

Revolution and Civil War in the Lebanon.  
An Unknown Page from the History of the  
Lebanon from 1841 to 1873

By a Contemporary of the Time,

Anṭūn Dāhīr al'Aqīqī.

Publication, Commentary, and Marginal Notes by  
Ibrahim Yusuf Yazbak.

Translation, Commentary, and Annotation by  
Malcolm H. Kerr.

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements  
of the degree of Master of Arts  
in the Arab Studies Program of the  
American University of Beirut  
Beirut, Lebanon.  
June 6, 1955.

Civil War in Lebanon

Kerr

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	iv
Abstract	vii
Chapter I. The Turkish Return and the Installation of the Qā'im Maqāms	
Commentary by the Translator	1
Commentary by the Editor	46
The Manuscript	82
Chapter II. Tānyūs Shāhīn	
Commentary by the Translator	103
Commentary by the Editor	131
The Manuscript	138
Chapter III. 1860	
Commentary by the Translator	174
Commentary by the Editor	191
The Manuscript	203
Further Commentary by the Editor	235
Chapter IV. Yusuf Bey Karam	
Commentary by the Translator	248
The Manuscript	256

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter V. Undisclosed Letters	
Commentary by the Editor	294
The Letters	298
Conclusion	
Postscript by the Editor	385
Conclusion by the Translator	390
Appendix A. Male Population of the Muqata'ahs (1849)	399
Appendix B. Convention of Peace Between the Christians and the Druses, 1860	400
Appendix C. Speeches in the House of Commons, August 17, 1860 on the Massacres in Syria	402
Bibliography	408

## Preface

The bulk of the intended contribution of this thesis is the technical work of translation. Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak's volume\* deserves to be read by those interested in 19th Century Lebanese political and social history, in a more incidental way it brings attention to 19th Century Ottoman provincial government in general and to the origins of the institution of confessionality in current-day Lebanese politics.

More specifically, the chief merit of Yazbak's book is the material it contains on the peasant revolt of 1859-60 against the feudal landlords of the district of Kisrawān. Both the letters published in Chapter V of this thesis and the 'Aqīqī manuscript of Chapter II furnish information on this subject which to my knowledge is not available in English- and French-language sources. Yazbak's own commentary is also worthy of attention, but more for its interpretation than its uncovering of factual information.

In my own commentary I have sought to fill gaps in the historical narrative and to provide an interpretation which draws both on Yazbak's work and on other available material. From the handwritten files of consular reports of the British Consulate in Beirut I have found data which I believe is not published elsewhere relating to the Druse rebellion of 1842, the beginnings of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah form of government in 1843 and 1844, and the rule of Amīr Bashīr Ahmad Abū al-Lama', the Christian Qā'im Maqām,

---

\* Yazbak's original Arabic title is Thaurah wa fitnah fī Lubnān: Safhah majhūlah min tārikh al-jabal min 1841 ila 1873. (Published by al-Tali'ah magazine, Damascus, 1938).

from 1854 to 1860.

The account of the 1860 massacres presented here contains no significant new factual information. This subject has received the attention of many writers of various viewpoints. To name a few of the best known, I refer the reader to Iskandar Abkarius, The Lebanon in Turmoil; Colonel Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites under Turkish Rule, 1840-1860; M. Jouplain, La question du Liban; and Francois Lenormant, Histoire des massacres de Syrie en 1860. The reorganisation of Lebanon's government in 1861 is the beginning of another story than the subject of this thesis; it is well documented in the British Foreign Office's publication of Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria, 1860-61. Chapter IV of the thesis, dealing with Yūsuf Bey Karam, is included only because it forms part of the translation, for it has little to do with the internal conflicts of Lebanon of 1840 to 1860. Karam has received rather scant attention from Western authors, but his career has been covered in detail in Arabic, notably by Saj'ān al-Khāzin in his books Yūsuf Bey Karam fī'l-Manfā, Yūsuf Bey Karam Qā'im Maqām Nasārā Lubnān, and others.

The footnotes in this thesis include those by Yazbak and those by myself. The former are indicated by a (Y) placed after the footnote number. My own have only the number, except when they are sub-footnotes to Yazbak's footnotes. In such cases they are signified by (K) without a number.

Chapters include (a) commentary by the translator (myself), (b) commentary by the editor (Yazbak), and (c) the manuscript by 'Aqīqī. Yazbak does not comment on Chapter IV, and Chapter V

consists only of letters which Yazbak included in his publication. I have placed Yazbak's introduction to his book in Chapter I as part of his commentary, to avoid an unnecessary break in the continuity.

The Arabic used by 'Aqīqī in his manuscript and by the various writers of the letters of Chapter V deserves a word of comment. Their language is semi-literate and contains frequent misspellings and grammatical errors. 'Aqīqī's vocabulary is simple and his phraseology extremely repetitious; I have made no attempt to correct this in the translation. The letters of Chapter V are far more difficult: their writers seem to attempt a classical erudition that is far beyond their reach and end by producing a curious mixture of obscure colloquial idiom and pompous phrase that defies an accurate and sensitive translation.

My acknowledgements are due to Professor Zeine Zeine for his interest and assistance in supervising preparation of this thesis; to Drs. Nabih Faris, Anis Frayha, and Issam Yaktin for assistance in the translation; to Mr. Norman Lewis for making available files of the British Consulate; and to Mr. Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak for an informative and stimulating interview.

Malcolm H. Kerr.

## Abstract

This thesis includes a translation of the book Thaurah wa fitnah fi Lubnān, by Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak, and my own commentary.

Yazbak's book consists of a manuscript by Anṭūn Dāhir al-'Aqīqī dealing with events in Lebanon from 1841 to 1873, 50 letters written by persons concerned with the 1859-60 peasant insurrection in the district of Kisrawān, and Yazbak's commentary.

Yazbak's most significant contribution is the material he publishes on the Kisrawān revolt. In my own commentary I have presented some information I believe to be hitherto unpublished found in the Archives of the British Consulate in Beirut, particularly regarding the Druse rebellion of 1842, the instituting of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system of government in 1843-4, and the rule of Qā'im Maqām Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama'.

A factual summary of the thesis is as follows:

Chapter I. 'Aqīqī manuscript recounts the expulsion of Ibrāhīm Pāshā and Amīr Bashīr Shihāb II in 1840; the appointment of a Druse and a Christian Qā'im Maqām or governor in 1843; the hostilities between the two sects in 1845; the rivalry of Amīr Ḥaidar, the Christian Qā'im Maqām, and his successor Bashīr Aḥmad; and the latter's unpopularity.

Yazbak supplies details in footnotes and describes the cooperation of Druses and Maronites in 1840 to support his thesis that there was then no sectarian enmity.

My own commentary explores the foundations laid for this enmity under Ibrāhīm Pasha, the beginnings of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah



system and the unsettling roles of the Maronite Church and the Turks from 1841 to 1845, and adds a large body of detail.

Chapter II. 'Aqīqī describes the opposition to Bashīr Ahmad after 1855; the unpopularity of the Khāzin shaikhs of Kisrawān; peasant organisation against them; the expulsion of the Khazins; and Ṭānyūs Shāhīn's leadership of the peasant movement.

Yazbak elaborates on the oppressions practised by the Khāzin family and states that Turkey, France, and England were responsible for precipitating disorder.

My commentary discusses Bashīr Ahmad's position; gives details and evaluation of the peasant movement and the role of the Maronite Church in it; and discusses the disintegration of feudal, ecclesiastical, and other traditional interests implicit in these events.

Chapter III. 'Aqīqī describes in detail the 1860 massacres. He blames feudal landlords and Maronite Bishop Ṭubiyyā 'Aun for inciting the war. He reports the repression of hostilities by the advent of European forces and the mission of Grand Vizier Fu'ād Pāshā, and the latter's measures of reparation and punishment.

Yazbak maintains that the massacres were due to the subversion by landholders and imperialists of the struggle of peasants against landlords into sectarian warfare.

My commentary adds details, maintains that a number of circumstances besides those Yazbak mentions were responsible, and examines the part played by Turkey, the Powers, the Maronite

Church, and social groups within the country.

Chapter IV. 'Aqīqī traces Yūsuf Karam's career after 1860: his period as Christian Qā'im Maqām; his expulsion of Ṭānyūs Shāhīn from Kisrawān; his later opposition to Dāwūd Pāshā, the Turkish governor; his exploits as an outlaw; and his exile.

My commentary is confined to details.

Chapter V. The letters here published by Yazbak, written by Ṭānyūs Shāhīn and those dealing with him, clarify the grievances of the Kisrawān peasantry, Ṭānyūs' ambitions, and the attitude of the Church toward him and his movement.

Conclusions. The feudal and sectarian issues of 1840-60 are inseparable. The breakdown of traditionally unified interests of Church, landlord, local government, Turkish authorities, and others created far-reaching dissatisfactions that led to the 1860 massacres.

CHAPTER I.

THE TURKISH RETURN AND THE  
INSTALLATION OF THE QĀ'IM MAQĀMS

## CHAPTER I

### Commentary by the Translator

Whether it is true to say that Druse-Christian enmity in the Lebanon originated in the period of Ibrāhīm Pāshā's rule is questionable. One finds occasional comments such as that of the Lebanese Iskandar Abkarius, who, writing of events in 1838, mentions "the bad feeling that existed of old between (the Christians and Druses),"<sup>1</sup> or that of Col. Rose, writing in 1842, calling the Druses the "ancient enemies"<sup>2</sup> of the Maronites. If one is to search for deep-seated causes that created the antagonistic state of mind of the mid-19th Century, he must consider the millet social institutions and the French sponsorship of the Maronites, both centuries old - not because they encouraged sectarian strife, but because they encouraged sectarian consciousness.

One would also have to consider that Amīr Bashīr Shihāb II, during his long reign, did much to upset the feudal traditions of the country, by dispossessing landholders, sometimes violently, and alienating prominent Druse families such as the Janblāṭs and Abū Nakads, not

- 
1. Iskandar Ibn Ya'kub Abkarius, Book of the Marvels of the Time Concerning the Massacres in the Arab Country. Translated and annotated by J.F. Scheikema under the title, The Lebanon in Turmoil. Syria and the Powers in 1860. p. 60.
  2. British Consular Files. Records preserved in the archives of the British Consulate in Beirut. Col Hugh Rose to Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Secretary, No. 82, Nov. 9, 1842.

to mention numerous members of his own family. The conversion of Bashīr and other Shihābs to Maronite Christianity, furthermore, helped to make the family a rallying point, after 1840, for the hopes of those desiring Christian political supremacy in the country. It helped to provide the latter with a "cause" -- surely a dangerous thing in a land whose equilibrium rests on long-accepted traditions.

In the more direct and immediate sense, however, the seeds of sectarian bitterness appear to have been sown during the Egyptian occupation of the years 1832-1840, which were Bashīr's last years of office. Further causes of discontent arose in 1841-5 and 1856-60; these we shall discuss in due course.

No sooner had Ibrāhīm arrived in Lebanon than he met with opposition from a number of Druse leaders. Shaikhs Hamūd Abū Nakad, As'ad Nakad, and Bashīr Janblāṭ actively cooperated with the Turkish Wālī of Aleppo in his effort to bring about the deposition of Amīr Bashīr; there were skirmishes between Druses and Christians, as a result of this, in Dair al-Qamar, the Matn, and Zaḥlah. It was Bashīr rather than Ibrāhīm who was the particular enemy of these Druses, until, shortly before the fall of 'Akkā in 1832, Ibrāhīm razed to the ground the houses of the Janblāṭ, 'Imād, and Abū Nakad insurgents.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. Ṭannūs al-Shidyāq, Akhbār al-A'yān fī Jabal Lubnān, pp. 569-73.

In 1835 Ibrāhīm ordered the conscription of Druses in Ḥauran and Wādī al-Taim. This was refused: with the help of Druses of the Lebanon they repeatedly defeated expeditions sent from Damascus. It was after a notable Druse victory at Ḥaṣḥbayyā that Ibrāhīm recruited 4,000 Lebanese Christians, armed them and others, and employed them in finally crushing the rebels in 1838. A group of these Christians were guilty of plundering a Druse khalwah, or sanctuary, an act not soon forgotten.<sup>4</sup>

There were by now 14,000 to 15,000 Maronites under arms and well disposed toward Ibrāhīm.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Egyptian rule had done much to raise the position of the Christians: equality of taxation, abolition of enforced petty distinctions of dress, exemption from conscription, and the return of their arms gave them a new feeling of equality and strength than ever before. Nevertheless, the opinion has been convincingly expressed that the diversity of sects was of great advantage to Ibrāhīm in maintaining his authority, and that like the Ottomans, "the Egyptians" always sought to foment discord between the populations to prevent them from uniting and being able to revolt with some chance of success."<sup>6</sup> A French priest wrote in 1841 that since

---

4. Ibid. pp. 584-8; Abkarius, pp. 59-60

5. Ferdinand Perrier, La Syrie sous le gouvernement de Mehemet-Ali jusqu'en 1840, p. 362.

6. Ibid., pp. 45-6.

Ibrāhīm's advent "we have seen that the fanaticism of the infidels has lessened in a noticeable manner."<sup>7</sup> These words soon proved to be mistaken, perhaps because some Christians mistook their new equality for privilege.

It appears to have been after the battle of Nezib in the spring of 1839, when hostilities were resumed between Egypt and the Porte, that the attitude of the Christians underwent a change. To support their campaign, the Egyptian authorities increased the corvee labour and requisitions from the country; the rumour spread that the Maronites would again be disarmed and then conscripted; and various Europeans, chiefly Englishmen, were said to have appeared in Lebanon ostensibly as traders or relief workers but in reality to agitate among the Maronites.<sup>8</sup>

In the spring of 1840 (in March, according to Perrier; in May, according to Yazbak) Christian and Druse leaders met at Dair al-Qamar and drew up the statement of alliance quoted by Yazbak. Amīr Bashīr was assured that he was not the object of complaint, and in turn he reassured the populace that they would not be conscripted. But the Egyptian authorities through Bashīr now set out to collect the head tax (fardah) both for previous unpaid years and for a year in advance, and in May orders came from Muhammad 'Alī to

---

7. Ibid., p. 394

8. Ibid., pp. 364-6

disarm the Maronites. This touched off an immediate revolt. Shaikh Francis Abū Nādir al-Khāzin was chosen "Sirr 'Askar of the Christians". Bashir sent envoys to dissuade the rebels, who stipulated the following conditions: (a) Payment of the fardah only on the basis of living individuals, (b) removal of Buṭrus Karāmāh, Bashīr's secretary on whom they blamed their misfortunes, from his position in the dīwān, (c) inclusion of two members of each sect in the dīwān, (d) cessation of corvee labour in the Qurnāyil coal mines, (e) permission for all to keep their arms, (f) no conscription. <sup>9</sup>

The Maronites appear to have been more resolute in their demands than the Druses, some of whom were satisfied by promises from Bashīr and Sulaiman Pāshā (a Frenchman in Muhammad 'Alī's service). In June the Egyptians attacked and defeated the Maronites, and again after the inhabitants of Dair al-Qamar raided Sidon. The revolt would have been crushed once and for all were it not for the intervention in the summer of the European powers, who, with the exception of France, came to the aid of the Porte by dispatching forces to Lebanon and eventually forcing the Egyptians to abandon Syria to the Sultan.

It cannot be said that the Maronites were totally abandoned by their Druse and other allies. As late as July, when the rebels had already met setbacks but before they

---

9. Ibid., pp. 367-74; Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 590-1.



received outside help, they sent messages appealing to France, Britain, and the Sultan to come to their aid.<sup>10</sup> These were sent in the name of the Christian, Druse, and Mutawālī (Shi'ite) sects. Shidyāq in listing the rebel leaders names numerous members of the Shihāb, Khāzin, Ḥubaish, Khūrī, Daḥdāḥ and Abū al-Lama' families, all Christian or partly Christian, whereas the only Druse family that appears to have played a leading part in the rebellion was that of Abū Nakad.<sup>11</sup>

It is superfluous here to describe the expulsion of Ibrahim from Lebanon and later from Syria, or the exile of Amīr Bashīr and appointment of his nephew, Bashīr Qāsim, to succeed him. We shall note only that, in Commodore Napier's words, after the return of the Ottomans, "The Turks, now considering themselves pretty secure in Lebanon, took no pains to gain the good will of the inhabitants; on the contrary, they soon made them feel that they had gained nothing by the change of masters."<sup>12</sup> Churchill, with his accustomed hyperbole, comments that "the Turks returned like screeching vultures to their baffled prey."<sup>13</sup> While Ibrāhīm was still encamped at Zaḥlah, the Turkish authorities neglected to give any material support to Bashīr Qāsim, with the result that his Lebanese forces returned to their homes and

---

10. Sir Charles Napier, The War in Syria Vol. II, pp. 303-7, gives the texts of these letters.

11. Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 592-3.

12. Napier, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 237.

13. Col. Charles Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites under Turkish Rule, 1840-1860, p.34.

the pass at Zahr at-Baidar was left unguarded.<sup>14</sup> 'Izzet Pasha openly spoke of again disarming inferior subjects, and the heavy internal customs duties once imposed by Ibrāhīm were resumed.<sup>15</sup>

In retrospect, it is curious that it was the Maronites who took the lead in the 1840 rebellion against Amīr Bashīr and Ibrāhīm Pāshā. It is noteworthy that the Maronites' complaints had nothing to do with sectarianism; there was no charge of religious persecution, nor any grievances not shared with equal justification by other denominations. Perrier, writing in 1842, concluded his book with the following words:

"La Syrie est livrée à l'anarchie et aux désordres; tout ce que les populations chrétiennes ont gagné par leur impolitique révolte, c'est d'être en butte à la réaction qu'elles souffrent aujourd'hui, mais qui n'est cependant ni l'oppression, ni la persécution religieuse."<sup>16</sup>

He does, however, note one fact of sectarian interest: that in June, 1840, there was observed the previously unknown spectacle of an open split within the Maronite clergy, with the patriarch and bishops threatening excommunication to the rebels if they persisted in disobeying the authorities, while the lower priesthood made common cause with those rebels, appearing in their camps to say mass and give their blessings on the eve of battle.<sup>17</sup>

---

14. Shidyāq, *op. cit.*, p. 612

15. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, p. 34;  
Napier, *Vo. I*, p. 238.

16. Perrier, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

17. Ibid., p. 310.

In this he is directly contradicted by another well-informed Frenchman who asserts that in 1840 the Patriarch (Yūsuf Hubaish, whose relatives were among the insurgents) had given every encouragement to the uprising, only to be disillusioned by the massacres that followed the Ottoman return.<sup>18</sup> We have no further evidence on this question, although it seems clear that in the years 1859-60, when clergymen of all ranks were involved in the turbulent events in Kisrawān, there was no such cleavage as that described by Perrier.

Perhaps more than anything else, it was the newly exalted position of the Christians, and particularly the Maronites, under Ibrāhīm Pāshā that led to their later difficulties. They were encouraged as never before to assert themselves, to count their newly found prosperity and favoured position as secure and inalienable, so that when in 1839 and 1840 they were called upon to make more than a customary contribution to support the Egyptian military effort (the request for their arms was made partly in order to equip Ibrāhīm's forces) they could not understand why they should be subjected to the same inconveniences as were the Druses. Some among the latter, resentful of the help given Ibrāhīm against them by the Christians in 1838, were perhaps not unwilling to stand aside and see the Christians chastised in 1840; and when the Maronites were rescued

---

18. Eugène Poujade, Le Liban et la Syrie, 1845-1860, p. 120.

by Europe, that resentment was increased.<sup>19</sup>

x x x x x x x x

Bashīr Qāsim Shihāb proved to be an unfortunate choice to succeed his uncle, and in little more than one year his threatening conduct toward the Druses, abetted by that of the Maronite Patriarch, led to his own deposition.

At issue was the feudal power of the Druse shaikhs, which was threatened in a number of ways. At the instance of Salīm Pāshā, his Ottoman overlord, Bashīr Qāsim organised a dīwān or council of twelve men, representing all of the principal sects, to assist him in judgment of legal disputes. The druses refused to cooperate in this arrange-

---

19. The anonymous author of Souvenirs de Syrie, one of the rare French-language sources critical of the Maronites and of French policy, presents a stimulating account of the anti-Christian reaction after 1840. After stating that Christian morale had been raised chiefly by the apostasy of Amīr Bashīr II and his harsh treatment of the Druses, plus the tolerance of the Egyptian authorities, their repression of Muslim fanaticism and encouragement of Christian liberties, the writer describes the recalcitrance of the Christians in acknowledging Turkish sovereignty once more, even in paying taxes, in the belief that the Turks owed them something for their help in expelling Ibrahim. The Ottomans, for their part, were anxious to reassert their authority over the rayas and practiced and excited intolerance toward the Christians, especially in Damascus.

(Souvenirs de Syrie. Expedition française de 1860, par "un témoin oculaire." pp. 95-103.)

ment by declining to choose their members, because they saw in the dīwān an encroachment of the traditional legal jurisdiction of the landholder over the peasants of his muqāṭa'ah or fief. Some Christian shaikhs objected as well, and a number of them banded together with their Druse peers to resist any invasion of their jurisdiction.

Bāshir Qāsim's reaction was a violent threat to dispossess the Druse shaikhs and divide their holdings among his followers. This he actually did in the case of the 'Imād family, from whom he took the village of Shimistār and gave it to the family of Abū al-Lama'; the latter, however, through the mediation of Patriarch Ḥu-baish, restored it to the 'Imāds.

