May 1904*	<i>al-Maṣṭriq</i>	S	Publication of deleted articles	TF, 1484:6
6 July 1904	<i>Bayrūt</i>	S	Failure to obey an order	TF, 1488:5
1 Oct. 1904	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	S	Publication of uncensored phrases	TF, 1499:4; Iq, 73:6
"	<i>al-Aḥwāl</i>	S	Same	Iq, 73:6
14 Nov. 1904	<i>Thamarāt al-Funūn</i>	S	For an unnamed reason (pardoned by the sultan)	TF, 1500:5; 1501:4; 1502:5; Iq, 76:6
12 Jan. 1905	<i>Ṭarāblus al-Shām</i>	S	For an unnamed reason	TF, 1506:5; Iq, 83:6
17 May 1905	<i>Lisān al-Ḥāl</i>	S	Same	TF, 1515:6; Iq, 100:6
3 Sept. 1906	<i>Bayrūt</i>	W	Mistakes resulting from careless editing	TF, 1590:5
3 Dec. 1907	<i>al-Maḥabbah</i>	S	Violation of the basic principle of the Press Law	TF, 1653:4; 1655:4; Iq, 227:6
29 Jan. 1908	<i>Bayrūt</i>	S	Disregarding the censor's warning	TF, 1660:5; 1663:4; Iq, 236:5

* Asterisk indicates the date is approximate.

b A few magazines are included.

c S, suspended; B, banned; W, warned.

d B, *Bayrūt* (unofficial); Iq, *al-Iqbāl*. Ṭarrāzī, Philippe di Ṭarrāzī, *Ṭārīkh al-siḥāfah al-'Arabīyah* (4 vols.; Beirut: al-Matba'ah al-Adabīyah, 1913-1933); TF, *Thamarat al-Funūn*. This list was compiled from indexes to *Thamarāt al-Funūn*, *Bayrūt*, and *al-Iqbāl* prepared by me.