Still more provocative was the circular sent by the Maronite Patriarch and signed by Abū al-Lama' and Shihāb amīrs and other Maronites, calling on those Christians living under Druse landlords to elect two wakīls (representatives) from each village to assume the legal authority previously held by the shaikhs. This was tantamount to the Patriarch asserting the right to dispossess the Druse landholders, and was duly resented by the latter, as well as by Greek Orthodox Christians who were not disposed to be dragged into such an issue by the Maronite Patriarch.<sup>20</sup>

---

20. Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 615-20; Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites pp. 36-8.

An incident in the Shūf then brought the growing irritation to the surface. A dispute which began over the alleged trespassing of a Maronite partridge hunter from Dair al-Qamar on the property of a Druse from B'aq-līn led to a pitched battle between the two towns in which 27 Druses were killed. The battle was stopped, but Shaikhs Nāṣīf and Hamūd Abū Nakad, Druse proprietors of the Dair, planned to take revenge when Amīr Bashīr Qāsim visited the town.<sup>21</sup>

In early November 1841 a meeting of Druse and Christian leaders was called at Dair al-Qamar to arrange the distribution of taxes -- another thorny problem that had not been amicably resolved. At the request of Druse chieftains, Amīr Bashīr Qāsim attended, only to be attacked by a band of Druses led by the two Abū Nakads and besieged in a building in the town for 24 days without the benefit of Turkish intervention. He finally left the town in the most humiliating circumstances, and soon after was dismissed and sent under arrest to Istanbul. 'Umar Pāshā, a German renegade, was appointed in his place.<sup>22</sup>

---

21. Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 621-2  
Churchill states that Bashīr Qāsim had levied Christian tenants of the Abū Nakads, which was a direct violation of their feudal rights. (The Druses and the Maronites, p. 47.

22. Napier, op. cit., pp. 292-5.

The incident at the Dair touched off disturbances between Druses and Maronites throughout the Shūf, in which the Greek Orthodox stood apart or openly sided with the Druses. A number of writers agree that it was the attitude of Patriarch Yūsuf Ḥubaish, who, in the words of one, "announced that he and his clergy were ready to head the Maronites and exterminate the Druses."<sup>23</sup>

The Turkish authorities shared in the blame. They stood aside, as has been said, during the attack on the Amīr, and in the Anti-Lebanon Najīb Pāshā, Wālī of Damascus, excited disturbance by removing Sa'd al-Dīn Shihāb, a Muslim popular with his Christian tenants, from his muqāṭa'ah and replacing him with the Druse Shiblī al-'Aryān, who had led the revolt of 1835-8 against Ibrāhim Pāshā. Shiblī disarmed the Christians of his district and then proceeded with Shaikh Sa'īd Janblāṭ in an attack on the large Christian town of Zaḥlah, in <sup>the</sup> Lebanon foothills near the Biqā'. An intercepted letter from Najīb Pāshā to the Sirr 'Askar in Beirut advised him to leave matters in the Lebanon alone, for the incidents were taking place there with the full sanction of the Porte.

---

23. Henry Harris Jessup, Fifty-Three Years in Syria, Vol. I, p. 161. See also Abkarius, op. cit., p. 58, footnote by Scheltema. According to Churchill, the Patriarch ended by taking refuge aboard a British warship. (See The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 46-51.)

In the sack of Ba'abdā and Hadath, Turkish troops openly joined the Druses, and on one occasion the Sirr 'Askar was heard to say that "he knew the Druses intended to attack Dair al-Qamar 14 days before the event occurred."<sup>24</sup> This pattern is seen by Churchill as part of a Turkish policy of asserting independence from Europe by inflaming Muslim fanaticism to counteract reforms forced upon them, to discourage the population from relying on Europeans, scorning the will of Britain in lesser matters "knowing that the English will be the last to desert them." He quotes the Ottomans themselves as saying, "The Turks cannot regain their lost position and influence without they return to fanaticism."<sup>25</sup>

We shall later see more detailed evidence of the fact that apart from ecclesiastical intrigues and Turkish rancor, there were social forces at work in the Lebanon making for unrest. 'Umar Pāshā, generally conceded to be a good governor while he lasted, "had to contend ... with the animosities resulting from the gradual breaking up of the feudal system which had been a potent factor in the former solidarity of the Mount's interests."<sup>26</sup>

---

24. Ibid., pp. 55-60.

25. Ibid., pp. 69-72.

26. Abkarius, op. cit., Scheltema introduction, p. 21.



This was in 1841 an influence affecting primarily the Druse muqāṭa'jīs, whose tenants included a large number of Christians. Muṣṭafā Pāsha, sent by the Porte in November 1841 to investigate the disturbances, was able to play on these circumstances in persuading or brow-beating Christians to petition for direct Turkish rule.<sup>27</sup> All that the European Powers could gain by their remonstrances was the dismissal of 'Umar.

The Druses soon learned that it was not out<sup>of</sup> any love for them that the Turks had lent them their recent support. A dispute over whether the booty seized from the Christians the year before was to be returned to them, plus threats to disarm and conscript the Druses, led to the arrest and imprisonment of five Druse chieftains in late 1842. By November a sizeable uprising had begun under that inveterate rebel, Shiblī al-'Aryān. At the same time the Maronites of North Lebanon were provoked by an unsuccessful attempt by the Turks to arrest Butrus Karam of Ihdin for his active opposition to their petition-seeking.<sup>28</sup> The result was that Druses and Christians once again found a common cause. Though the two parties could not agree on a formal alliance Shiblī's insurrection received at least partial Christian support, notably from

---

27. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, p. 66;

Poujade, op. cit., p. 39.  
28. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 71-5.

Amīr 'Abdullah Shihāb and the Christians of the Matn. Other Christians remained neutral. Col. Rose, the British Consul in Beirut, wrote to London that "great as are the wrongs inflicted on them by the Druses, the more reflecting and respectable amongst them, as well as the clergy, wish well to the movement of the Druses; and singular to say, there is a sympathy on the part of the Christians for their hereditary enemies; they are glad when they are successful, and sorry when they are not so."<sup>29</sup> Druse forces threatening Bait al-Dīn refrained from cutting off that stronghold's water supply, because in so doing they would also deprive the Christians of Dair al-Qamar, whom they did not wish to antagonise. A few days later, however, Rose wrote that "it is very doubtful whether the Maronites will remain true to the Druses, when they are once committed in warfare. Corruption has already made them act treacherously toward their own co-religionists; probably these and similar temptations would induce them to act in a similar manner toward their ancient enemies."<sup>30</sup> And still later: "The Greek Antiochans, influenced by their Patriarch and clergy, who are under a foreign influence (Russia), shew a tendency to favor the policy of the Turks, and thereby prevent the restoration of a Maronite Emir."<sup>31</sup>

---

29. British Consular Files. Rose to Aberdeen, No. 84, Nov. 19, 1842.

30. *Ibid.*, No. 82, Nov. 9, 1842.

31. *Ibid.*, No. 86, Nov. 29, 1842. It was chiefly the Maronites hope of gaining Druse support for a Shihābī ruler that induced them to give what help they did.

On November 19 the Consul reported that the Turks had inflicted a severe defeat upon the <sup>Druse</sup> Turks. The Druses were bitter toward the Turks, "who they state last year incited them to destroy the Christians, and now turn their arms against them because they do not give up the Christian plunder which the Turkish authorities promised them as a reward for their attack on the Christians." 32

'Umar Pāshā had unsuccessfully tried to persuade the Christians of the Matn and Jazzīn to take up arms against the Druses. He did have at his command a few hundred Christian cavalry; these however were members of his regular forces recruited before the insurrection had begun.

In early December the Maronite chiefs met at Antilyās to consider openly joining the Druse rebels, and decided to do so on the following conditions: (a) Restoration of all plunder not destroyed or burnt. (b) Agreement to a Maronite Shihāb governor. (c) The Druses of the Matn to remain under the Maronite family of Abū al-Lama'. (d) The Druses to give bonds for whatever plunder could not be liquidated at once. Rose however foresaw that the Christians would not follow up their propositions, for they "cannot be relied on ... They are

---

32. Ibid., No. 84, Nov. 19, 1842.

pusillanimous and can nearly all be bought, the only difficulty is the amount." Amīrs Bashīr and Ḥaidar Abū al Lama', according to Rose, had already been bribed.<sup>33</sup>

As'ad Pāshā, Mushīr at Beirut, then made concessions to win the support of the Anṭilyās gathering, including a guarantee of seigneurial rights and a general amnesty for those Christians in rebellion, but making the condition that the Maronite leaders pledge their unqualified fidelity and their acceptance of whatever governor the Porte should appoint.<sup>34</sup> This gained the desired object. The revolt collapsed, the Druse insurgents fled or surrendered, and Amīr 'Abdullah Shihāb and his small group begged British protection.<sup>35</sup> Thus ended the last notable example of Druse-Maronite cooperation for

---

33. Ibid., No. 89, Dec. 7, 1842.

34. Text and translation of a letter from Amīr 'Abdullah Shihāb to British Consul Rose, found in British Consular Files. 'Abdullah himself had only the previous June undertaken a solemn engagement to desist from further political activities or advocacy of a Shihābī governor for Lebanon. (British Consular Files, miscellaneous papers.) Shiblī al-'Aryān was brought to surrender through betrayal on the part of his own Christian dragoman. (Rose to Aberdeen, No. 2, Jan. 7, 1843.) The numerous other Druses who were imprisoned with him were released in February, thanks to Rose's efforts. Shiblī was sent to Constantinople. (Rose to Aberdeen, Nos. 9, 10, 15, Feb. 3 and Feb. 8, 1843.)

35. Poujade, op. cit., pp. 43-5.

several decades, more significant for the circumstances of its eventual failure than for the brief successes it enjoyed.

Even before the dismissal<sup>55</sup> of 'Umar Pāshā as Turkish governor of the Mountain, negotiations had begun between the Porte and the Powers for an acceptable system of rule. Despite the solidarity of England and France in supporting the cause of the Shihābs (a cause later abandoned by the British), and despite the numerous petitions in Lebanon demanding a Shihābī ruler, the Porte was successful with Russian backing in refusing. As a counter-proposal, the Ottomans proposed a Muslim governor for the country.

On May 27, 1842, a conference of the five Powers and the Porte agreed in principle on a scheme proposed by Metternich for two separate governments or Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, with a Christian and a Druse Qā'im Maqām presiding over their respective co-religionists. Turkey had "l'art de presenter comme une concession ce qui est pour lui une victoire," outwardly at least giving only grudging acquiescence, calling the arrangement only a temporary one, and setting aside the area of Jubail, on the coast north of Beirut, to be under the supervision of the Mushīr in Beirut. She was, however, glad to be rid of the Shihābs, who would not be eligible for the post of Christian Qā'im Maqām, and she has been amply

accused of favoring the arrangement as one which could only lead to disorder and pave the way for the return of her direct sovereignty.<sup>36</sup>

For the fact was that while in the north the population was almost totally Christian, excepting a number of Druses in the Matn district, in central and south Lebanon a majority of about two to one were also Christians living under a totally Druse landed aristocracy.<sup>37</sup> According to the decisions made in Constantinople, the authority of each Qā'im Maqām would extend over all his co-religionists. This meant that no geographical boundary line could be practicable, and it meant that Christian peasants in the south would be under one governor while their Druse landlords would be under another. These difficulties were recognised to some extent at Constantinople, and As'ad Pāshā was appointed Mushīf of the coastal province of Sidon, with headquarters at Beirut, to supervise the practical implementation of the scheme.

It was on this implementation that French and British policies went their separate ways. It was the opinion of As'ad Pāshā, shared by Britain, that there would have to be some safeguard for the feudal rights of the Druse Muqāṭa'jīs. In order to avoid conflicts of authority or a repeti-

---

36. For statistics of population by district, see Appendix A.

37. Poujade, op. cit., pp. 27-33

tion of the affair of the Maronite Patriarch's circular of 1841 dispossessing the Druse landholders, the only sensible solution would be to limit the jurisdiction of each Qā'im Maqām within set boundaries. To this the French objected, in the interest of their Maronite wards in the Druse-governed area who would have no opportunity of redress to a Christian authority. They maintained that technically title to the fief was not hereditary but appointive -- the implication clearly being that it would not be inconvenient to effect a wholesale dismissal of Druse landlords. In actual fact, France clung to her preference for the ancien regime of the Shihābs, and would have preferred to see the new plan discarded without being tried.<sup>38</sup>

The numerous Greek Orthodox of the southern half of the country, for their part, voiced their preference for Druse to Maronite rule. It has been seen that they opposed a Shihābī restoration; they had been sympathetic to the Druses in the 1841 outbreaks, and dreaded what they considered a patronising intolerance on the part of the higher Maronite clergy.<sup>39</sup>

As'ad Pāshā meanwhile proceeded to put the arranged plan into effect, however vague it was. On January 1, 1843, he named Amīrs Ḥaidar Ismā'īl Abū al-Lama' and Aḥmad Arslān

---

38. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 80-1.

39. British Consular Files. Rose to Aberdeen, No. 1, Jan. 1, and No. 5, Jan. 7, 1843.

as Christian and Druse Qa'īm Maqām respectively. The latter was brought to his new post from the jail where he had been put only a few weeks before for his part in the uprising of Shiblī al-'Aryān. His selection was highly displeasing to Col. Rose, the British Consul, who considered that it was his ineffectual character that had led the rival Janblāṭī and Yazbakī Druse factions to recommend him as a compromise choice, and that had led As'ad to accept him. Amir Ahmad returned each night of his own will to the jail, where he found the atmosphere companionable and spent the evening in consultation with his interned colleagues. Only three days after his appointment, he was dismissed by As'ad for his "insolent" demands: confirmation of the Druse feudal rights and the release of the Druse leaders; and he was returned to prison to spend his days as well as his nights, until on January 14 he was reinstated in office.<sup>40</sup>

Further confusion arose when on January 10, encouraged by Basily, the Russian Consul, As'ad Pāshā removed the Greek Orthodox Christians from the authority of Amīr Ḥaidar.<sup>41</sup> This was partially in response to an attempt by Ḥaidar to assert his authority over the Greek Orthodox village of Shwaifat, where As'ad had specifically recognised the Ars-

---

40. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 7, Jan. 20, 1843.

41. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 5, Jan. 7, 1843.



lān family's jurisdiction and where that family enjoyed great popularity.<sup>42</sup>

As'ad then consulted the consuls on whether to divide the authority of the Qā'im Maqāms on a territorial or religious basis, and it was generally agreed that the latter was impracticable. In April instructions arrived from the Porte to divide the country territorially, between the five Muqāta'ahs owned by Christians and the five owned by Druses.<sup>43</sup> This was done, and the boundary was drawn along the Beirut-Damascus road. At the same time the area of Jubail was returned to the Maronite Qā'im Maqāmiyyah.<sup>44</sup>

These decisions, however, were by no means sufficient in themselves to provide the country with effective government under the new arrangement. The Druse Qā'im Māqām made his headquarters at Shwaifāt and the Christian at Bikfayyā, but both were without revenue or the means of authority. The population found it more suitable to do whatever business they had with the Turkish authorities at Jubail or Dair al-Qamar.<sup>45</sup> The Maronite ecclesiastical

---

42. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 12, Feb. 5, and No. 35, April 10, 1843.

43. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 31, April 6, 1843.

44. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 12, Feb. 5, 1843. The town of Dair al-Qamar at the request of its inhabitants had been withdrawn from its Druse Abu Nakad overlords and placed under direct Turkish administration.

45. Ibid., Rose to Aberdeen, No. 21, Feb. 26, 1843.

and other leaders still clung to the hope that the current plans would be abandoned and they would again receive a Shihābī amīr as governor; there was some loss of faith in France, who had not brought this about.<sup>46</sup>

By 1844, with questions affecting the mixed districts still in abeyance, As'ad Pāshā reported to Constantinople that the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah plan as it stood could not be implemented except by force. The Porte then dispatched Khalīl, Kapudan Pasha of the Fleet, to investigate the entire matter, intimating to France and Austria that if Khalīl deemed it advisable the Shihābs might be restored to power. He had scarcely arrived (in June, 1844) when he declared that he would accept no petitions for the Shihābs; the issue was to be closed, and no mention was even to be made of them. This was a great blow to the Maronite and French partisans of that family, for only in May, Bishop Tūbiyyā 'Aun of Beirut had received a delegation of Talḥūq and 'Abd al-Mālik Druses who declared their desire for the return of Amīr Bashīr II,<sup>47</sup> (who was then 76 years of age). Khalīl's mission, plus the return to the fold of Islam of Bashīr's son Amīn, who was the leading Shihābī candidate, effectively put an end to any hope of a return to the status quo ante.

---

46. Poujade, op. cit., pp. 52-8.

47. Ibid., pp. 53-4.

The question of the mixed districts was one not only of feudal authority and judicial redress but also of taxation. In 1841 it had been decided that Mount Lebanon would pay a *mīrī* or village tax totalling 3,500 "bags" (one bag equaled 500 piastres). After the investiture of the two *Qā'im Maqāms* it was provisionally agreed that the Christian subjects of the Christian *Qā'im Maqām* in the north would pay 973,656 piastres; the Druse *Qā'im Maqām's* Druse subjects in the south, 365,317 piastres; the disputed mixed districts, which were mostly Christian, 373,527 piastres; and the Druses of the Matn, from whom the Christian *Qā'im Maqām* refused to collect, 37,500.

Of this total, the Porte allotted 1800 bags to be divided equally between the two *Qā'im Maqāms* -- not as salary, but as their total governmental income. To this *Amīr Ḥaidar Ismā'īl* objected, since he collected two thirds of the total taxes and clearly needed the larger operational funds. He further objected to *As'ad Pāshā's* suggestion that the Druse *Qā'im Maqām* collect the taxes from the mixed districts, on grounds that this would prejudice the final disposition of those districts. Under these circumstances, the *Mīrī* was not systematically collected at all; each *Qā'im Maqām* collected only enough for his immediate needs as they arose.<sup>48</sup>

---

48. *Ibid.*, p. 64. Col. Rose had over a year before attributed such a proposal to *As'ad Pāshā*. (British Consular Files. Rose to Aberdeen, No. 35, April 10, 1843.)

Khalīl Pāshā soon after arriving declared that he would himself see to collection of the Turkish Government's share of the *mīrī*, and on September 2 announced his decision that the mixed districts would be placed under the full authority of the Druse *Qā'im Maqām*. All districts were ordered to elect representatives to meet with Khalīl to arrange a financial settlement; but the Christians of the disputed areas refused, declaring that rather than submit they would accept the scheme of emigration with compensation proposed by the British Consul and accepted by the Porte.<sup>49</sup>

Poujade, the French Consul, then proposed a plan which, with modifications, was eventually accepted by the Porte. In each *muqāṭa'ah* of mixed population a Druse and a Christian *wakīl* (representative) would be chosen, each with judicial authority of first instance over his own co-religionists and responsible to his own *Qā'im Maqām*.

---

49. Poujade, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-5. This plan did to some extent weaken feudal rights of the landlord, which traditionally included power of punishment not including death; the right to the subject's service in war and labor in peacetime; and collection of taxes, of which the landlord retained a small percentage. (British Consular Files, Rose to Aberdeen, No. 5, Jan. 7, 1843.)

Mixed cases would be heard by the two wakīls jointly. The Porte, however, reserved for the Qā'im Maqām of the district some choice in selecting the wakīls, with the result that a Christian wakīl in the south would not in reality be too closely bound to the Maronite governor of the north.<sup>50</sup>

In the spring of 1845 a number of causes combined to produce a fresh outbreak between Druses and Maronites more violent than that of four years before. Early in the year the austere and respected As'ad Pāshā was replaced by Vejīhi Pāshā as Mushīr, whom Poujade found to be a classic type of old-line Ottoman: one who liked to give Europeans the impression of cooperation and good will while actually having his own way. He had 16 wives and concubines, lived in great luxury, and "ne connaissait d'autre récréation... que l'intérieur de son harem."<sup>51</sup> Vejīhi stationed groups of Turkish troops in various mountain villages in a manner considered by some to be more provocative than reassuring, the complaint being made that these forces were placed only in Christian localities and that Christians but not Druses were being disarmed.<sup>52</sup>

---

50. Ibid., pp. 86-7.

51. Ibid., pp. 78-9. Poujade spells the name "Vedji", and Rose, "Wagieah." The name as found in Yazbak and Shidyāq is "Wajīhi", or, as pronounced in Turkish, "Vejīhi".

52. The Reminiscences of Daniel Bliss, edited and supplemented by his eldest son, p. 141.

There was, to be sure, ample cause for Druse irritation. Maronite leaders, notably the Patriarch and bishops, had persistently refused to renounce their demands for a Christian Shihābī governor of all Lebanon, and meanwhile were unwilling to concede the Druses enough authority in central and south Lebanon to make the Qā'im Maqām system work. An American missionary wrote that the friction in 1845, as in 1841 and 1860, "had as its determining cause the ambition of the locally all-powerful Maronite Patriarch, whose seat was in the North. Not content with his legal rights to control his co-religionists in the Southern Lebanon in matters spiritual, he now claimed jurisdiction over them in temporal matters as well. His pretensions were bitterly resisted by the Druse chieftains, who saw their feudal rights threatened. ... The seeds ... were political rather than religious."<sup>53</sup> Another American has quoted Patriarch Hubaish as saying that "all Lebanon must be under either Druse or Maronite rule, the blow must be struck, and he who strikes first will have two chances to one in his favor."<sup>54</sup>

---

53. Jessup, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 162-3.

54. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 85-6. Churchill states that the Patriarch used French and Austrian funds, sent for relief of the 1841 refugees, as a war chest, authorising the priests to recruit combatants at a wage of four piastres per day. (p. 86.)

The Maronite leaders of Dair al-Qamar reportedly forbade their people to have any dealings whatsoever with their Druse neighbours; a Maronite priest was put to death for having entered into friendly relations with Shaikh Sa'īd Bey Janblāt. Christian tenants feared to approach their Druse landlords and therefore abstained from paying rentals.<sup>55</sup> The Druse family of Abu Nakad, for their part, having long been feudatories of Dair-al-Qamar, were embittered at having been dispossessed after 1841, with the town placed directly under a Turkish mutasallim at the request of its inhabitants.

A Druse council of war was held at Mukhtārah in January, and later a Maronite one at 'Abbaih. In April the Maronites marched on Mukhtārah, burning 14 Druse villages before being defeated by Turkish troops. From then on the Druses were victorious,<sup>56</sup> with the active or passive

---

55. Ibid., p. 91.

56. Poujade, op. cit., p. 83. Poujade went to great efforts in trying to secure a death sentence for Shaikh Ḥamūd Abū Nakad, the Druse leader of the raid on 'Abbaih. After prolonged delays Shaikh Ḥamūd was found innocent by a Turkish court, but he was eventually exiled to Nicomedia upon the threat of the French Ambassador to leave Constantinople. (pp. 87-106).

assistance of the Ottomans -- notably at 'Abaih, where a French priest was slain and the town sacked under the eyes of 200 Turkish soldiers.

Poujade, the French Consul at the time, has reproduced in his book the texts of two letters from Shaikh Sa'īd Janblāṭ to Shaikh Ḥamūd Abū Nakad and to the Muslims of the Kharūb district, which indicate a detailed plan of attack drawn up in cooperation with Dāwūd Pāshā, the Turkish military commander.<sup>57</sup> The Turks, however, made some effort to conceal such complicity by stationing a garrison at Dair al-Qamar which did aid in quelling the outbreak.<sup>58</sup>

Khalīl Pāshā had declared his mission at an end and withdrawn from Lebanon in the spring, just at the time the civil war had begun. On September 20 a new mission of inquiry arrived in the person of Shakīb Effendi, the foreign minister, with the announced purpose of general disarmament, settlement of indemnities, and the establishment of mixed tribunals attached to the two Qā'im Maqāms. He demanded and secured assurances of a free hand from the European consuls; he further asked for the withdrawal of all European nationals from the Mountain, to which all but Poujade assented.<sup>59</sup> Under Nāmiq Pāshā, the ranking military

---

57. Ibid., pp. 247-8.

58. Jessup, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 163.

59. Poujade, op. cit., pp. 95-9.



commander of Turkey's Arab provinces, a general occupation of the Lebanon was effected.

The conduct of the occupation troops and the alleged one-sidedness of the disarmament provoked frequent complaints by the Maronites and French, and the promised indemnities were never paid.<sup>60</sup> Shakīb's creation of the tribunals, or majlises, was however a commendable accomplishment that stood until 1860 and gave anxious minorities some assurance of justice. The majlis of each Qā'im Maqām consisted of ten members, including one judge and one tax assessor from each of the five sects (Maronite, Druse, Greek Orthodox, Greek Catholic, and Muslim), each member receiving a fixed salary. This institution was not popular with Amīr Aḥmad Arslān, the Druse Qā'im Maqām. His power was already restricted by an oligarchy of the Janblāṭī and Yazbakī Druse factional chiefs, who shared in his income as well as his decisions. The majlis further reduced his authority. His Christian opposite, Amīr Ḥaidar, enjoyed a more independent position and ruled over a comparatively unmixed population, and was therefore less averse to accepting his majlis, the majority of whose members were in any case Christian.<sup>61</sup>

---

60. Ibid., pp. 101-3; Comte Melchior de Vogüé, Les Evénements de Syrie, p. 19. Poujade relates how a French frigate landed an armed force at Jūniyah Bay to secure the release of a Lebanese employee of the French Consulate who had been arrested. (Op. cit., p. 103.)

61. Ibid., pp. 108-15.

Thus the Shakīb mission confirmed the Qā'im Maqām system at long last in a viable way, with boundaries fixed, feudal rights defined, and means of redress provided for subjects of all sects through local agents and the mixed judges of the majlis. Over three years had elapsed since the Porte and the Powers had first agreed on the principle of partition. Those years had been so full of suspicion, intrigue, and violence as to render the plan almost universally unpopular, as a whole or in part, and destroy the remaining confidence between Druse and Maronite that was essential to make possible any long-term success.

It was first of all imperative that if the 1842 partition scheme was to work, it must be instituted with vigor and wholehearted determination by the Ottoman Government, and must be clear enough in its details so as to avoid false hopes or exaggerated claims by either party. Turkey, however, appears to have been far from anxious for it to succeed, and believed that by giving it only the most halfhearted support she could demonstrate its impracticability and pave the way eventually for her own direct rule. This statement is not to be classed with the mass of irresponsible charges and counter-charges so frequently made by the partial or frustrated apologists for one cause or another, that one so frequently encounters in the material written on this period of Lebanese history. It is not to be compared with the picture drawn by Frenchmen of the Maronite lamb

devoured by the Druse wolf, or that by Englishmen and Americans of the chivalrous Druse, slow to anger, taking up arms only when threatened with imminent extermination. That the Turks in 1842-5 sought the failure of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system is a fact attested to by writers of every allegiance as well as by a firm body of evidence. Both Poujade, who as French Consul disliked the plan, and Rose, who as English Consul insisted that it be given a fair trial, furnish such evidence. Thus in late 1844, long after Turkey had officially committed herself to the partition plan, Khalīl Pāshā -- who had come to Lebanon to make the plan work -- deceived Bishop Ṭūbiyyā 'Aun of Beirut into making a request for "any" form of government that would not subject Christians to Druses. This request was then openly interpreted by Khalīl as favoring direct Turkish rule, not because Khalīl expected to be able to implement such rule, but because he could use the request as an excuse to Rose for further delay settling the question of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs.<sup>62</sup> By the same token, Rose interpreted As'ad Pāshā's nomination of the weak-willed Aḥmad Arslān as Druse Qā'im Maqām, his dismissal of him three days later, and his reinstatement of him still later. Aḥmad was thus shorn of his prestige before executing his first act of office. The appointment of the Qā'im Maqāms without defining

---

62. Ibid., pp. 74 - 7

their jurisdiction or providing for their support or means of authority betrays the same motive.

The Porte, to be sure, followed this path partly because it was not strong enough to win its own way in any other fashion. The partition scheme was not Turkey's; she had her own favored plan but was not permitted to employ it. Thus when Sir Stratford Canning urged Sarīm Effendi, Ottoman foreign minister, in the spring of 1843 to divide the Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs on territorial lines. Sarīm indicated his "concession but courteous rejection of responsibility."<sup>63</sup> Lack of responsibility, in fact, characterises Turkey's role in the entire question.

Who then was responsible for the plan of partition? The original suggestion is commonly attributed to Metternich. The official British position at that time (May 1842) was, like that of France, favorable to a return of the Shihābs; after Metternich's plan was adopted, Britain was openly insistent on its adoption in good faith. But David Urquhart, a British writer, in 1860 produced an analysis that suggested an insidious British plot to impose the scheme, knowing it to be ill-advised, and throw all the blame on the Porte. According to him, Aberdeen and Canning encouraged Col. Rose to support the scheme and Richard Wood to denounce it, the

---

63. British Consular Files. Rose to Aberdeen, No. 35, April 10, 1843.

former having himself hatched it and the latter thinking it a Turkish idea. Rose was allowed to criticize the Turks in 1841 for imposing a high internal tariff in Lebanon while Wood behind his back worked for its enforcement and bribed the chieftains opposing it with "a considerable sum of money, watches and ornaments," so that their followers would be left in the lurch, civil war would ensue, Bashīr Qāsim would be deposed and the way would be clear for the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system. The right hand was kept from knowing what the left hand was doing, so as to create a state of anarchy and discontent which could be blamed on Turkey.<sup>64</sup>

This fanciful and improbable account serves better to show the dangers of a creative imagination than to explain Britain's actual role in the question. Aside from his failure to suggest a motive Urquhart ignores the fact that there

---

64. David Urquhart, The Lebanon (Mount <sup>Syria</sup> Syria): a History and a Diary. Vol. II, pp. 406-30. As an example of Canning's ignorance of the affairs of Lebanon, Urquhart quotes him as saying that "the Sheikhs Beshir" were a royal family of the Mountain. "The Sheikhs Beshir," as Urquhart says, is equivalent to "the Mistery John." (p.418). But he exhibits his own misinformation by identifying Russia, not Austria, as the power that first proposed the Qā'im Maqā miyyah plan. (p.406).

was no effort to conceal Britain's steadfast support of the new arrangement of Turkey's distaste for it; nor could they have been concealed.

The opinion of some Frenchmen was, perhaps correctly that England's chief motive in supporting the 1842 plan was to keep out the Shihāb family whose rule over the entire Mountain would mean the return of unchallenged French influence. Guizot came under heavy criticism in the Chamber for maintaining at all costs France's cooperation with the other four Powers rather than unilaterally and forcefully insisting on the restoration of her protégés. There was impassioned talk of "ces populations (chrétiennes) qui ont été gardées, maintenues par la Providence comme une protestation éternelle contre la barbarie qui les entoure."<sup>65</sup>

The answer, of course, was that France could no more afford to defy the rest of Europe any more than she could in 1840. Her position had been weakened by her support of Ibrāhīm Pāshā against the Maronite rebels. Guizot's own words were that "il faut soigneusement éviter tout ce qui risquerait de nous donner aux yeux des autres l'apparence d'une action propre, cherchant à devancer ou à dépasser la leur. La conséquence inévitable serait de les réunir encore une fois contre nous, et de nous rejeter dans l'isolement."<sup>66</sup>

---

65. Poujade, *op. cit.*, Appendix II, p. 279.  
Speech by Léon de Malleville in the French Chamber of Deputies, June 15, 1846.

66. *Ibid.*, pp. 284-5. Guizot dispatch of 1842 quoted by Malleville, June 15, 1846.

France had no commitment or responsibility to support the 1842 plan, and made no effort to hide her preference for the Shihābs; but she could not match the vigour displayed by the British in advancing their own interests.

Turkey and Britain blocked the Shihāb restoration; France and Britain opposed direct Turkish rule. The system of Qā'im Maqāms, proposed as a compromise and steadily urged by England, neither France nor the Porte could refuse outright, though the former could encourage the Maronite clergy to demand unreasonable terms and the latter could play upon the ensuing dissension to cause the plan to fail.

x x x x x x x x x

The years 1846 to 1856 inclusive are passed over lightly in almost all the best-known published works on Lebanese history. These years were a relatively quiet period in the Mountain, in which the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system functioned fairly smoothly. It may not have deserved to be called "good government," but it was not seriously challenged; there were no further sectarian outbreaks, and no noteworthy political developments until 1854, when the death of the Christian Qā'im Maqām and of the Maronite Patriarch brought to office two personalities whose careers were of the greatest significance.

For an account of these last years of comparative tranquility -- 1854 through 1856 -- and for much of the following three years as well, I have relied almost exclusive-

ly on the unpublished record of dispatches from the British Consul in Beirut to his government, as the only source available to me that enters into any detail. It is one-sided, but it is conscientious and substantial, and it carries a day-to-day report on events that otherwise are largely ignored.

The Crimean War had a decided impact on affairs in the Lebanon. Nevin Moore, who had succeeded Col. Hugh Rose as Her Majesty's Consul at Beirut, wrote of his "conviction that the tranquility of Syria is mainly to be attributed to the existing alliance between England and France. So great is the influence of these two powers in this country, that the mere knowledge that it is the wish of the agents of those Governments that the Syrians should conduct themselves as dutiful subjects, suffices to keep this heterogeneous and turbulent population in ... tranquillity."<sup>67</sup> Moore made it his policy to advise all segments of the population to demonstrate the devotion they professed by "cooperating with the Sultan's authorities for the maintenance of public tranquility and avoiding of all party feuds and strife."<sup>68</sup>

To maintain peace and quiet did require some effort. At the start of the Crimean War leaders of the Druses professed

---

67. British Consular Files. Moore to Lord Clarendon, No. 58, Nov. 25, 1854.

68. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 3, March 30, 1854.



a desire to serve in the Ottoman Army. Wāmiq Pāshā, then Mushīr at Beirut, responded by devoting 150,000 pounds for recruitment, and the Druse Qā'im Maqām was directed to levy 10,000 men. This proved to be no easy task, and while the Qā'im Maqām sought futilely to fill the quota, those men whom he did enlist loitered on the coast, having drawn their equipment and advance wages, creating a considerable problem to the authorities and a menace to the unarmed Christians of the country. The Qā'im Maqām sought further funds, which were refused; his authority was already circumscribed by the oligarchy of muqāta'jīs surrounding him.<sup>69</sup>

"The present attitude of the Druses," wrote the acting British Consul, "is fraught with importance when viewed in connection with their attempts to excite the Christians of the Lebanon to engage in a bloody quarrel with them. Their extreme reluctance to comply with the repeated requisitions of the Mushīr of Saida to hasten their departure betokens likewise not only a great lack of the loyal feelings which they manifested at the commencement, but it betrays likewise a lurking sinister design on their part ..."<sup>70</sup>

- 
69. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 1, March 18, 1854; Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 110-1.
70. British Consular Files. Charles J. Calvert to Clarendon, No. 3, Jan. 19, 1854.

The delay was due in part to the question of who would wield authority among the Druses in the absence of Amīr Amin Arslan, the Qā'im Maqām. The Acting Consul reported in March, "I have the honor to state, with some satisfaction, that the joint action of Mr. Consul Wood and myself in the effort to consolidate the British influence amongst the Druses of the Lebanon has been attended with no despicable success." The two had aided in consolidating the power of the Janblāt faction against that of the Yazbaks, who had tended to flout the authority of the Mushīr and of Amīr Amin. The Amīr now showed new independence of the Yazbak party, under whose thumb he had long been, in the face of British and Turkish displeasure. He now submitted to British advice on the choice of a deputy to act in his absence,<sup>71</sup> and before finally leaving for Anatolia with his Druse recruits, made to Moore "the humblest confession of his past misconduct, and expressed his sincere regret and contrition."<sup>72</sup> His young son Muḥammad was named Acting Qā'im Maqām, though without the proposed Janblāṭī and Yazbakī advisers "on account of personal and family rivalry."<sup>73</sup>

Moore had further to use his influence in restraining disorders in the mountains, where "many of the complaints

---

71. Ibid., Calvert to Clarendon, No. 12, March 7, 1854.

72. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 5, April 14, 1854.

73. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 32, Aug. 17, 1854.

preferred against certain Druses of having usurped the property of their Christian neighbours in the Mixed Districts and in some instances entire confiscation were only too well founded." He singled out his great favorite, Shaikh Sa'id Janblāṭ, as "almost the only Druse chief who cannot be charged with acts of violence and extortion towards his Christian tenants."<sup>74</sup>

Meanwhile on May 11 the Christian Qā'im Maqām, AmīrḤaidar Ismā'il Abū al-Lama', had died and his nephew Bashir 'Assāf appointed, on the recommendation of the European consuls, to fill the office temporarily while a successor was sought. The British and French Consuls soon agreed on Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama', who, "notwithstanding some objectionable traits of character," appealed to Moore as courageous, firm, experienced, and in fact the only qualified member of the family of Abū al-Lama' (from which the Qā'im Maqām had to be chosen). He was admitted to be obstinate and ambitious, but to Moore's mind the best means of dealing with his ambition was to satisfy it. Bashīr 'Assāf, for his part, was "universally allowed to be wanting in the requisite qualities, he has neither sufficient experience nor does he possess the personal endowments..."<sup>75</sup>

---

74. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 33, Aug. 17, 1954.

75. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 12, May 6, and No. 13, May 12, 1954.

There was however opposition to Bashīr Ahmad's candidacy from the Khāzin Shaikhs of Kisrawān, who addressed a memorial to Patriarch Yūsuf, a member of their own family, proposing (1) that Amīr Ismā'īl, "the weak-minded and incapable son-in-law of Emir Haidar," be Qā'im Maqām with a Khāzin as his Kākhiyā (administrative assistant), or (2) that a Khāzin be Qā'im Maqām, or (3) that the Christian muqāta'jīsrule their districts directly under the Turkish Mushīr, without a Qā'im Maqām. The Patriarch hastily disavowed any complicity in these proposals.<sup>76</sup>

The Greek Orthodox Patriarch had his own ideas, first asking that Amīr Haidar's successor be an Orthodox, and later asking Wāmiq Pāshā for a Muslim Qā'im Maqām. Each request was abruptly dismissed.<sup>77</sup> The Crimean War had for the time removed what influence was customarily enjoyed by the Orthodox,<sup>78</sup> and the Porte was in no position to irritate

---

76. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 16, May 19, 1854.

77. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 12, May 6, and No. 15, May 19, 1854.

78. The Greek Orthodox made little attempt to hide their loyalty to Russia. When Patriarch Maximos of the Greek Catholic Church offered prayers in a public service for victory of the Sultan over his enemies, the Orthodox Patriarch (who had once been the Tsar's confessor) was so offended that he refused to pay the customary courtesy visit to Maximos after arriving in Beirut. (Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 59, Nov. 27, 1854.)

its French and British allies as it had frequently done a decade before, by encouraging requests for Muslim or direct Turkish rule. On August 13 Bashīr Ahmad was formally invested in office.

November 3 of the same year also brought the death of Yūsuf al-Khāzin, the Maronite Patriarch, and the succession of Bishop Būlus Mas'ad to the chair of Antioch. Moore received assurances from the new Patriarch that "he had to greatest disinclination to engage in secular affairs at all, and would never countenance political intrigues; and I really believe him to be sincere in those professions ... His Eminence is, I have reason to think, one of the few exceptions among the higher order of the Maronite clergy, or indeed of that of any other Christian communities in this part of Syria."<sup>79</sup> It will be seen how well these hopeful words were to be borne out. Moore's dispatches suggest that he exercised significant influence in securing the selection of Būlus Mas'ad,<sup>80</sup> and he had earlier declared that "the existing favorable sentiments (of the Maronites) towards Great Britain have been of gradual growth commencing from the time of the intervention of Her Majesty's servants in the affairs of Mt. Lebanon."<sup>81</sup> One feels inclined to treat these claims with considerable reserve after reading Eugène Poujade's account of the active

---

79. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 50, Aug. 23, 1855.

80. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 49, Nov. 8, and No. 52, Nov. 13, 1854.

81. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 20, enclosure, June 7, 1854.

part he played as French Consul in 1845 in the election of Yūsuf al-Khāzin as Patriarch.<sup>82</sup>

In April 1855 Wāmiq Pāshā became Wālī of the Damascus province and was replaced at Beirut by Maḥmūd Nadīm Pāshā, who enjoyed a reputation for exceptional ability and enlightenment.

In June a dispute flared between the Christian town of Zaḥlah and the Mutawālīs of the Biqā' led by the Ḥarfūsh family. Edouard de Lesseps, the French Consul, took an active part in deposing Amīr Faddāh Ḥarfūsh and securing the appointment of his relative Sulaimān, who was under French patronage. De Lesseps earned the annoyance of his

---

82. See Poujade, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-93. Poujade traveled through North Lebanon as a mediator and emissary among the higher clergy in the dispute over the location of the election, which eventually took place at al-Dīman. Three bishops had been held as hostages at al-Dīman by the partisans of Būlus Mas'ad, the unsuccessful candidate.

Canon law decreed that the Bishops of the Maronite Church must name the new Patriarch on the ninth day after the death of his predecessor. Should they fail to agree, the choice would be made from Rome. It was to avoid prolonged dispute, factionalism, and the intervention of Rome that Poujade and possibly Moore used their influence in 1845 and 1854 respectively.

Poujade lists nine bishoprics of the Church: Aleppo, Damascus, Beirut, Sidon, Eopoli, Jubail, Ihdin, Tripoli and Cyprus. Six additional bishops were without diocese: two were vicars of the Patriarch, spiritual and temporal; one represented the Church in Rome; and three resided at various locations in the Lebanon. (*Ibid.*, p. 129).

colleagues and of Maḥmūd Pāshā by what was considered a usurpation of the Mushīr's authority. "He has invested shaikhs and other individuals with robes of honor, a mark of favor belonging exclusively (to the Porte)." Wāmīq Pāshā from his post in Damascus was accused of "equivocal proceedings" in the matter in cooperation with de Lesseps; and when in January 1856 Wāmīq and Maḥmūd exchanged offices, Moore saw the former's return to Beirut as having been secured under "foreign" (i.e., French influence).<sup>83</sup>

Affairs of Syria took a general turn for the worse in 1856, as interpreted by Moore's dispatches. Despite the issuing of the Hattī Humayun of that year, of which some clauses were intended to promote sectarian equality, the Christians of both Lebanon and Syria found cause for complaint in a requirement that they pay the badal or redemption fee in lieu of military service, without the right to choose to be conscripted even if they so preferred. The badal was to be paid by the community at the rate of 5,000 piastres per man, in the same proportion as the Muslims were obliged to furnish actual conscripts. The petitions of the Christians were rejected, and the Maronites especially considered themselves humiliated.<sup>84</sup>

---

83. British Consular Files. Moore to Clarendon, No. 41, June 25, No. 69, Dec. 8, 1855, and No. 1, Jan. 18, 1856..

84. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 37, Aug. 18, 1856.

There were armed disturbances between the Druse families of Janblāṭ and Abū Nakad, which Moore attributed to de Lesseps, the latter purportedly attempting to woo the Abū Nakad shaikhs away from British influence. Wāmiq Pāshā declared himself powerless to intervene.-- an indication of the "utter subserviency of Turkish officials of every grade to French influence."<sup>85</sup>

The British Consul painted the blackest picture of the general state of affairs in Syria in a dispatch of November 24, 1856, commenting on the lack of security and of respect for governmental authority and on the "disgusting" interference of France.<sup>86</sup> The following month he reported Zahlah to be in a state of anarchy, with two factions at each other's throats, the more powerful supported by the French, whose influence frustrated all efforts by Wāmiq Pāshā to restore order.<sup>87</sup>

The Crimean War and Anglo-Turco-French cooperation in Lebanon appeared to have drawn to a simultaneous close, and the way was prepared for renewed disorders.

---

85. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 37, Aug. 18, 1856.

86. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 58, Nov. 24, 1856.

87. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 61, Dec. 19, 1856.



Commentary by the Editor

Page 9

(Quotations)

"Often, Members of the Chamber, we attribute to the Maronites and Druses a lack of civilisation, deception, and fraud. But when one day they learn to write history, they will no doubt charge Europe with treachery, because from it men came to them to throw them into turmoil, promising them retention of their privileges, even with broadening their domain; and you have seen how they kept their promises!..."<sup>88</sup>

---

88. This is translated from Yazbak's Arabic; the full speech is found in the original French in Eugène Poujade, Le Liban et La Syrie, pp. 275-98. The passage here quoted is as follows in the original: "Nous parlons beaucoup, messieurs, de la ruse, de la perfidie de ces races non civilisées. Si elles apprennent jamais à écrire l'histoire, elles auront à parler de la félonie de l'Europe, car à cette époque on est allé les agiter en leur promettant le maintien de leurs garanties, de leurs privilèges, que dis-je, en leur promettant de les étendre. "Et voici comment on a tenu parole:..." Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations found in Yazbak's text are translations from his Arabic, and not the originals.

- Deputy de Malleville, in the French Chamber of Deputies, June 15, 1846.

"In Syria are two evils, the Christians and the Druses, and whenever one slaughtered the other, the Sublime Porte profited..."

- Aḥmad Pāshā, Governor of Syria and Marshal of the Garrison of the Arab countries.

"The Maronites are submissive soul and body to France... and there remains for England no choice in the matter, indeed it has become incumbent on her to protect the Druses..."

- The English Colonel Rose to his Government.

age 10  
"The old Turkish party, desirous always of a policy of violence, deceit, and bloodshed dreams of annihilating the Druses by means of the Maronites, and vice versa."

- Guizot, Foreign Minister of France.

"The plan to divide Lebanon into two sanjaqs, Christian and Druse, aims at igniting the fire of clan warfare there..."

- Rif'at Pasha, Ottoman Foreign Secretary.

"The Druses came to make war on us only under the

compulsion of the landowners, who forced them to do this by beating them with sticks - and there is no contradicting that Lebanon will enjoy no rest as long as its leaders retain their privileges and exemptions..."<sup>89</sup>

- The people of Zahlah to the French consul in Beirut, 1845.

"It is our love for France and our asking for her help that have brought on us these calamities and misfortunes..."

- Bishop 'Abdullah al-Bustānī.

---

89. The entire text of this letter is reproduced in French in Poujade, op.cit., pp. 245-6. The passage quoted here by Yazbak appears in French as follows:

"D'après les rapports qui nous sont faits, il paraît positif que les Druzes ne viennent nous faire la guerre que parce qu'ils y sont forcés par leurs mokatagis, même à coups de bâton.

"En effet, tant que les chefs auront des prétentions, des privilèges, des immunités, le Liban ne pourra par jouir de la paix, car en réalité ces privilèges et ces immunités n'étaient accordés aux Druzes que par le prince de la Montagne, à qui ils rendaient des services et qui les leur retirait à sa volonté."

The next sentence is remarkable.  
"Le Liban n'est point la propriété des Druzes, il est à nous. Les Druzes sont des réfugiés que nous avons bien voulu accueillir lorsqu'ils ont fui de l'Égypte après le meurtre de l'imposteur Hakim-el-Amrihe (Hākim bi-amrihi), ils ne sont donc point les vrais propriétaires du pays: ils sont étrangers."

The Purpose in Publishing this Book

During my search in the villages of Lebanon, especially in Kisrawān, for manuscripts and traces on which to rely in my study of the "republican" revolution which the people of Kisrawān undertook under the guidance of their great leader, Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, against their feudal rulers of the Khāzin family, there was presented to my noble friend, Sha'yā al-'Aqīqī, bearer of the popular standard in his town, Kafar Dabyān and its environs, a manuscript 20 centimeters in length, 14 centimeters in width, in which his deceased relative Anṭūn Dāhar al-'Aqīqī wrote a chapter on that revolution and its preceding factors and causes, the writer having lived surrounded by and observing most of them. This chapter has come to throw new light on the history of the Mountain, some of which continues to be unknown or ignored, and some mistaken, despite the efforts of our best and most zealous historians who strove to eliminate this deficiency and expended much of their efforts and even their lives touring the villages and hamlets, monasteries, and ancient houses, smelling the stench, dust, and germs, expending their eyesight in solving the mysteries of some of the manuscripts. Most of them paid the widow's mite as the price of a certificate or a trace, all that in order to publish folded letters or manuscripts relating to this history; and they - may God prolong their useful lives -

Page 13

continue to serve knowledge and the nation with their valuable writings, and their precious searchings, without receiving any recognition or compensation for their excellent qualities.

The manuscript with which we are today concerned is in two parts: first, the elastic history of East and West - and this is more than what is found in the spice shops - "authored" by the novice Anṭūnyūs, son of Shaikh Abou Khaṭṭār al-Shidyāq of the house of al-Ḥājj 'Abd al-Nūr of the village of 'Aintūrīn. It runs to 264 pages consecutively numbered, and it was copied by the deceased Anṭun Dāhir al-'Aqīqī. It is of no concern to us now.

The second section which we are publishing to the letter below, without changing a word or letter, is the "Memoirs" set down by the copyist, in which he recorded the events which he says he eye-witnessed, or heard about, from the year 1841 to the year 1873. These are, on the whole, the most momentous affairs to have taken place in the dear Mountain, unfortunate Mount Lebanon, from the time it was first settled to the present day.

It appears from the course of these Memoirs that the writer recalls events according to what he knew in his own surroundings, and according to the relation of these events to Kisrawān, ignoring some of what took place, or is taking place, in the southern part of Lebanon. But he

has his excuse for his deficient information, and his ignorance of its analysis or correct understanding, for Kisrawān was "far!" - in that day - from Dair al-Qamar, for example, where the revolt put an end to the rule of the Egyptian Ibrāhīm Pāshā. News was not spread with the ease we know today; political secrets were veiled from most of the people, and culture limited to a special group of the sons of the ruling feudal houses, with rare exception.

The writer, however, despite the existence of all these reasons, which hamper a true and complete history, displays in many cases a sound logic, a valid conclusion, an excellent political consciousness, and courage (an instinctive truthfulness) to declare what does not agree with the policy stated by some of the leaders of his own Maronite sect, although he is a Christian, a Christian from the top of his head to the soles of his feet! So you see him stripping Bishop Ṭūbiyyā 'Aun, head of the bishopric of Beirut, of his robe of innocence, although he was his own relative, <sup>90</sup> saying of him that it was he who incited the Christians to fight their brothers the Sons of Ma'rūf (the Druses) in the year 1860 in opposition to the

---

90. (Y) The writer of the Memoirs, confirmed by many supporters, says that the 'Aqīqī family in Kafā'Dabyān, the 'Aun family in al-Dāmūr, and the Rahman family in Bisharrī, are of a single origin.

will of his chief, Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad, who "prohibited the occurrence of this ineluctable business." Bishop Tūbiyyā had intrigues in that black and violent year which were not free of momentous responsibilities; and we believe that the time has come for him to bear his just share of them in justice to history and truth...

We also see Anṭūn al-'Aqīqī in another part of his Memoirs narrating the cause of that civil turmoil among the Lebanese, with entire truthfulness, saying that in origin it was a revolt of the peasant against feudalism, that republican revolt led by its heroic chief, Tānyūs Shāhīn, to the noblest page of our country's history. This farrier became its commanding lord, "giving orders for obtaining rights and punishing the sinners as he willed, without opposition, and saying, 'by the power of the Republican Government.' His name became great, and his reputation penetrated the whole population." That revolution which the peasantry set ablaze was, then, for the declaration of republican government in Lebanon - the oldest republic in the East! - but the Druse overlords and the feudalists deceived the people and set them in sectarian conflicts"... That was in the beginning of the year '60. The cause of its occurrence was that some of the people of that district (the Shuf) yearned to throw off their feudal lords such as the princes of the house of Abū al-Lama' and various Druse and Christian shaikhs.

So they began their mischievous movement. The Druse Shaikhs learned of this news and began persecuting the people with a kind of trickery and incited disturbances between the two sects etc..." This historical truth has unfortunately been forgotten today. Common Lebanese opinion has ignored it entirely; it was dealt a decisive blow by the misleading "histories!" which were circulated, and whose poisons are still breathed, by a party of foreign missionaries and their hirelings, the pack-animals of the colonialists, the extremists among the shaikhs and clergymen, and those who benefit from sectarian division among the Lebanese.

We also see al-'Aqīqī enlarging on his description of some of the painful slaughters that occurred in that year, so profuse in his description that its publication today still opens wounds; it provokes these fishers in turbid waters who seek office or promotion of disunity; and the colonialist agents take advantage of this to awaken buried hatreds. But if reactionaries profit in some way from the publication of these Memoirs, the nationalist cause, the popular cause, and with them historical truth, will greatly benefit and profit from their publication



together with the clarifications we have attached to them. Indeed we say; the publication of these bloody incidents and a detached explanation of them are necessary to every writer who works for future generations, for they bear a valuable message to the people, who learn from it the evils of reprehensible extremism, which profits those who blow its horn - and they are but individuals - while others burn in its furnace, and they are the whole nation. It is to be considered brutal humiliation which the masses approach because they are guided by haughty leaders, and it is tangibly evident that every foreigner to these

---

91. (Y) Sources of the commentary:

1. Sulaimān Abū 'Izz al-Dīn, Ibrāhīm Pāshā fī Sūriyyā, Al-Matba'ah al-Adabiyyah, Beirut, 1929.
2. Majmū'ah al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah wa'l Mufāwadāt, 1840 ila sinnah 1910. Translated into Arabic by Philip and Farīd al-Khāzin, Sabr Press, Jūniyah, Lebanon, 1910.
3. Ṭannūs al-Shidyāq, Tārīkh al-A'yān fī Jabal Lubnān, Beirut, 1859.
4. Lubnān, Mabāhith 'Ilmiyyah wa Ijtimā'iyah, Publication undertaken by a literary committee sponsored by Ismā'il Haqqī Bey, Mutasharrif of Mount Lebanon. Al-Matba'at al-Adabiyyah, Beirut, 1334 A.H.
5. M. Jouplain, La Question du Liban, (Jouplain is the pen-name of the late Bulus Nujaim), Librairie nouvelle de droit et de jurisprudence, Paris, 1908.

houses - whether Turkish Muslim or European Christian - trafficked with our grandfathers and permitted the shedding of their blood for the sake of his greeds. Nay, the truth must be considered more momentous and more painful when it is seen that the grandsons of most of those feudalists and foreign agents who caused the slaughters, and permitted violation of honor, blood, and sustenance - that most of the grandsons of those criminal feudalists continue today, as their grandfathers did 80 years ago, to make war with the foreigner against the Lebanese people! This feudalist-colonialist unity is a logical result of the factors on which rests the present order in the world.

Page 17

We do not deny that Anṭūn al-'Aqīqī errs in some of his accounts, but his errors are unintentional, and we shall see him in the following pages showing sympathy for individuals and a yearning to support certain policies. He nevertheless exerted himself - God's pardon! rather he went forth behind his naturally truthful disposition - in saying the truth whenever he could, and trying to be fair to everyone he mentions in his Memoirs. He is markedly honest, and many cultured historians would do well to imitate him.

Those few individuals who have been able to make a serious study of the Eastern Question in its various stages, and were acquainted with the aims of the colonialist

states of that day (Russia, England, and France) to interfere in the affairs of the Ottoman authority, know that the Arab countries were the gate to that great Question; and if we are correct in saying this, - and we are correct - then from sound deduction we aver that Mount Lebanon was its key. Inasmuch as the momentous events related in this book concerning the Mountain are unknown to most readers because they have not had the chance to study them in detail, we thought of facilitating their task with a brief word, as an introduction, so that they may begin reading about them with knowledge of some of the principal causes.

Page 18

We in Lebanon, and in all our Arab countries, are in need of many studies like these Memoirs, so that the masses of the people may rise from their disunity and unite their ranks. What al-'Aqīqī has written in its pages bears, as I have said, a valuable message in this field. This is why I have printed and annotated it as far as possible, and I hope that the readers will receive it with open arms, and thank with me the dear "Al-Ṭalī'ah" which undertook its publication, for it has contributed to the cultivation of the Arab masses and their direction toward high ideals, and it is the living example of the pure and noble periodical which serves its readers with truthfulness and sincerity. Would that we had 100 "Ṭalī'ahs" like it!

Bhamdūn, September 25, 1936.  
Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak.

Introduction

Page 19

The Syrians and Lebanese were bending, at the outset of the 19th Century - and the length of the Ottoman period - under the yoke of tyranny, fatigue, and humiliation. Anarchy was general in all their lands, and they were ruled by conditional factors. The rope of security was shaken, rights were lost, and landowners competed to rent tracts from the governors (agents of the Sultan) to utilise them for their own personal gains, ruling summarily over the necks of the inhabitants, spoiling the land, and then willing it to their own sons after them.

When Muhammad 'Alī secured his footing in Egypt, after his sword had sparkled in saving the Hejaz and the plateaux of al-Murawwah, he stretched his ambitious eye to the eastern bank of the Suez straits (the canal had not yet been dug), greedy to widen his holdings and fatten his wealth, and to enlarge his army, and began to prepare the way to the conquest of Palestine, Lebanon and Syria. He spread his "eyes" into them to glean news for him and find the vulnerable spot in their strength, and sent his agents to persuade their inhabitants to support him. The ties of friendship were firm between him and Bashīr al-Shihābī the Maltese, governor of Mount Lebanon, and he showed favor to individual Lebanese so that his name became beloved to certain persons. Strangely enough, most of the population of geographical Syria were expecting their liberation by his hand from the noose of the Ottoman tyranny and its

Page 20

cruel agents, at a time when Egyptians were fleeing from the tread of Muḥammad 'Alī's rule and taking refuge in Syria.

That desire governed Egypt's ruler until it became almost his sole concern, especially since <sup>joining</sup> joinging the far-reaching Arab area to his rule would remove his capital city of Cairo from the Ottoman frontiers and make him secure from the sword of the Turkish Sultan. When the first opportunity presented itself, then, early in 1831 he sent his eldest son Ibrāhīm Pāshā at the head of a force of 30,000 troops equipped with heavy cannon and a variety of weapons, and among them his cleverest, most experienced leaders, to occupy these lands. The Arab cities all received them with welcome, and they met with no opposition except from the garrison of the fortress at 'Akkā, most of whose men were † Dalatians <sup>92</sup> † and Albanians.

The country complied with equanimity to the rule of the friendly "conqueror". With the aid of its sons, and especially the Lebanese, Ibrāhīm Pāshā was able to continue his victorious march on Kuthahia and to humble most of Anatolia up to the walls of Constantinople; and had Anglo-Russian policy not stood in his way, he would have occupied the Ottoman capital and deposed the Sultan.

---

92. According to Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak, denotes Ottoman irregulars of remote North African origin, whose ancestors migrated to Egypt and later to the Levant.

We do not now propose to examine the "nature" of the Arab Idea which ran in the mind of Muḥammad 'Alī and his son Ibrāhīm, and led them to found an Arab realm, far-reaching, full of courage, conscientious in beneficence, but we do assert unquestionably that it was not the child of nationalist will or the emanation of racial partisanship. It was no more than pure materialistic greed whose analysis has no place in these lines.

Page 21 What does deserve mention in this connection is that Muḥammad 'Alī sought influence with the Sharif of Mecca to win over the Arab countries to himself and to please them with his plan. He accused the Caliph of unbelief and sought a fatwa for this thought, and broadcast in the lands "a circular in which he accused Sultan Mahmūd, charging him with straying from the faith and with unrestrainedly imitating the unbelievers, declaring that the likes of him were unfit to possess the office of Caliph and to sit on the throne of the House of Osman; and he followed this by calling on all true believers to rise to save the faith which was threatened by him who ought to be its strongest defender..."<sup>93</sup>

---

93. (Y) Abū 'Izz al-Dīn, p. 58, taken from Sir John Gardner Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, (London, Murray, 1843).

Some historians see the rule of Muhammad 'Alī in the Arab countries which he governed, and especially Lebanon, as being on the whole a period of good; for he was just to the various religious sects of the people and rendered everyone equal before the law and in payment of taxes, and in the lands of the vilayets (outside Mount Lebanon) put an end to the preference, favoritism, and deprivation which the Ottoman imperialism had planted in compliant Arab souls. He put an end as well to anarchy and thievery, spread satisfaction, and worked for the revival of agriculture and industry so that he might profit; and profit he did. But those happy days of his did not last. The tyranny of foreign rule did not lessen however much its justice increased; and its evils were several times its benefits. The author of Ibrahim Pasha fi Sūriyyā said that the sons of that country welcomed the extension of Muhammad 'Alī's rule "because of what they had endured of the anarchy of the authorities and tyranny of the governors in the Ottoman period, because of the coaxing promises Ibrāhīm Pāshā gave them, and what they saw of the good behaviour of his troops in the country and their forbearance from touching the honor and money of its people. But after his conquest of Syria was completed, the garb of politics was shed, laying bare what was under it. He directed himself toward exploitation of the sources of

wealth of the Syrian country and weakening of the power of its people. He began to collect arms, conscript the men, monopolise the trade with the national produce, impose heavy taxes, and force the people to work for the promotion of the government's plans. <sup>94</sup> The Syrians had not been accus-

---

94. (~~Y. page 22~~) Ferdinand Perrier describes in some detail the system of rule imposed by Ibrāhīm Pāshā in Syria. Taxation included (a) the mīrī, or collective village tax; (b) the Kharāj (imposed on Christians and Jews); (c) the fardah al-rūs, which was a newly imposed head tax; (d) the customs duties; and (e) government monopolies. The mīrī was originally established at the time of the Ottoman conquest, being imposed more by right of conquest than by any deeper legal sanction. A cadastral survey made by Sultan Salīm served as the basis for assessment, but by the 19th Century was of course hopelessly out of date. A "green mīrī" was also levied on fruit trees, at the rate of 5% per year of the produce; payment began when the tree was planted, before it bore fruit, thus discouraging adequate planting. Furthermore, the land mīrī once levied was never lifted no matter what became of the land. In 1839 some Lebanese pleaded with Amīr Bashīr to take property which they were abandoning, so as to relieve them of the tax; this was refused. "In the East," says Perrier, "it is not that the tax itself is exactly ruinous; it is the lack of reasonableness that governs its distribution, the violence and partiality of the arrangement, that cause all the evil." There is no evidence that Ibrāhīm took measures to correct this outmoded system, though he cannot be held responsible for its creation.



---

The Kharāj, or tax on the rayas, had long ago been fixed at about seven to nine piastres per head. Owing to the long-term devaluation of the piastre, it had by the 1830's become relatively negligible.

The fardah al-rūs, an Egyptian creation, was levied on all heads without distinction of religion. This aroused the objections of Muslims who saw in it an impious innovation. As Yazbak states below (his page 26) it varied between 15 and 500 piastres per man. This was not high in itself, but the minimum was harsh on the poorest individuals, and it was assessed at a total for each town which grew with the population but never diminished.

Customs duties touched not only imports from abroad, but goods and animals entering towns from the nearby countryside.

Add to this the fact that the cost of living under Ibrāhīm had risen sharply as a result of the quartering of troops, the corvée labor, and the monopoly system. Perrier concludes that Egyptian rule was an economic burden to the countryside, which had to contribute more to the support of Ibrāhīm's army and government than it had for the Turks, while the trading and artisan class of the towns, which in days past had been the first to feel the effects of Turkish misrule, was now better off than before. (Perrier, op.cit., pp. 95-109).

The disarmament here mentioned by Yazbak was one of the first actions of Ibrāhīm in Lebanon, where 60,000 weapons were taken from the Christian population. The disarmament of the Druses came later, a fact which contributed to bitterness between the two sects. As for conscription, Perrier states that in the years just before Ibrāhīm's advent, the Turks twice pressed the Christians into service; though not in large numbers, enough to irritate both Christians and Muslims. (Perrier, op.cit., pp. 359-61).

tomed to all these undertakings in previous times, and the fires of revolt intensified in most parts of Syria, with the exception of Lebanon, where Muhammad 'Alī, s government was able to divide the aims of the people with the aid of Amīr Bashīr Shihāb by promoting the enmity that existed between Christians and Druses and even within the ranks of the Druses, whom they weakened by inducting their young men into the military corps and showing favoritism to the Christians to guarantee their friendship. For after having collected their arms from them, he distributed arms back to them in the year 1838 to seek their help in putting down the Druse rebellion when it spread from Ḥauran to Wādī al Taim..."<sup>95</sup>

We have said: The Lebanese had not, before the Egyptian regime and its pack-animal Bashīr al-Shihābī, known sectarian division. Theirs had been a feudal partisanship uniting Christian, Druse and Muslim in a single rank, against Christian, Druse, and Muslim in the opposing forefront. In earlier times they had been divided

---

95. (Y) Abū 'Izz al-Dīn, p. 256, taken from Ferdinand Perrier, La Syrie sous le Gouvernement de Méhémet-Ali jusqu'en 1840. (Paris, Bertrand, 1842).

into Qaisites and Yemenites. When their contenders quarreled, the allied families of numerous sects took the field against their competitors, pushed on by partisan, rather than sectarian interest. A look at their history before the ominous Shihābī rule shows us a clear page of religious tolerance and unity; in fact it is sufficient for us to look at the situation at 'Ain Dārah, for example, at the outset of the 18th Century, when the two parties fought the struggle of men ready to die, and the prospect of Mount Lebanon was turned head over heels. This was the most momentous event in its national history, and we see that the families of al-Qādī, 'Imād, Nakad, and 'Abdul

- 
96. (~~V. page 23~~) The origins of the ageless Qais-Yemen factional rivalry are obscure and need not be discussed here. Suffice it to say that, as Yazbak observes, it cut across sectarian lines. After the extinction of the Ma'n family and the succession of the Shēhabs to leadership in the Lebanon at the end of the 17th Century, the rivalry came to be superseded by that of the Janblātī and Yazbakī factions, especially among the Druses. This new alignment is traced by Colonel Churchill to the two sons of 'Alī Janblāṭ Pāshā, governor of Aleppo, who took refuge in the Shūf district of Lebanon after a military defeat suffered by their father. The later descendants of Janblāṭ and Yazbak, the two sons, occupied the Shūf and 'Arqūb districts respectively, the latter being led by Shaikh 'Amād, founder of the Druse family of that name. Eventually the two families quarrelled and became known, with their adherents, as the Janblāṭī and Yazbakī factions. (See Col. Charles Churchill, Mount Lebanon: a Ten Years' Residence, vol. I, p. 207; also Poujade, op.cit., pp. 21-2; also Perrier, op.cit., pp. 42-3.)

Mālik, who were Qaisite Druses, fought against their co-religionists 'Alam al-Dīn, Harmūsh, Arslān, and Ṣawwāf, who were Yemenites. The former were joined by a group of Christians, whose Christianity made no impression of their Druse allies or enemies. We see that Shaikh Qiblān al-Qādī, "Chief of the Shūf sects," as al-Shidyāq describes him, died in the year 1712 without an heir, bequeathing all his leavings to the Muslim Amīr Haidar al Shihābī, who was bound to him by the Qaisite tie. Indeed, we see a still more significant event than all that, in support of the partisanship, and that is that the Maronite Shaikh Francis al-Khāzin shortly before his death appointed his Druse ally, Shaikh Bashīr Janblāṭ, as guardian of his children. Again, we see the Lam'aïtes and the Yazbakī faction under the leadership of the Nakads fighting Bashīr al-Shihābī and applying themselves to confirmation of his cousins in the government against the Janblāṭs, the 'Imāds, and their allies who were supporting Bashīr. Then we see this same Bashīr agreeing with the 'Imāds to kill their enemies the Nakads by a base plot. History also shows us a Maronite from Dair al Qamar named Hannā Baidar rescuing his compatriots Maḥmūd and Wākid of the Nakadī Druses from the 'Akkā prison by a daring scheme that no Druse would undertake. And so strong was the sympathy of Shaikh Bashīr

Janblāt for the Maronites in his domains that he built churches for them at his own personal expense, and the Maronite monastery of Mashmūshah in the Jazzīn district testifies to this day of the tolerance of that Druse chief-tain. No doubt his grandsons have kept the letter of the Holy See to him thanking him for his "good intentions"<sup>97</sup> toward his Christian countrymen. Then history shows us that Amīr Amīn 'Abbās Arslān, a Druse, joined the army of the Christian Amir Khalīl Bashīr al-Shihābī and fought with him against the Druses of Wādī al-Taim... These events and witnesses, which are a few out of many, affirm to us that it was feudal partisanship that led the Lebanese in their lives, and sectarian division did not enter their ranks until after the coming of Ibrāhīm Pāshā to their land, and then the spreading of evangelical missions there with their diverse creeds.

In justice to history it is incumbent on us to say that the European powers, particularly England and France, strove mightily to create this division among the Lebanese and to split them into religious factions. There is Colonel Rose, the Englishman whom London sent to Lebanon and Syria to expel Ibrāhīm Pāshā from them, saying quite

---

97. (Y) Tārīkh al-A'yān, p. 142.

frankly in an official report which he sent to his government, "The Maronites are submissive soul and body to France ... and there remains for England no choice in the matter, indeed it has become incumbent on her to protect the Druses..."<sup>98</sup>

The above-mentioned Colonel Rose is to be reckoned, with his colleague Richard Wood, who later became the consul of the English government in Beirut<sup>99</sup>, the most cunning of those who combatted and killed the policy of France and her agent Muhammad 'Alī in Syria. After they succeeded in taking advantage of the Egyptian authorities' ill-treatment of the Lebanese, they worked hard to win the sympathies of the Maronites over to England. When they did not succeed they sought to kindle the fire of division between them and their brothers the Banī Ma'rūf (the Druses), and to split the Mountain into two segments, Druse and Christian, appearing to help the Druses, as we saw in the Colonel's report, so that he means of them England could gain supervision over this country and prepare the minds there whenever the opportunity permitted her to conquer it, following the way of India, and to spread British trade in the Near East.

---

98. (Y) Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, vol.I, p, 73.

99. It was Rose, not Wood, who became Consul General in Beirut. Wood was later Consul in Damascus.

Again in justice to history we should mention that politics is treacherous and does not fulfill covenants. France, to whom "the Maronites submitted soul and body," was unconcerned about the complaints of these friends of hers against the Egyptian tyranny and shut her ears to them, and even helped their enemy Ibrāhīm Pāshā! For thus her interest decreed... This painful truth was recognised by Monsieur Guizot, the French Foreign Minister, in the parliament on July 15, 1845, when he said: "We were in a position inconvenient to a victory of the Syrian Christians... and lately we neglected them in their opposition to the Pasha of Egypt, and protected the Pasha not only against the Sublime Porte but also against the Maronites of Syria, who were rising against him..."<sup>100</sup>

Returning to Ibrāhīm Pāshā and the revolt against him, we say: After his victory at Nisībīn and the political conflict over the Syrian question, Muḥammad 'Alī was convinced that he must undertake the struggle of a new war for the defense of Egypt and Syria, and he determined to increase his land and sea forces to 400,000 fighters. Among other things he resolved to conscript the Lebanese of all sects and to collect "poll tax"<sup>101</sup> money from them for

---

(Y) 100. Ibid., p. 199.

(Y) 101. Or a head levy, which is a tax Ibrāhīm Pāshā imposed on all males on the basis of 12% of the subject's income from lands or condition that it should not exceed 500 piastres however great the income, nor be less than 15 piastres even if the subject were poor. Men of religious calling and government workers were excused.

seven years in advance. He knew that the Lebanese would oppose these demands in view of the misfortunes they had suffered at his hands, and he ordered that their arms first be collected to deprive them of the means of defense.

Early in the year 1840 a number of Europeans had scattered through the country, claiming that they had come to trade or to distribute help to the needy and the destitute to alleviate their needs and losses caused by the succession of wars and revolts. At the same time the rumours spread of Ibrāhīm Pāshā's intention to conscript the Syrians once again to make up the gap in the ranks of his army and to prepare it for a new war; and tongues carried the rumour that European troops would soon come to Syria to save its people from misfortune and lift from their shoulders the exactions of Muḥammad 'Alī's government. These rumours made a great impression on the people, pervaded as they were with despair and trouble. A phrase much repeated on the tongues of the Lebanese at that time was, "Oh Lord, Thy comfort or Thy European!"<sup>102</sup> Every moment on the part of Muḥammad 'Alī's government gave rise to a thousand conjectures. For example, when Sulaiman Pāshā "the Frenchman"<sup>103</sup> moved from his residence in Sidon to Beirut,

---

102. "يارب فرجك والافرنجيك"

103. This was Colonel Sève, onetime officer of the French army.



it was rumoured that he had done so in order to conscript the Beirutis and the people of the neighbouring towns. Fear crept into their hearts, and many Muslims fled with their families from Beirut, some traveling by sea to Cyprus and the Greek islands. It happened that Muḥammad 'Alī ordered the conscription of Muslim youths in Egypt, and among those seized were the Lebanese Christian students who were studying medicine in Egypt. When the news reached the Christians of Syria, they believed they would be conscripted like the Muslims. It happened that there arrived in Beirut during this time a ship laden with military clothing, and it was rumoured that they had been prepared for the young men of the Lebanese Christians, and their fears of conscription intensified. Negotiation took place between the Christians and the Druses in Lebanon. Their leaders held a meeting in Dair al-Qamar and agreed to resist Ibrāhīm Pāshā with all their strength if he attempted to take a single soldier from Lebanon. Coffers were set up for the collection of funds to purchase arms and munitions when the need would arise.<sup>104</sup> The news of this meeting was related by a contemporary writer who may have been staying in Dair al-Qamar, for he said: "On the 27th of May, Wednesday, the people of Dair al-Qamar elected 12 (actually

---

104. For all of Yazbak's page 27, see Perrier, pp. 364-6, and Shidyāq, pp. 588-9.

Page 28

it was 14) men to make arrangements (from the Druses: Ḥamd al-Shaḥḥārī and Khazū' Khubaiṣ. From the Maronites: Nadir Abū 'Akr, Ibrāhīm 'Īd, Fāris Thābit, Sa'd Bāz, Yūsuf Abū Sham'ūn, Ghandūr/al-Kak, Bishārah al-Julkh, and Manṣūr Murhij. From the Catholics: Salūm al Ḥaddād, Ḥannā 'Isā, Dāwūd al Jāwīsh, and Ḥabīb al-Ṣūṣah) and they agreed that all they planned would be kept secret until the time for action. On the same day men from the various districts presented themselves two by two representing every district, and met with the 12 (more correctly, with the 14) and formed a pact with a single view, heart and voice. They then spread the call to rebellion to all corners of the land, and we came across a pamphlet of this call whose literal text is as follows:

"Following the introduction: previously we sent to your Excellencies other messages for clarification of what has been happening, and perhaps they have reached you. We are repeating for your information, that last Saturday the 22nd (more correctly, the 23rd) of this month, a high order was issued to the entire country, from His Excellency the Master of Favors - may God support him! - requesting the army rifles in our possession. Immediately we presented our plea three times, to keep the arms now in our possession, and this was not accepted; and once he has realised his

request for our arms, there will follow, first, seven poll-  
taxes <sup>105</sup>, and second, demanding our sons of all sects to  
enter the service (that is, military). Since this is an  
order which has no equal, we must show rebellion after  
trusting in God, and seek to oppose this treachery and  
render obedience to his Excellency the great Amīr.

Page 29  
Yesterday on Blessed Wednesday, we received news from Sidon  
that soldiers went forth from this side accompanied by  
their Excellencies the Shaikhs of the House of Abū Nakad.  
On Thursday we received the wonderful tidings that they  
defeated those foreigners and took from them 180 rifles, and  
that they are still stationed on the bridge of Sidon await-  
ing the troops that may pass to our side. We desire that  
you should be, as we, wakeful and watchful, alert to any-  
thing new in the environs of Beirut and the northern side,  
and whenever anything new reaches you, inform us at once by  
special messenger, and with God's help you will be victori-  
ous. We need not urge you to be wakeful so that this will  
be good and beneficial to all. We ask Him-may he be  
exalted! - that we may hear whatever your pleasure may be  
on account of your past favors. This is what you should  
know, and may God keep you.

Your brothers,  
The people of Dair al-Qamar  
Druses and Christians.<sup>106</sup>

---

105. (Y) That is, demanding payment of  
the "fardah" or capital levy, for  
seven years in a single payment.  
106. (Y) Abū 'Izz al-Din, p. 256 ff.

When the news of this pamphlet reached Amīr Bashīr, he burned with anger and wrote warning the people "against falling into this error which would necessitate ruining the houses and uprooting the traces..."

We understand from the above that the "kitchen" of the national revolt against foreign rule was in Dair al-Qamar, although it neighbored on Bait al-Din, where resided the Shihābī governor, hated for his promotion of the policy of the Egyptian occupation. Those who raised the standard of that noble revolt were the Druse and Christian "brothers" of the Dair, together, on the 27th of May, 1840. On the 28th the news reached their town that under the leadership of the Nakadīs they had defeated the foreign army. The author of Ibrāhīm Pāshā fī Suriyyā goes on to say: "Among those who blew the tempest of rebellion and led its men were a number of the Shihābī and Lama'ī Amīrs and Shaikhs of the families of Khāzin, Ḥubaish, and al-Daḥdāḥ, because the Amīr Bashīr had robbed them of the feudal authority they had enjoyed, not because of friendship for the people of the country, but in order to transfer it to his own people and well-wishers, such as his sons and grandsons and those who were close to him in and outside his family; and these were firmer in their grip on the people than their previous rulers had been. Among those who shared in the leadership of the revolt were Amīr

Khanjar al-Ḥarfūsh, Abū Samrā Ghānim, Aḥmad Dāghir, and  
107  
Yūsuf al-Shantīrī."

On the seventh of June the leaders of the Lebanese rebellion on all sects met at the church of Mār Ilyās at Anṭilyās and wrote the following compact:

"The reason for writing:

"On this day we met at Mār Ilyās, Anṭilyās, we whose names are listed, in a common body, Druse, Christian, Mutawālī, and Muslim, known throughout Mount Lebanon in all villages, and swore on the altar of the said saint that we will not betray, nor comply with any harm to any of us, as we speak and believe as one. And we the Druse populace if we show the slightest defect we shall be innocent of our faith, and cut off from the company of the Druses and the Five Favours, and our wives will be divorced from the Seven Ways and forbidden to us in all ways. And also Mār Ilyās will testify against us and be our antagonist. And we have called upon a Shaikh, His Excellency the Shaikh Francis, son of His Excellency Shaikh Hannā Haikal al-Khāzin of Ghūstā. And we the Christian populace, may Mār Ilyās be the enemy of him of us who betrays us, and may he not die a Christian death. Recorded on the eighth of Rabī', the end of the year 1256, twelve hundred fifty-six.

Concurring,

The Druse,  
Christian, Mutawālī, and Muslim populace of Mount Lebanon in a common body."

"Those whose names are registered above met and swore on the altar of St. Mar Ilyās in accordance with what is recorded above literally, and for clarity we have recorded this witness on the seventh of June in the year 1840 A.D.

(place of the seal)

The Scribe

The clergyman Isbīrīdūn 'Arāmīnī, the servant of Mār Ilyās, Antilyās, Antūnyānī." 108

Page 32

The next day (June 8) the Lebanese rebels broadcast to their compatriots the following circular:

"Dear Compatriots: You all know of the injustices which the Egyptian government has brought down upon us, the huge taxes, the hardships, the kinds of enslavement which all Syria has bent wearily under. Ruin has come to many families, while the people of Lebanon, despite their pride and spirit of independence, have borne with patience the injustices of the tyrannical authorities in obedience to the wishes of Amīr Bashīr al-Shihābī in the hope that this patience would guarantee to them the keeping of their honor, freedom, and rank. And if up to now we have not resorted to arms to free ourselves from the tyrannical authorities, it is because we had built all our hopes on the mediation of our Amīr, Amīr Bashīr, issuing from patriotic generosity to lighten our distress. Unfortunately this government, persisting in its error and oppression, has not kept faith with our Amīr for the service he rendered in quieting our revolt, nay, when he wanted to intercede for us repeatedly, it threatened him and worsened its treatment of him in a debasing fashion in Tarsus, as you all know. And since that time this government has followed an ominous path, harmful to our country, by dividing our alliance, seeking this goal by lies and false promises. It demanded our arms and collected them, first from the weak districts, then it collected them gradually from all, and it employed those treacherous ways in order to conscript us. So the enslavement of a large number of our brothers was facilitated, and its yoke became heavy on them because all preferred death to remaining under its rule. They revolted and many regular troops were killed in humbling them.

Page 33

"May they rest in peace, the bodies of our brethren who died in the path of freedom, for they resemble the courage of the Frenchmen who, when they were

---

108. (Y) Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, vol. 1, p. 2.

threatened with annihilation if they did not surrender, preferred death and faced the abyss of war, killing 150,000 men. And this, brothers, is a historical incident which you should not forget. For our compatriots who fought in Hauran were few of number, but despite the weakness of their means, as you know, they surpassed the French. As we were tested with those obligations and we have been asked to deliver our arms which the government had given us; and as experience, which is the greatest teacher, teaches us that taking us for the army is a result of our weakness, we must await no other indications of the evil future threatening us. As death comes to those who await it in a cowardly way in their homes just as it does to those who arise to throw off the yoke of tyranny, do not hesitate; nay, let us form a firm union whose warp and woof are mutual sympathies, and let us arise fearlessly, for the despotism which threatens us to the last hour of our lives is about to destroy our country. Is not that quite clear? But it is absolutely certain that late repentance will not save us if, God forbid, we become divided or hesitate for the wink of an eye from uniting our strength to bring back our freedom. So that we may act decisively in accordance with what the momentous circumstances such as these require, adapting our work to wisdom and sobriety worthy of a free people like ourselves, we must hold a meeting of the men known for their high rank and lofty knowledge. The foundation of this society will be five heads elected by a majority of votes in every district. All or some of them will hold a council in an appropriate place to agree on establishing an organised leadership and to choose 10,000 of our brave men to resist all plots and movements hostile toward our freedom, and to determine taxes - which the government had intended to seek payment of from those it wishes to conscript if we should not arise against it - to purchase the necessary provisions for 10,000 fighters who will settle things with the courage of the Maccabeans, every one of whom used to fight ten. For he who has right on his side is unconquerable. It is requisite that the bonds between the members of the society be continuous so as to facilitate making rapid arrangements for the defense of our countrymen whom danger is staring in the face, and

to save ourselves from slavery and wrong, and prevent all plots and tricks of the hated authorities from dividing us one from the other. Previously the Greeks were the finest example for us, since they achieved their liberty with God's help. The people of Dair al-Qamar are among the first to have armed for the defense of our sacred and just cause, and may their patriotic call be heard in all directions. As for us, our resolve is strong and unshaken, and we have sworn the return of our independence or death in this path." 109

And more; for this brief foreword helps us to follow Antūn Dāhir al-'Aqīqī in his Memoirs. And so to the manuscript, dear reader.

---

109. (Y) Ibid., Vol. I, p.3.



Page 36      Quotations

"You know in all certainty whence blow the storms which are destroying unhappy Syria. Their source is not the Mediterranean but from behind the English Channel."

-From a speech by Deputy Bélieu in the French Chamber of Deputies.

"On that date (1840) everyone was expecting the imminence of the partition of the Ottoman Sultanate. Yes, endeavours were being made to strengthen the bases of her existence, although it appeared that the building was cracking and had begun to crumble on every side. The observation of Europe was especially directed to some of the vilayets which were starting to split off, particularly Syria...

"I accuse the French Government no only of weakness in her conduct in the great Eastern Question since the year 1836, but also with the paucity of wisdom, resolve, and determination; and there is not a single open-minded man aloof from every personal aim, who does not share my opinion...

"Austria, a Christian state having, like France, a religious and commercial interest in the East, opposed her own interests in order to please England, whose agents have for six years undertaken a hateful task whose principle was to plant the seeds of enmity between the Maronites and

the Druses, and to stir up hatred between them..."

- From the speech of the poet Lamartine  
in the French Chamber of Deputies.

"They resorted to creating reasons for intervening in the East. Syria was quiet, and it was necessary to make her aware that the English, who needed to create a justification for this intervention, intended this method and went to Syria in order to inflame minds against the Pāshā of Egypt and to plant enmity between the sects which were living in peace and friendship..."

"Often, members of the Chamber, we attribute to these people a lack of civilisation, deception, and fraud. But when one day they learn to write history, they will no doubt charge Europe with treachery, because men came in that period to throw those people into turmoil, promising them retention of their safeguards and privileges, even with broadening their domain; and you have seen how they kept their promises..."

"You have verified the moderation of the (French) Government in its dispute with the European states, even though this House has been insistent toward it and urged it from atop this podium to follow the request for the return of authority to the Shihābī family because it is the only way...to keep our influence... It is easy for me to contrast the weakness of our government with

the energy of the English agents and their resolution in refusing the return of the Shihābīs, and what great endeavours they undertook to preserve the order of 1842 (the split of Lebanon into two Sanjaqs) which drew calamities on Syria and which was in their eyes an attainment in that it realised their desires, namely, the expulsion of France from the East and the destruction of her influence.

"Your supporters and friends, Mr. Foreign Minister of France, were saying a few days ago, "We must make Lebanon like Switzerland! As for me, all I wish is that you do not make her like Poland!"<sup>110</sup>

- From the speech of Deputy de Malleville in the French Chamber of Deputies, June 15, 1846.

---

110. The original French of Malleville's speech: "Il fallut à cette époque se créer des prétextes. La Syrie était tranquille; Il fallut l'agiter: et alors ceux qui avaient besoin du prétexte de l'intervention en Orient, ceux-là même allèrent exciter en Syrie la révolte contre le Pacha, la division entre les races qui vivaient en paix... "Nous parlons beaucoup, messieurs, de la ruse, de la perfidie de ces races non civilisées. Si elles apprennent jamais à écrire l'histoire, elles auront à parler de la félonie de l'Europe, car à cette époque on est allé les agiter en leur promettant le maintien de leurs garanties, de leurs privilèges, que dis-je, on leur promettant de les étendre. "Et voici comment on a tenu parole:..." Yazbak's next sentence is the roughest paraphrase of page 282 of Poujade. Then (page 284): "...

---

Ce qui est vrai... c'est que l'Angleterre a mis depuis cinq ans l'ardeur la plus soutenue à écarter à tout prix le rétablissement de la famille Cheab et de l'Emir Béchir. Et pourquoi? Personne ne s'y troupe, le rétablissement de l'autorité unique et chrétienne dans le Liban, c'est la restauration de l'influence Française, et c'est là qu'on vous refuse toujours... (page 298) "Vos amis disaient il ya quelques jours: Il faut faire une Suisse en Orient; moi je demande qu'on n'en fasse pas une Pologne!" (Poujade, op.cit., pp. 275-298).

Page 40 The Manuscript

A chapter about what the copyist said and what happened in this period; some of it by witness and some by hearsay.

In the year 1841<sup>111</sup> Ibrāhīm Pāshā came with his Egyptian troops, which numbered around 16,000 fighting men, to Mount Lebanon and camped at Waṭā al-Jawz because the country was in rebellion and popular revolt.<sup>112</sup> The leader of the populace was Shaikh Francis Abu Nādir al-Khāzin. Ibrāhīm Pāshā came in order to enforce the obedience of the country, and on his arrival the allied fleet crossed the sea, delivered arms and ammunition to the people of the country, and left. Stambūli (Turkish) troops came to the aid of the people of the country. Trouble arose between Ibrāhīm Pāshā's troops and the inhabitants at Waṭā al-Jawz, where the troops stayed about 35 days. There were many troubles between the two parties, and defeat was inflicted sometimes on the Egyptian troops, and sometimes not. After this the Egyptian troops split into two groups, one of them making for al-Qāt<sup>+</sup> and settling in Bḥirsāf. There were many troubles in the two places, and during this time they (the Egyptians) burned part of Bait Shabāb and its environs, and those in Waṭā al-Jawz burned part of Faiṭ arūn. As for the Turkish troops, they stayed down in Jūniyah, or if they

---

(Y) 111. More correctly, 1840.

(Y) 112. A popular revolt in which the general populace participated. A literal translation of the French word "Commune" attached to the popular revolution in Paris of 1871.

did go up (the mountain) during the day, at night they would return to Jūniyah for fear of Ibrāhīm Pāshā. After this time the Egyptian troops were driven from Kisrawān, with the help of God, on Sunday, the first of October, and retreated from Kisrawān. Of the troops of the Egyptian there were many killed and captured, and the troops of the country acquired much booty. Later, they (the Egyptians) were driven from Bhirṣāf and headed for Zaḥlah and then Damascus.<sup>113</sup> They stayed four months in Damascus, collected their troops from all places, and set out for Egypt disappointed, after ruling this country about 10 years.

After that the Government of Damascus was headed by Aḥmad Āghā al-Yūsuf on behalf of the Sublime State (Constantinople). He remained approximately 4 months, and after

---

113.(Y) The retreat of the Egyptian troops from Kisrawān under the command of 'Uthmān Pāshā came immediately after a battle that developed between them and Bashīr Qāsim Shihāb ("Abou Thīn") and his men on October 4th (not the 1st), for 'Uthmān Pāshā was determined to move with his troops from Mairuba to the Biqā'. The Lebanese continued to follow on the heels of the Egyptians as far as Naba' Ṣannin and captured close to 300 of them. On the 10th of October Ibrāhīm Pāshā was routed in the historic battle of Bhirṣāf, and fled to Qarnāyil by way of Salīma, then to Zaḥlah and the Biqā'. On the same night Sulaimān Pāshā withdrew from al-Hāzimiyyah, leaving his cannon and 2,000 troops in Beirut under command of Admiral Sādiq Bey, who surrendered with the unit to the allies on ~~Oct. 11~~.

Oct. 11.

him came Wālīs on behalf of the State and occupied the post of Damascus.<sup>114</sup>

As for Mount Lebanon after the departure of the Egyptians, Amīr Bashīr Qāsīm became prominent in the country and came up from Jūniyah with soldiers, taking the place of the Egyptian troops, and with him were the troops of the country. He stayed in the village of Ḥammānā for a time. After that he ruled the land a full year; and as for Amīr Bashīr "the Maltese", he had gone down to Sidon, from whence he appealed for help to the French Government; thence he went to Cyprus, and then to Istanbul, he and his three sons - Amīr Khalīl, Amīr Qāsīm and Amīr Amīn - and with them a group of about 300 servants and their harem as well. After they stayed in Astaneh (Constantinople) for a time they moved from there to Bursa (Brussa), where His Grace died as a Christian and received very great honors.

---

114. (Y) The Egyptian troops met in Damascus and stayed there a few weeks. Their oppressive taxation aroused the people against them. "And when Ibrāhīm Pāshā decided to leave Damascus once and for all, he convened a council to which he invited the notables of the town and charged them with the selection of a governor (Mutessaḷim) for their city. And the choice fell on Ḥasan Bey al-Kaḥḥalah". On Monday, December 29, Ibrāhīm Pasha and his soldiers left the city, and Ahmad Aghā al-Yusuf came to it, delegated from the Sīrr-'Askar Muḥammad 'Izzet Pāshā to take charge of governing it in the name of the Sultan.

Some of his sons died before him and some after him.

Amīr Bashīr lived 96 years,<sup>115</sup> and ruled Mount Lebanon 45

---

Page 43

115. (Y) Bashīr "the Maltese" was born on January 6, 1767, in Ghazīr. The period of his rule began in the year 1788, although it slipped from his grasp more than once, and his authority was not finally assured until 1822. After the expulsion of Ibrāhīm Pāshā from Lebanon the British Admiral Robert Stopford dismissed him (October 9), and he came with his family to Sidon surrendering (Oct. 11) to Khalil Pāshā, delegate of the Ottoman State, who treated him well and welcomed him. But the Commander of the English fleet, Commodore Sir Charles Napier, was not satisfied with his surrender and asked that he be sent to Beirut. In Beirut it was decided to remove him to Malta (Nov. 1) <sup>K</sup>

He was permitted the company of his family and "to take his money in gold which totaled 18,000 bags"!!! After he stayed eleven months in Malta he was moved to Za'farān Bol (an inland village near Istanbul), then to Brussa, and later was returned to Istanbul. He died at Qadi Kōy (on the Bosphorus) on December 29, 1850, and was buried in the Armenian Church in Pera - so he lived 83 years less seven days. The Lebanese in his day suffered many misfortunes. As for his son Amīn, he abjured Christianity and made a pretense of returning to the Islamic faith.

(K) According to Shidyāq (p.611), Bashīr was given his choice of exile by 'Izzet Pāshā, of anywhere but France, Egypt and Syria.



years. Amīr Haidar Ismā'īl at the time of the government of Amīr Bashīr Qāsim had been taken to Sannār and after one year returned from Sannār.<sup>116</sup> He governed Mount Lebanon in

---

116. (Y) When the matter of the Lebanese revolt became serious in the eyes of Muhammad 'Alī's Government and his Shihabī ally, the latter determined to inflict exemplary punishment on those of his enemies whom he could. He began to collect arms from the people, expel the feudal landlords, and arrest whomever he could. On August 7, 1870, he sent 75 Lebanese prisoners to Muhammad 'Alī in Alexandria and the latter sent them to Sannār in the Sudan. They were returned to their own country in mid-March 1841, after Ibrāhīm Pāshā's rule was erased from Lebanon. One of them, Yūsuf Sulaimān Shihāb, died en route.

Page 44

(K) Sir Charles Napier lists the following among the prisoners: Maronite amīrs: Haidar of Ṣalīma (later the Christian Qā'im Maqām), Fa'ūl Shihāb, Fāris Shihāb, Yūsuf Shihāb, Maḥmūd Shihāb, 'Abdullah Umrād, 'Alī Qā'id Bey, 'Alī Fāris. Druse Shaikhs: Hamūd-Abū Nakad, Qāsim, 'Abbās.

Muḥammad 'Alī sent the prisoners down the Nile under guard with orders to be delivered to the governor of Kharṭūm. En route, they bribed the guard to give them the orders, planning if they were to be sentenced to death to escape into the desert toward Yemen. But upon breaking the seal and learning that they faced only imprisonment, they allowed themselves to be taken to Sannār. (Shidyāq, op. cit., p.603).

Colonel Edward Napier eventually secured the release of these men, following the cessation of hostilities, and they were returned to Beirut aboard an Egyptian corvette in March, 1841. French merchants and priests in Beirut publicly claimed the credit for their liberation. (C. Napier, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 259-62.)

the period of 'Umar Pāshā<sup>117</sup> on behalf of the Sublime State

---

117.(Y) Bashīr Qāsim Muḥim Shihāb, famous as "Abu Ṭhīn", was installed as governor over Mount Lebanon on October 9, the day his namesake retired, but he was not a good politician and dealt badly with the Druse chieftains, most of whom rebelled against him. The pestilent winds of strife gathered in the land, and the Christian and Druse landholders began to slit one another's throats at the instigation of foreigners, especially the English. As the situation became critical the Ottoman Government delegated Sīr 'Askar (military commander) Muṣṭafā Pāshā as Emissary Extraordinary to the Mountain, with a great force of troops. He dismissed Amīr Bashīr Muḥim and sent him to Astaneh (Constantinople) in late 1841; with his departure Shihābī rule in Lebanon came to an end - and praise be to God, after they had caused disgraces and disasters to fall on the Lebanese people.

Then 'Umar Pāshā "the Austrian" was appointed as successor to the divested Shihābī. His policy was worse than that of his predecessor in its provocation of scorn and protest, and he was removed late in the year 1842.

Ideas differed on the form of government and person of the governor. There were lengthy negotiations between the Powers and the Sublime Porte on this matter, "and M. Metternich, Chancellor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire mediated in the question and proposed the appointment of a Christian Qā'im Maqām over the Druses. The State accepted his proposal on the 7th of December, 1842, and forwarded it to the Powers, all of whom agreed to it except the French Ambassador, who clung to the right of the return of sovereignty to the Shihābī Princes. The Porte appointed As'ad Pāshā as Wālī of the eyalet of Sidon and entrusted him with responsibility and authority over the affairs of Lebanon. He made it into two Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, Christian and Druse. To the first was appointed Amīr Haidar Ismā'il Abū al-Lama'. It was extended from Tripoli to the Damascus Road, including the Matn, and later, on 14 March, 1843, the

for Mount Lebanon to this period was divided into two Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, one for the Christians and one for the Druses. Therefore they fixed borders as follows: from the Damascus Road southward was entrusted to the Druse Qā'im Maqām, and to the north of it was entrusted to the Christian Qā'im Maqām. The Government of the Mountain underwent this division<sup>118</sup> after it had been under the Government of him who

---

Jubail country was attached to it. Abū al-Lama' took Bikfayyā as a capital for the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah. Amīr Ahmad Arslān was appointed to the second Qā'im Maqāmiyyah, which stretched from the Damascus Road at the slopes of Zahr-al-Baidar to Sidon; and for his capital he took Beit al-Dīn. The administration of Dair-al-Qamar was transferred to the responsibility of a Turkish Mutasallim ( -See Lubnan, p. 298 -) The author of al-Muqata'at al-Kisrawāniyyah said (p.306), "In 1842 Umar Pasha was discharged from the governor strip of the Mountain, and to replace him Muṣṭafā Pasha installed Amīr Ḥaidar Ismā'il al-Lama', in accordance with the views of the Patriarch Yūsuf Ḥubaish; and so he stepped forward and was named Qā'im Maqām of the Christians.

118.(Y) The division of Lebanon into a Druse Qā'im Maqāmiyyah and a Maronite one, in accordance with the ambitions of certain foreign states, only increased the interference of the Consuls and their agents in the affairs of the Mount. This interference was not in order to show mercy and compassion to the Lebanese, but rather made their friendly and brotherly sects into fuel for the fires of insurrection and intrigue. Once again anarchy spread, and Astanah (Constantinople) delegated Admiral Khalīl Pasha, a son-in-law of the Sultan, to return to Syria. He had been preceded in this responsibility by Salīm

had occupied the throne of Dair al-Qamar since long ago.

---

Bey Walī Pāshā Zādeh, son of 'Ali Pāshā Tepelen, to observe the actions of Muṣṭafā Pasha at that time. As for Khalīl Pāshā, he was charged with settling the question of the indemnities which it had been decided to give the Maronites, and cessation of their crushing misfortunes, without enforcing the arrangements of the 7th of December, 1842. He commanded As'ad Pāshā, Wālī of Sidon, to issue an order to stop consideration of the return of sovereignty to the Shihābī family. On July 4, 1844, or 14 Jamādī al-Ukhrā, 1260, he wrote from Beirut to the Amīrs, shaikhs, notables village officials, and peoples of the southern district, beginning from the border of the Qaḍā of Jaffa to the end of the Qaḍā of the Matn. At the same time he also wrote in the same sense to the people of the northern district from F am al-Mizāb, above Bisharrī, to Jūniyah, and notified them all by his two above-mentioned manifestoes, of the arrival of Khalīl Pāshā with his fleet to reform conditions in Lebanon and regulate its affairs. On the 15th of September of that year As'ad Pāshā called the Christian and Druse chieftains together and informed them that the administration of Dair al-Qamar would be delegated to two agents, one Christian and the other Druse. With their appointment, the Qā'im Maqāms of the two sects, who were the two aforementioned Amīrs, would be free to make other revisions in organising the arrangements whose formulation and execution were desired. Then Muḥammad Vejhī Pāshā's vileyet of Sidon, of which the governor's authority over the landowners and officials of villages of mixed population was cancelled; and their supervision was transferred to the two Qā'im Maqāms, each group of them falling under the final jurisdiction of the Qā'im Maqām of its own district. Because of the failure to stamp out the complicated local intrigues, there came forth those who sought to arouse the latent hatreds between the Druses and Maronite Christians. The fire was lit in late April 1845, and without delay the conflagration intensified and

The money of the collective village tax (Mīrī) was

its evils spread. Bahrī Pāshā, Mutasallim of Beirut, hastened to repair the situation before it became serious. He gathered the feudal leaders and chief spokesmen of the Druses and Maronite Christians to set right the enmity and root out the remaining hatred. What he desired was achieved, and the chiefs of the two sects wrote down a covenant of their agreement to forget their malice and concealed hatreds of the past, redeeming the blood that had been shed. They signed this on the 2nd of June of that year, or 24 Jamādī al-Ūlā, 1261. But all that was not enough to extinguish the fire of enmity and erase its traces. The situation required the presence in Syria of Shakīb Effendi, the new director of foreign affairs, to ensure public security and complete tranquillity in the land, and to remove the causes of the upheavals and disturbances. He came to Beirut on July 14 of the same year, accompanied by two regiments of infantry, and began taking and collecting arms from the people, which caused them some difficulty and hardship. Cooperating with him was Mushīrkk (Marshal) Nāmiq Pāshā, commander of the garrison of the Arab countries. Then he dismissed the Druse and Christian Qā'im Maqāms and sent Hamūd Nakad to al-Astaneh (Constantinople) where he received the just deserts of his deeds. He then brought back both Amīr Haidar al-Lama' and Amīr Aḥmad Arslān to their respective Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, revised the order of December 7, 1842, and reformed it by reorganising the divans of the two Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs. This is known to the present time as the reorganization of Shakīb Effendi. His work stood until the year 1860." - Lubnan, p. 299.

"ثم ادخل من اسعد باشا في ايلة صيدا" محمد وجيهي (K)  
 باشا ..."

This is misleading; the fact as reported by Poujade (op. cit., p. 78) is that As'ad was replaced as Mushīr by "Vedgi."

fixed on the people of the two districts at no more than 3,500 bags, in accordance with the system instituted for the State by Shakīb Effendi. Out of this he would take money for the two Qā'im Maqāms, for the landholders, and the confederates and servants of the governors, totalling about 2,000 bags. The remainder reverted to the Treasury - may it prosper! For each Qā'im Maqām a divān was set up composed of twelve men, of whom six were judges and the other six ordinary members.<sup>119</sup> The tribesmen remained in

Page 48

---

(KK)The term "Mushīr" denotes both military and civil functions: in this case only the former. The governor of a province often combined administrative and military authority and therefore sometimes enjoyed the simultaneous titles of "Wālī" and "Mushīr".

The Governors of the province of Sidon residing in Beirut were known as "Mushīrs", although their predecessors had been known as "Wālī" of 'Akkā' (Acre) until the seat of government was transferred to Beirut in 1841. (See Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 615, and Abkarius, op. cit., p. 51 footnote.)

- 119.(Y) In October 1845 the above-mentioned Vizier Shakīb Effendi directed a buyrouldi (command or proclamation) to both the Druse and Maronite Qā'im Maqāms in which he said to them: "A royal firman has been written permitting the formation of a council (majlis) for each Qā'im Maqām, similar to the councils found in other parts of the Sultanate, to cooperate with him in the discharge of his functions, taking account of the special and the general demands of the subject peoples to the two Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, in accordance with ancient local customs and sectarian principles, and to govern by these principles through policies in keeping with the intentions of His Majesty our Great Sultan, which are founded on justice

Page 49 their customary situation, each ruling his own people under

---

and equity... etc. Included in the information broadcast by Shakib Effendi concerning the composition of these two councils was that their members, "the judges and councillors, would be elected and appointed with the knowledge of the bishops and 'Uqqal (Druse initiates) of the two sects;" that each one would be from the district of his council; and that the following three conditions would be observed: (in selecting him)

1. That he should not have been employed by foreign agents.
2. That he should not have been under the shadow of foreign protection.
3. That he should not be of the population of those villages which lay outside the department of the Mountain administration.

As for their positive qualities, they were: "One of the most important functions and concerns of the two councils is to attend to the distribution of the land tax (wairku) of the Mountain every year with all justice and right; and in the second place, to consider all claims and disagreements which require settlement and judgment, in keeping with ancient local custom and in accordance with justice and dignity... it is necessary that the distribution of the taxes should not cause even the least justified complaints on the part of the population, and that these taxes should be collected in full on condition that there be no accusation of oppression or fraud by the collector, or of his doing harm or of his heavy expenditure... and that the persons appointed to collect taxes should not take head taxes greater than the fixed land tax (Wairku). Where as all the sects have the right to be treated with gentleness and forbearance, and in order to guard against everything entailing the creation of dislike and enmity among the sects, it is necessary that the tax-gatherers whose appointment is

the authority of the Qā'im Maqām. The Qā'im Maqām of the Christians was Amīr Ḥaidar and the Qā'im Maqām of the Druses was Amīr Amīn Arslān. Conditions progressed in this way with complete tranquillity and security. Amīr Ḥaidar ruled for 14 years,<sup>120</sup> with the people at their work

Page 50

Page 50

desired should be from the sect of the villages to which they are sent, by what even means that can be arranged. That is to say, that a Moslem should be sent to the Moslems, and a Maronite to the Maronites, and an Orthodox to the Orthodox, and so forth. Each of them will work in this fashion when it is necessary to inform them of the regulations, or take measures leading to the welfare and benefit of the sects of the Mountain, by expending efforts to do away with disturbances of their peace as much as possible - (sic) - and by conforming to these principles, especially by implementing them with exactitude in what concerns the monasteries."

The salary of the deputy Qā'im Maqām was fixed at 600 piasters a month, that of the member (of the council) at 500, and that of the secretary at 450 piasters. Shakīb 'Effendi's directive on formation of the two councils ended with the following paragraph:

"In connection with this, the members of the council are warned against taking any gifts or anything else from those submitting claims, and they must expend their efforts in following the twin paths of purity and honesty, and serve their Sultan, country and religion with loyalty; and let them be sure that every obstruction of their duty will without doubt bring upon their heads the punishment they deserve." - Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. I, pp. 218-227.

120. (Y) Ḥaidar Abū al-Lama' was <sup>born</sup> ~~born~~ at Ṣalīmā in 1787 and was appointed Qā'im



and their trades, with the grain-taxes being paid yearly according to the law, and with the world at rest from troubles and disturbances. There was at this time, however, some discord between the Druses and Christians in the Shūf district, and there were many evil doings. This was before the rule of Amīr Ḥaidar or at the beginning of it. Most of the country there (i.e. in the Shūf) was burned, and afterward the Druses all descended on Zaḥlah and laid a heavy siege to it; and they besieged Dair al-Qamar. With God's help they were driven away from Zaḥlah, and they lost a number of killed and wounded. They were also driven off from Dair al-Qamar. The hostility between the two sects remained; and for this reason, in order that conditions should progress and affairs come under control, the Government of the Mountain was divided into two Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs, as was mentioned. But Satan watches over his work closely, and he did not leave the people in peace, but started implanting evil ideas and envy among them, until Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama' rose against his uncle Amīr Ḥaidar, in order to take from him the government of the Christian Qā'im Maqāmiyyah in the Mountain.<sup>121</sup> He began

---

Maqām in December, 1842 (actually January 1, 1843). He died in 1854.

From Al-Muqāṭa'at al-Kisrawāniyyah, p. 322: "His rule lasted 11 years and five months, during which time the population enjoyed rest and quiet."

121. In early 1854 Wamīq Pāshā, the Mushīr of Sidon, appointed Bahsīr Aḥmad to

to bribe certain Pāshās in order to become head of the government, and a sharp quarrel arose between him and his unnce, each bribing the (Turkish) State officials to harm the other. A partisanship developed on both sides in this way and they suffered heavy losses.<sup>122</sup> Nevertheless, despite that, Amīr Ḥaidar remained theruler until his death, because he was a man of "strong faith and of piety and

---

to raise 2,000 volunteers for the army from the Christian districts, but neglected to inform the Qā'im Maqām or the Muqāṭa'jis. These complained to Wāmiq, and were assured that the Porte did not in fact require troops. Bahsīr Aḥmad's instructions were not rescinded, however, and he continued to sollicit volunteers against the wishes of Amīr Ḥaidar and the Muqāṭa'jis. He had no ready arms or money for distribution and consequently met with little success.

(British Consular Files. Calvert to Clarendon, No. 7, Feb. 13, 1854.)

- 122.(Y) This course of bribing had been followed by the Shihābīs before the Lama'īs who were now quarreling. The Shihābīs in this particular had shameful quarrels, and used to pledge their women, their children, and their men to the Ottoman Wālīs who would signify their satisfaction when they paid the Wālīs the agreed price for the right to rule Lebanon and plunder its people. And among the "distinctions! ..." of Amīr Bashīr the Maltese, whose praises are sung by some simpletons, was that he was the first Lebanese to offer his wife to Jazzār (Aḥmad al-Jazzār, Wālī of Akkā) as a guarantee for the price of the governorship. No Lebanese before this Shihabī had offered his wife.

Page 52 conscience, so much so that he was known as "Father of the Rosary". Most of the people would appeal to him for help, as long as he lived, because he was so beloved for his mercy and compassion; and there are many sayings about him in this vein. It was said that he governed all this time by means of piety. That was in the days of the reverend Father Mār Yūsuf al-Khāzin, Patriarch of Antioch.<sup>123</sup> Some disagreement arose between the Amīrs and the Patriarch, but they did not harm one another, and afterward, by God's inspiration, the Amīr Ḥaidar went to the village of Ṣarbā, while the Patriarch was at his monastery residence, Bkirkī, and peace fell between them. His Grace the Amīr went up to his Beatitude, and they asked one another's pardon. Peace fell between them because the two were so very pious. Twenty days after the affair, Amīr Ḥaidar fell ill with paralysis and died in the village of Ṣarbā. The Patriarch was present at his death,<sup>124</sup>

---

123. The origins of both the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Maronite Church from which it sprang are obscure: According to the Enciclopedia Italiana, the Church "takes its name from an ancestor, St. Marūn, who died at the start of the Vth Century... A Maronite tradition attributes ... the foundation of their patriarchate and community to one John Marūn, a monk ... (who was) Patriarch of Antioch 685-707 A.D.; but the very existence of this John Marūn is extremely problematical, and the tradition regarding his patriarchate has become generally recognized as a legend, arising not before the 14th Century." (Enciclopedia Italiana, Rizzoli and Co., Milan, 1934. Article "Maroniti", Vol XXII, P. 406.)

124 (Y) The Patriarch did not live long after

and his protégés were also present<sup>125</sup> as well as his relatives from the district of Bait Shabāb. They took his body there and it was burried in Bikfayyā with all honor.

---

him. He died on November 3, in the same year, in al-Dimān, and was succeeded in the Patriarchal Chair of Antioch by Būlus Mas'ad, the greatest prelate and wisest leader of the Maronite confession (he died April 18, 1890).

- 125 (Y) The protégé or "patronage" (محمية وعهد) according to Lebanese custom was a practice whereby a common man would offer his services to the leading Amīr or feudal shaikh. "The follower would strive to please the patron, while the latter watched over him, kept him from his enemies, bestowed money on him, helped him toward his goal, and honored his particular requests. If he became angry with anyone and opposed him, that person could be rid of him only by taking refuge with another chieftain who would dare to oppose the wrathful patron ... If the Amīr (the governor) marshalled his followers against the shaikh (the landholder) and the latter ranged those under his patronage and their allies, he could control them as he could his own fingertips. They were known in their many occasions for their bravery and their unity (even if they were of different religious groups)... The greatest governors bore witness to their credit, such as 'Abdullāh Pāshā, Wālī of 'Akka, Ibrāhīm-Pāshā the Egyptian, and others. If they rebelled against the governor or the shaikh, then known as they were for their fine loyalty, they were transformed into bitter enemies."
- Lubnan, p. 180.

His Kākhiyā (Administrative Deputy) was Shaikh Abū Hātim. Then after his (Amīr Haidar's) death the government was entrusted to his nephew, Amīr Bashīr 'Assāf, by temporary appointment. That was in the year 1853,<sup>126</sup> and he remained in the appointment for only four and a half months. Then Amīr Bashīr Ahmad took charge of the government and received the cloak of office<sup>127</sup> from Wāmiq Pāshā, Wālī of Sidon, to become Qā'im Maqām of the Christians in Mount Lebanon. Amīr Amīn Arslān remained Qā'im Maqām of the Druses, ruling over his district as before. At the start of his rule, Amīr Bashīr Ahmad employed excessive harshness corresponding to that of Amīr Bashīr Qāsim the Maltese,<sup>128</sup> including harsh measures, imprisonment, and expropriations against wrongdoers, until he terrified the sects with his government. He would listen to the words of none of his family and servants, thinking that he could return the government to what it had been previously in the days of Amīr Bashīr (al-Shihābī). But despite this, he presided over a government of justice and set out to obtain those rights that had been trampled on and abandoned. He restrained the strong from (harming) the weak with his bravery and the

---

126. (Y) Actually, 1854.  
127. "ولبس الخلع من يد وامي بآنا"

According to traditional ceremony, the appointee would put on a cloak which symbolized that the Wālī was pleased with him upon his investiture.

128. It was not Bashīr Qāsim, but his uncle and predecessor in office, who was known as (the Maltese".

strength of his courage, as opposed to the course taken by the government of his uncle Amīr Ḥaidar. For he substituted harshness for mercy, took no notice of anyone, and did not pay any attention to the concerns of his feudal chieftains or anyone else. He remained in this course for about six months until the people thought that Amīr Bashīr had risen from the tomb. By this time he had humiliated some of the people in matters affecting their honour and set about to replace them. Some of them were represented by the house of Khāzin, the house of Ḥubaish the house of Daḥdah,<sup>129</sup> and others. They came to be very much afraid of him although at that time the greatest landowners were perplexed in this particular. Then Yūsuf Buṭrus Karam came to him from Ihdin and asked him to make him chief of his district in that area. (The Amīr) did not grant this to him, because he had (already) confirmed his (Karam's) brother, Shaikh Mikhāyil, in the title over the district which he had controlled since the days of Amīr Ḥaidar three years before the aforementioned Yūsuf pleaded that his brother had had three years of authority and that now it was his right to have an equal measure. His Grace the Amīr did not concede that, but replied that he did not recognise such honor in him, nor did Yūsuf have any following. As for his brother, he had given it (the overlordship) to him simply as a favor; for there was unfriendliness between the Amīr and Yūsuf Karam.

---

129. (Y) The three feudal families of importance of the Maronite millet. The Khāzins were proprietors of Kisrawān, the Ḥubaishīs proprietors of Ghazīr, and as for the Daḥdah family, they controlled al-Futūh.

Page 55 Yūsuf tried every means with His Grace the Amīr but did not attain his desire, and after despairing of his request he went away disappointed from His Grace. There was a dispute between Yūsuf and His Excellency Hannā Bey al-As'ad, who was kākhiyā (secretary) to His Grace the Amīr, and this was the reason that Yūsuf's request brought no result. So he went to the illustrious French Consul in Beirut and asked him to enable him to obtain what he had requested and attain his right, saying that the right to assume responsibility for the affairs of Zghartā was his and not his brother's. Inasmuch as Yūsuf Buṭrus Karam had taken refuge under the protection of the French State since the days of his father and claimed that King Louis had been his godfather at his baptism and was the protector of this state, the French Consul was obliged to give him consideration and wrote to His Grace the Amīr to put the title (to the land) in the hands of the above-mentioned Yūsuf, to the exclusion of his brother. The Amīr was not pleased at that. He had this case reviewed many times and convened the dīvān (commission) repeatedly; and after considerable evidence and reports Yūsuf proved that the title belonged to him, and the Consul wrote to His Grace the Amīr to invest Yūsuf; so His Grace had to invest him with the title, not because he had a right to it but out of respect for the words of the Consul. And so Yūsuf received the title in place of

his brother against the will of the Amīr,<sup>130</sup> and he (the Amīr) clothed him with the "Sago"<sup>131</sup> and he (Yūsuf) returned to his own country in peace.

---

130. Baptistin Poujoulat discounts the story of Karam's baptism. According to him, the Prince de Joinville (later King Louis Philippe) visited Lebanon and was "witness or godfather" at the wedding of Yūsuf's sister. Yūsuf was at that time 13 years old and already baptised. (La vérité sur la Syrie et l'expédition française, p. 371.)  
- Poujoulat's account of the dispute between Yūsuf and his brother Mikhāyil states simply that the latter, being the elder, was named as muqāṭa'ajī on the death of his father in 1847, but Yūsuf being clearly more capable and the favorite of the inhabitants, "à la demande du peuple entier le caïmacan nomma Joseph gouverneur du district de Bécharré". (Ibid., pp. 374-5.)

- 131 (Y) The Amīr clothed the seeker of control over the land with the "Sago" (a ceremonial cloak) as a sign of sovereignty over it and of his (the Amīr's) favor, while the Amīr, for his part, would seek investiture from the Ottoman Wālī, Lubnan, p. 179; the seeker of authority in this Mount would "present to Jazzār (Aḥmad al-Jazzār, Wālī of 'Akkā) six fine horses with silver saddle and harness and 50,000 piasters in payment for the investiture and the certificate (the shart namé)<sup>k</sup>. Frequently he would receive the authority whose present had been preferred to the others..."

(K) A document listing the obligations of the office.



CHAPTER II.

ṬĀNYŪS SHĀHĪN

## CHAPTER II

### Commentary by the Translator.

The career of Ṭānyūs Shāhīn and his peasant movement in Kisrawān from what may be considered the core of Yazbak's book. The manuscript of this chapter, together with the letters found in Chapter V, constitute the real contribution of his work, inasmuch as they bring to light a detailed, though scattered and incoherent, account of an obscure but significant page of the history of the Lebanon.

It is first necessary to give some attention to the troubles which befell Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama', the Christian Qā'im Maqām of 1854-60, of which 'Aqīqī gives a brief account. The widespread opposition to the Amīr had, as 'Aqīqī suggests, a decided bearing on the peasant uprising of 1859. Like the events of the preceding years, this opposition is largely ignored in the most readily available sources, and we have again been obliged to rely almost wholly on the unpublished British consular dispatches.

It was seen in our commentary to the preceding chapter that the appointment of Bashīr Aḥmad received the full approval of Nevin Moore, the British Consul, as well as that of his French colleague. Only three months after the new Qā'im Maqām was invested in office, Moore had expressed his satisfaction with that functionary, who relied heavily on him for advice. "That confidence is indeed un-

limited: so much so that matters which do not seem to me to require consultation are nevertheless brought for my opinion."<sup>132</sup> The Amīr continued to enjoy an untroubled rule through the Crimean War. Early in 1857 he began to encounter the opposition of the Greek Orthodox and the Maronite clergy; the former in part because he represented Maronite domination over other Christians, which the Orthodox had tried to resist in 1854 after the death of Amīr Haidar, and the latter chiefly because of the strong views of Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad. Būlus had risen from an unknown peasant family to receive a religious education in Rome and eventually to reach the top of the ecclesiastical ladder; he was noted for his piety -- or fanaticism, some would say -- and for a marked dislike of the landed aristocratic class. These sentiments were shared by many of the lower Maronite priesthood, and found an object in the Qā'im Maqām, who had been born a Druse and was not known for his close adherence to the religious life.<sup>133</sup>

In March 1857 Moore reported lively disagreement among the Maronite bishops over whether to continue to tolerate the Amīr. The Patriarch and bishops were all ill disposed toward him and would join in asking for his dismissal were it not for their reluctance to take a step which would be so

---

132. British Consular Files. Moore to Clarendon, No. 56, Nov. 25, 1854.

133. See Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 120-2.

welcome to the Greek Orthodox. The Amīr enjoyed the firm backing of Wāmiq Pāshā, France, and Austria. The Austrian Archduke Maxilimian, on a visit to the East, wrote to him guaranteeing Austrian support against his removal.<sup>134</sup>

A memorandum was submitted by the Orthodox Bishop of Beirut asking that the Orthodox population be placed under landlords of their own faith so as to free them from the abuses of the Maronite Qā'im Maqām and feudatories, and demanding a larger Orthodox participation in Bashīr Aḥmad's administration. In reporting this Moore commented, "The institutions of the Lebanon are of themselves exceedingly well calculated for the benefit of the country. The evil has all along been the want of cordial support on the part of the Mushir and the dishonesty of the present two Kaimakams ..."<sup>135</sup>

The Maronite Bishop Tūbiyyā 'Aun of Beirut complained to Moore that "it was impossible they could have a worse Kaimakam than Emir Beshir Ahmet and that he would never give him his support." Moore promised his efforts to reconcile the antagonism between the Maronite and Greek clergy, the latter appearing to view Bashīr Aḥmad and the Maronite nation in general as one and the same. Petitions flowed into Beirut protesting against the Qā'im Maqām from Christians of both sects, despite open intimidation and forcible interference by the Amīr.<sup>136</sup>

---

134. British Consular Files. Moore to Clarendon, No. 11, March 14, 1857.

135. Ibid., Moore to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, No. 34, May 4, 1857.

136. Ibid., Moore to Stratford, No. 37,

These events represent the collapse of what Churchill describes as the triumvirate of the Patriarch, the French Consul, and the Christian Qā'im Maqām, a collapse which he attributes to the invasion by the Amīr of the rights of the Maronite clergy.<sup>137</sup> The French Consul stood by Bashīr Aḥmad; he alone among the European representatives refused to accept the petitions of the Orthodox and transmit them to Constantinople. In October 1857 an event occurred which hastened the withdrawal of the Maronite muqāṭa'jīs from Bashīr Aḥmad's side. Shaikh Khalīl Hubaish was jailed by the Amīr on charges of favoring petitions against him; Shaikh Khalil denied this, but was told he would be released only by appealing to the French Consul. This he refused to do, saying that "he will owe his liberation only to English intervention." The combined efforts of Moore and Khūrshīd Pāshā (who had succeeded Wāmiq as Mushīr) were to no avail; Shaikh Khalīl was finally freed on the advice of de Lesseps.<sup>138</sup>

On December 3, 1857, Moore wrote, "The Emir has ... dispatched an armed party to scour the country and arrest and bring before him alive or dead such persons as are (involved) in petitioning."<sup>139</sup>

---

May 26, No. 38, May 29, and No. 39, May 30, 1857. Bashīr Aḥmad admitted to the Austrian Consul that he had placed men on the roads to seize those suspected of bearing petitions; he denied his guilt to the Mushīr, however.

137. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, p. 122.

138. British Consular Files. Moore to Stratford, No. 58, Oct. 30, 1857.

139. Ibid., Moore to Stratford, No. 68, Dec. 3, 1857.

It was soon after that that the landed aristocracy organised their opposition in a series of meetings and societies. The assembly at Zūq al-Kharāb, dated March 15, 1857 by 'Aqīqī, took place actually a year later than that date and was reported by Her Majesty's Consul as follows: "A very numerous and influential meeting is now being held at a central point in the Kesrouan to which Christians of different sects, as well as Druses, resort from every district." This group submitted petitions to the Consuls, directing against the Qā'im Maqām the charges cited by 'Aqīqī in his manuscript: injustice, influence of selfish interests, acceptance of bribery, and failure to follow the "straight path of religion."<sup>140</sup>

Moore appears to have seen in these events an opportunity to extend British influence, for he wrote, "The French have succeeded in establishing a system of terror all over Syria by means of which they have become the virtual rulers of the country." Though the Maronites are "French" and the Druses "English", the former, with encouragement and assistance, "would desert the French and come over to us ... England enjoys the moral, and France the material weight in this country... that latter species of influence is unquestionably the more advantageous and and practicably useful."<sup>141</sup>

---

140. Ibid., Moore to C. Alison (British Chargé d'Affaires in Constantinople), No. 22, March 16, and No. 23, March 17, 1858.

141. Ibid., Moore to Clarendon, No. 8, enclosure, February 19, 1858.

Does this explain England's espousal of the cause of those complaining against the Qā'im Maqām whom France supported? There were other possible explanations, chiefly that England simply viewed the maintenance of an unpopular governor as a danger to the political system that Moore considered "exceedingly well calculated for the benefit of the country." And as we shall soon see, it was France rather than England who favored the popular cause in the peasant movement against their aristocracy in Kisrawān.

Amīrs Amīn and 'Alī Abū al-Lama', relatives of the Qā'im Maqām, in retaliation for his interference with their property in the Biqā', then "made an attack upon him and compelled him to shut himself up in his own house." On May 10 Bashīr Aḥmad fled his Brummānā residence, following a threatening demonstration by the populace, and took refuge in Beirut. The Maronite aristocracy submitted a fresh petition of their grievances, insisting that in the meanwhile they would not permit his return to Brummānā. Weckbecker, the Austrian Consul, recommended that he be reinstated by force of arms; but the complainants blocked the roads to prevent communication with Beirut, and Bashīr Aḥmad rented a house in Beirut for six months and resigned himself to a protracted stay.<sup>142</sup> Khūrshīd, however, showed more determination: in less than three weeks he sent the

---

142. *Ibid.*, Moore to Alison, No. 35, May 11, and No. 36, May 14, 1858; Moore to Malmesbury, No. 21, May 12, 1858.

Amīr back to Brummānā accompanied by a force of irregulars, Albanians, and Druses, who met with no opposition.<sup>143</sup>

A delegation then presented the English Consul with a long list of grievances, including the charge that since his return the Qā'im Maqām had resorted to "violent proceedings" to crush the opposition. These complaints Moore "saw it his duty" to support.<sup>144</sup>

The Turkish Government had six months earlier promised to send as a special emissary Ata Bey, to investigate the charges against the Qā'im Maqām. Delay followed delay; Ata Bey went to Cyprus on another mission. He eventually reached Beirut on June 9, only to insist shortly afterward on referring the entire matter to Constantinople. This was taken as a guarantee of further procrastination. Literally thousands of mountaineers were reported streaming into Beirut to submit their complaints; Ata Bey, however, was said to receive only the petitions of the few supporters of Bashīr Aḥmad, and armed men were placed on the roads to block the procession of further complainants into the city. It was clear to Moore that Ata Bey and Khūrshīd Pāshā were determined to maintain the Qā'im Maqām at all costs.<sup>145</sup>

- 
143. Ibid., Moore to Alison, No. 42, May 29, 1858.  
144. Ibid., Moore to Malmesbury, No. 28, June 5, 1858.  
145. Ibid., Moore to Malmesbury, No. 31, June 10, No. 32, June 23, No. 34, June 25, and No. 50, Aug. 5, 1858.



In July the time was due for collection of the mīrī taxes, and Khūrshīd Pāshā commanded the Qā'im Maqām to proceed with this duty. The announcement of this intention brought a storm of protest from the populace, who stated alternatively their willingness to pay the tax either directly to the Beirut authorities or to a specially appointed agent, but in no case to Bashīr Aḥmad. Representatives informed Ata Bey that "if the Kaimakam did not at once withdraw the officers whom he had sent in virtue of the Pasha's orders, they would drive them out of the districts, attack the Emir and expel him from the Lebanon." Under these circumstances, Ata Bey ordered the Qā'im Maqām to withdraw his agents and refrain from collecting the tax until further notice.<sup>146</sup>

It was not, however, until September 14 that Moore wrote the dispatch quoted by Yazbak, reporting "the nomination of an acting Kaimakam pending the pretended inquiry into the Kaimakam's conduct but without suspending the latter ... The person selected to act is Emir Hassan Bellamaa (Ḥasan Abū al-Lama'), relative of the Kaimakam and his warmest ~~and~~ adherent and quite unqualified as to capacity and personal consideration for the appointment. I need scarcely say that under the circumstances his selection has given universal dissatisfaction.

---

146. Ibid., Moore to Alison, No. 59,  
July 17, 1858.

"The second measure adopted by the Turkish authorities is the dismissal of the Emir Beshir Assaf from his post of Mokatajji, an act of injustice and vindictiveness which Emir Beshir Assaf has done nothing to merit<sup>147</sup>." As for the innocence of Bashīr Assāf al-Lama'ī, one may note the account given by 'Aqīqī of his "election" as Qā'im Maqām by the assembly of Bashīr Aḥmad's opponents which had met in Raifūn, and of Bashīr 'Assāf's subsequent efforts in their behalf. Moore's dispatches make no specific mention of this although he once wrote to Lord Malmesbury that he had not "intrigued" with 'Assāf, but "he had had my assistance and countenance in common with the other complainants and as being the most considerable and influential amongst them. But I do not admit that he is a rival of the Kaimakam;" if he was so in secret, he had done himself no good by irritating the Turkish authorities and identifying himself with the complainants.<sup>148</sup>

It appeared after Bashīr Aḥmad's suspension that his dismissal was only a matter of time. Weckbecker, the Austrian Consul, declared that he had changed his opinion and that he now considered the Amīr wholly "insustainable", and a month later Moore reaffirmed his belief "that it is the intention of the Turkish authorities not to dismiss the

---

147. Ibid., Moore to Malmesbury, No. 54, Sept. 14, 1858.

148. Ibid., Moore to Malmesbury, No. 28, June 5, 1858.

Christian Kaimakam until the Lebanon shall have been involved in civil war ..."<sup>149</sup>

In protest against the continued rule of the Qā'im Maqām, the Christian town of Zaḥlah on December 15 requested to be placed under the direct rule of a Turkish governor. They had organized a provisional municipal council and, as 'Aqīqī states, elected a shakih shahāb or leader to govern, Bashīr Ahmad's authority for all practical purposes having for some time been without effect in the town.<sup>150</sup> Their demand was not acted upon until the following July, when orders arrived from the Porte to place Zaḥlah under the government of Damascus; but the inhabitants, who had thought they were choosing the lesser of two evils, now complained that all they had wished was "that a Ma'mour (official) should be sent to us on the part of the Turkish Authorities of the Eyalet of Sidon to which Pashalik <sup>our</sup> town, as well as Mt. Lebanon, from old times belong."<sup>151</sup> Accordingly, Khūrshīd Pasha dispatched a Muslim overseer to rule the town. Shortly afterward, however, he was withdrawn and Zaḥlah returned to the authority of the Qā'im Maqām, and when one faction of the inhabitants again requested direct Turkish rule in late November, Khūrshīd refused to receive their petition. At the close of the year

---

149. Ibid., Moore to Malmesbury, No. 57 Sept. 29, and No. 63, Nov. 1, 1858.

150. Ibid., Moore to Sir Henry Bulwer, No. 103, Dec. 22, 1858. (Bulwer had succeeded Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in Constantinople.)

151. Ibid., Moore to Sir Henry Bulwer, No. 39, July 21, 1859.

Moore wrote that the people of Zaḥlah "are divided among themselves as to whether they are to be under the Kaimakam or follow up their demand for a Turkish Governor; but it seems that the great majority are averse to a change, if the present Kaimakam were replaced by another Governor."<sup>152</sup>

Zaḥlah had not been alone in its demands. In July the village of Amyūn in North Lebanon, whose inhabitants had failed to obtain satisfaction in their complaints against the Qā'im Maqām, petitioned the Porte asking to be detached from the Lebanon and annexed to the Tripoli district under Turkish administration.<sup>153</sup>

To return to Bahsīr Aḥmad: the Turkish officials, having put him under an unofficial suspension, now made efforts to secure his return. Khūrshīd undertook to bring about a reconciliation between the Qā'im Maqām and his rival, Bashīr 'Assāf, taking the latter back into his good graces and offering to restore him to his post of muqāṭa'jī. 'Assaf resisted this bait, however, and refused to withdraw his complaints against his cousin.<sup>154</sup> Bentivoglio, the newly arrived French Consul, next succeeded in forcing the Khāzin Shaikhs into a reconciliation. They were "enjoined by Count Bentivoglio in the most emphatic terms to be prepared to accompany the Emir

---

152. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 53, Sept. 30, No. 62, Nov. 25, and Quarterly Report, Dec. 31, 1859.

153. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 35, July 9, 1859.

154. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 18, May 7, 1859.

back to the Lebanon whenever it may be convenient to send him. Every remonstrance on their part was overborne and I am assured it was signified to them by Mr. de Bentivoglio that they must obey this injunction."<sup>155</sup> It will be seen shortly that the ground had been prepared for these moves by the popular uprising in Kisrawān, which by this time had caused the expulsion of the Khāzin family from their homes and driven them to Beirut and elsewhere, so that in the interests of their own return they could be prevailed upon, however reluctantly, to accept the reinstatement of their enemy. In September, when on a trip to Bait Mirī to investigate an outbreak between Christians and Druses of that town, Khūrshīd Pāshā installed Bashīr Aḥmad once more in Brummānā, though without officially proclaiming him as reinstated. "The Christian Kaimakam remains", Moore reported on October 15, "with a force of about two hundred irregular troops in the pay of the (Turkish) Government. The fact of the Pasha having left this force with the Kaimakam gives rise to the surmise that the Authorities are afraid of leaving him without this support."<sup>156</sup>

As if trying to please both sides at once, Khūrshīd Pāshā and Ata continued to hint that Bashīr Aḥmad would be dismissed, so much so that in January Ata declared his inten-

---

155. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 31, June 8, 1859.

156. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 51, Sept. 17, and No. 53, Sept. 30, 1859.

tion to secure this dismissal and the British Consul concluded with satisfaction, "The dismissal is to be inferred of the present Kaimakam and appointment of Emir Beshir Assaff in his place."<sup>157</sup> Only a few days later, Khūrshīd issued a proclamation of reappointment of Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad.<sup>158</sup> But the Amīr could not regain effective control, for at the end of March "the disorganised state of the Lebanon has increased. The Emir's authority is everywhere treated with contempt, and his police driven away whenever they attempt to execute his orders, and this notwithstanding the efforts that are made by the French Consul General to uphold him."<sup>159</sup> He was again obliged to leave the Mountain, and on the very eve of the historic 1860 massacres, he was reported "residing at Beirut, although his district ... is in a state of disorganisation which he is powerless to check."<sup>160</sup>

We must now return to the fall of 1858 to take up the story of the peasant revolt against the Khāzin shaikhs of Kisrawān. Although some brief mention of this movement is made by almost every European writer dealing with the general period of the 1860 massacres, such mention is usually so vague that one can deduce little more than the fact that

- 
157. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 1, Jan. 10, 1860; enclosed report by interpreter H. Meshaka to Moore, Jan. 9.
158. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 3, Jan. 18, 1860; enclosed report by Meshaka to Moore, Jan. 18.
159. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 7, March 30, 1860.
160. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 18, May 18, 1860.

the rebellion did take place (some give the date as 1857, about two years too early<sup>161</sup>); that the Khāzins were driven from their homes; and that the rebels received some outside encouragement. The British Consular reports at the time made frequent mention of the uprising, but contribute disappointingly few details or informed explanations of the underlying causes; their first mention of the affair is not till January 29, 1859, a good two months after events had taken place that would have been handwriting on the wall to an on-the-scene observer.

Nevertheless, isolated facts may be pieced together from the diplomatic papers to make some contribution to the story. Baptistin Poujoulat's volume, La verité sur la Syrie et l'expédition française, published in 1861, contains an absorbing account, long on interpretation but short on facts (and inaccurate on dates<sup>162</sup>). On the whole, the 'Aqīqī manuscript and the collection of letters found in Chapter V of this paper probably contain more information than all the available French and English sources combined.

In review of the difficulties of Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad, the Christian Qā'im Maqām, for our present purposes it is desirable to dwell on the alignment of his friends and enemies

- 
161. Even British diplomatic documents commit this mistake. See Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria, 1860-61 (henceforth referred to as Syria Correspondence) published by the Foreign Office, I, 519. Lord Dufferin to Bulwer, Jan. 18, 1861.
162. He places the start of the outbreak in early 1858. (p.61)

rather than on the original causes of discontent with his rule. He was supported, we have seen, by the Turkish authorities and by the French and Austrian Consuls, albeit with habitual dissimulation on the part of the Turks, who managed to give the impression that they planned to dismiss him without actually doing so. He was opposed by the British Consul and by the overwhelming majority of the Greek Orthodox and Maronite ecclesiasts and Maronite landed aristocracy.

Churchill's image of the triumvirate of the French Consul, the Maronite Patriarch (representing his clergy), and the Christian Qā'im Maqām (representing the landlords) was indeed valid until the advent of Bashīr Aḥmad in 1854. This triumvirate constituted a solidarity of Catholic interests which remained unshaken for over a decade. Now it was breaking up; the Qā'im Maqām lost the support both of the Church and of his own fellow landholders. Nor was this all, for after 1858 a split between the landholders and the Church, and between the landholders and their hitherto docile peasantry, completed the process disintegration.

Let us examine each stage in turn. The unpopularity of the Qā'im Maqām with the shaikhs and the clergy seems to have been largely a personal affair. He was charged with usurping rights of landlords, of the Maronite Church, of the Orthodox Church; he was unpopular with a cross-section of the population, as in the town of Zaḥlah. He was simply a bad ruler. The Turks maintained him in office for obvious reasons: he seemed to offer living proof that the system of government in the country should be changed. The French



had their reasons too, though these were more obscure. Possibly, not demonstrably, they shared the motives of the Ottomans. They are said by Churchill to have been stirred by the "unpardonable sin" committed by the Khāzin family of laying their grievances before the British Consul.<sup>163</sup> British motives appear in a one-sidedly favorable light, of course, in the British Consular Files, which imply only that Her Majesty's Consul was committed to good government in Lebanon -- which need not be denied in itself.

Faced with his difficulties, the Qā'im Maqām could only be expected to look for opportunities to plant among his enemies troubles of their own. His efforts found fertile soil.

We must avoid the sweeping overstatement that the Maronite clergy in a body were brought into conflict with the Khāzin family, or that they gave unqualified support to Ṭānyūs Shāhīn and his band. The letters of Chapter V, while confirming the involvement of Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad, Père François Leroy of the Lazarites, and other individuals as something more than mediators, at the same time do not suggest direct complicity with the insurgents and indeed reveal, on the part of some, decided disapproval of Ṭānyūs' tactics.

Poujoulat eliminates the rank and file of lower clergy from any implication with the words, "Ces hommes de tant de vertus manquent d'instruction en général; en dehors des fonc-

---

163. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, p. 125.

tions du saint ministère, ils n'exercent sur l'esprit des populations aucune espèce d'influence; et, il faut le dire, ils ne la recherchent pas ... Il nous faut écarter les simples prêtres comme une des causes de la révolution libanaise."<sup>164</sup>

What intentions had the higher clergy? Certainly not an ecclesiastical state, says Poujoulat. They did want to combat the influence of certain individuals in the Church. But those among the rebels who refused to return property stolen from the Shaikhs were excommunicated, nominally including not only Tānyūs Shāhīn but relatives of the Patriarch himself. The equivocal attitude of Būlus Mas'ad "tiendrait bien plutôt à un caractère d'homme qui, dans un but qu'il croit louable, cherche à ménager tout le monde, que dans une pensée arrêtée de bouleversement à son profit."<sup>165</sup>

There was, however, a desire within the Church to restrict the Khāzin influence. This family traced their overlordship in Kisrawān to the days of Amīr Fakhr al-Dīn, and had later formed an alliance with the Druse/<sup>family</sup>of Janblāṭ against Amīr Bashīr II.<sup>166</sup> Although the bishops of the Maronite Church had historically been drawn from all classes, the local power of the Khāzins in Kisrawān had its effect. "Jusqu'en 1787,

---

164. Poujoulat, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

165. *Ibid.*

166. Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, vol. I, pp. 87-8.

époque à laquelle l'émir Béchir fut élevé au gouvernement unique de la montagne, gouvernement qu'il a conservé jusqu'en 1840, les cheiks du Kersrouan (sic) et surtout les cheiks Kazen avaient exercé dans cette province, qu'ils possédaient presque en entier, une influence réelle sur la nomination des évêques. Mais, à partir de 1787, cette influence fut singulièrement paralysée par la forte main du grand Béchir. L'antique puissance des cheiks renaquit en 1840, époque de la chute du célèbre gouverneur de la montagne. Cette puissance en trouve une nouvelle, en face d'elle: la puissance populaire. Il y eut résistance réelle de la part de l'Eglise maronite contre la prépotence ancienne des Kazen principalement. Cette Eglise ne voulut plus laisser introduire dans son sein un autre élément que le sien propre. De là des froissements inévitables. Et ces froissements ont produit une sorte d'hostilité morale réciproque. L'Eglise maronite a voulu garder toute sa liberté et, selon moi, elle a bien fait... Ce qui est nouveau peut-être, c'est l'acte par lequel le clergé a voulu renoncer à une sorte de tutelle que les anciens cheiks exerçaient sur lui. De là est venue contre le clergé l'accusation fautive, c'est ma conviction, d'avoir armé les fellahs contre les cheiks. Ce qui est vrai, naturel, c'est que les fellahs sont alliés au clergé déjà en lutte morale avec les cheiks."<sup>167</sup>

---

167. Poujoulat, op. cit., pp. 74-6.

Poujoulat's account was by no means shared by all.<sup>168</sup> In saying that "L'Eglise maronite a voulu garder toute sa liberté" he provokes the retort, well founded in Letters No. 28, No. 30, No. 31 and No. 34 of Chapter V, that in 1859 the Church in Kisrawān leaned heavily on France. Apart from this, Poujoulat is at least not contradicted by the contents of the letters or by the 'Aqīqī manuscript.

It seems significant that the letters contain petitions to the Patriarch from both the peasant representatives and from the Khāzin shaikhs, and that there are clear references (Letters No. 15 and No. 17) to the Patriarch's mediation. Letters No. 28 and Nos. 30-34, however, suggest close consultation between the Patriarch, Père François Leroy of the French Lazarite mission, and the French Consul, all of whom, with the assistance of certain mediaries, held Tānyūs Shāhīn at arms's length but actively supported the demand for selection

---

168. A British diplomatic agent in 1861 reported that "there is reason to believe" that the French Consul and Maronite Patriarch together incited rebellion and armed the peasants. (Syria Correspondence, II, p. 144. Colonel Burnaby to Lord Dufferin.)

Comte Melchior de Vogüé, one-time French Ambassador at the Porte, is closer to Poujoulat in saying that the clergy stood aside, hoping to profit by their neutrality. Les événements de Syrie, p. 4)

of ma'mūrs (local officials) from among the peasantry.

It remains to examine the final instance of the disintegration of Catholic interests: the cleavage between landlord and peasant, which led directly to the rebellion.

In general terms, peasant emancipation in Lebanon carried with it some of the historic features found in similar movements in Europe: a weakened feudal aristocracy, a changing economy, and an awakening peasantry stirred by dimly understood new social ideas and hitherto unknown sense of opportunity. The Khāzin and Ḥubaish shaikhs, like the Janblāts in the south, had been hard hit by the rule of Bashīr II Shihāb, who had installed his brother Qāsim as overseer in Ghānzīr. Though in 1860 the Khāzins still were proprietors of 30 villages, they had been obliged to sell property to peasants, while some peasant families enjoyed a decided rise in prosperity. <sup>169</sup>

There were, moreover, instances of abuses and oppression by the aristocracy. In 1852 Col. Churchill had written, "Till within the last few years the feudal system which has existed so long in the Lebanon pressed on the peasants with peculiar severity. On the slightest pretense, horsemen were quartered on them, and not taken off until they had paid whatever sum it pleased their chiefs to exact. The slightest resistance was immediately punished by summary

---

169. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 55

corporal punishment. Indeed, the Emīrs and Sheikhs looked upon this power of fining, as a considerable source of revenue. Under the despotic rule of the late Emir Bechir, the exactions on the people were so repeated, as more than once to raise them into rebellion, and they obtained the reputation of being restless and insubordinate."<sup>170</sup>

Some idea of the particular oppressions exercised on the people of Kisrawān may be had from Letter No. 3 of Chapter V, which enumerates the demands of the insurgent leaders: equitable distribution of taxes, cessation of unjust exactions and of obligatory gifts to the shaikhs on festival occasions, some political representation for the populace, and the equality of all before the law and in social dignity. Poujoulat cites the further complaint that the Khāzin shaikhs had withheld 20,000 piastres of tax revenues from the Government to finance a cadastral survey that was never held.<sup>171</sup>

The shaikhs could remind dissatisfied tenants that there was scarcely a locality in the Ottoman Empire where the peasantry enjoyed a more prosperous life of farming or industry. The raising of silk had indeed made Kisrawān wealthy. But it may have been this very prosperity that had encouraged the dissatisfaction. <sup>172</sup>

---

170. Churchill, Mount Lebanon, vol. I,  
pp. 51-2.

171. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 59.

172. Ibid., p. 60.

To Amīr B ashīr Aḥmad, therefore, the possibility of instigating the populace against their landlords must have been a very real temptation; but apart from the undocumented charges of such instigation made by various writers and by 'Aqīqī himself, we have no direct evidence with which to indict him.<sup>173</sup> We can at most infer a sort of guilt by association, reasoning that the Qā'im Maqām was the protégé of the Mushīr and the French Consul, who unquestionably gave the rebels their moral support. But this is no reason to deny that the insurrection was able to gather its forces on the strength of purely local conditions; and as Letter No. 32 reveals, Bahsīr Aḥmad's authority was scorned by Ṭānyūs Shāhīn and his followers. That the Qā'im Maqām originally encouraged the insurgents is quite probable; but what is more demonstrable and significant is the fact that once the movement had begun, his French and Turkish supporters -- for they were more influential than he -- chose to lend their assistance.

---

173. Poujoulat states that Shaikh 'Abbās al-Khāzin of 'Ajaltūn was chosen by the Qā'im Maqām as the "instrument of discord," being promised authority over a "considerable portion of the Mountain" in return for his evil efforts; but after his success, he was discarded without reward. (op. cit., p. 65.) If this is the same individual as 'Abbās Shaibān al Khāzin, the writer of Letter No. 4, which seems likely, we must discount the story.

This assistance was chiefly of a negative sort on the part of the Turks, who refused to send an effective military force to restore order in Kisrawān and return the Khāzins to their homes after they had been expelled in January, 1859. In February a handful of troops were quartered on various towns, but soon withdrawn. The efforts of the British Consul to persuade Khūrshīd to take action continued sporadically until finally in May, 1860, he concluded that "if Khorsheed Pasha were sincere in his desire to restore order in the disturbed district, he has abundant means at his command of doing so without the cooperation of a military force. It cannot for a moment be supposed that a handful of unsupported peasants should venture to defy the authority of the Porte." He did however note the fact that almost all Turkish troops from the Damascus Pashalik were being returned to Constantinople, and the transfer of a battalion from Beirut to the interior of Syria was contemplated. The military means of keeping order in the Lebanon were meagre at best.<sup>174</sup>

The Porte furthermore failed to act on the numerous petitions of the Khāzin family for redress, or even to provide them with relief of any kind. "This large body of persons, about five hundred in number," Moore wrote, "are reduced in many instances to actual beggary and in all to the greatest

---

174. British Consular Files. Moore to Bulwer, No. 16, May 9, 1860.



straights for the means of subsistence." 175 And later:  
"Their application to the Pasha for protection and justice  
elicit from His Excellency nothing but unfulfilled promises." 176

The role of the French Consul was more direct, in that he enjoyed the great confidence of the Maronite clergy and population and was able to utilize his personal contacts to advantage. Letters No. 27 and No. 28 of Chapter V mention his visits to Tanyūs Shāhīn and Père Leroy, the latter being actively involved in negotiation of the question of selecting a ma'mūr from the populace. 177

---

175. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 49, Sept. 2, 1859.

176. Ibid., Moore to Bulwer, No. 52, Sept. 29, 1859.

177. The Consul's prestige is amply revealed in the following report to Moore from an agent at Ghazir, describing a visit by Count Bentivoglio to that town. (Ibid. Moore to Bulwer, No. 61, Nov. 8, 1859, enclosure.)

"On Saturday last, the 5th instant, about midday, the Consul General of France came to Ghazir and took up his quarters at the Jesuit College. One hour afterwards the people of the town in a body assembled having Messrs. Botros and Wakeem Bakhos at their head and fired musketry in honor of this visit.

"On the following day, Sunday, the people assembled again fully armed, displaying the French flag and singing hymns of praise, invoking blessings on the Consul General and his government, declaring that they are devoted to them and living under their protection. After an hour they proceeded in a body to the College of the Jesuits, still singing and firing their muskets and with the French flag before them, entered the Convent and sat under the trees in the yard where they continued about three hours the

Of Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, who as chief among the wakīls or representatives chosen by the villages of Kisrawān, one finds varying descriptions. An unverified legend relates that this one-time muleteer and shodder of animals, almost totally illiterate, fell gravely ill in 1857. His wife and nephew (he had no children), thinking him about to die, searched out his hoard of small savings that he had hidden away and fell to quarreling over it. At that moment Shaikh Mārūn al-Khāzin passed by, stopped the quarrel, and took the money with him to keep in trust until Ṭānyūs should die and the rightful heir be identified. But Ṭānyūs unexpectedly recovered and reclaimed the money; Shaikh Mārūn returned the box containing 20,000 piastres. Ṭānyūs asserted that 10,000 piastres were missing; he accused the shaikh of theft; a bitter dispute arose, and thus Ṭānyūs Shāhīn became the staunch foe of the Khāzin family.<sup>178</sup>

---

same professions in presence of the Consul, who, afterwards taking leave, mounted, preceded by the crowd with the flag until he reached the Convent of St. Elia of Ghazir. On the Consul bidding them farewell, he ordered that a sum of fifteen hundred Piastres be paid to them, namely, Ps. 500 for the cost of the gunpowder used on the occasion and Ps. 1,000 as an assistance to the needy amongst them." (signed) Tanous Bakhos.  
178. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 61.

Tānyūs was described in sweeping terms by Lord Dufferin as "the insurgent blacksmith Tannous Shaheen, a ruffian of the most despicable character, the author of several murders, and one of the chief promoters of the late disturbances" (i.e., the 1860 Druse-Maronite war).<sup>179</sup> Poujoulat gives him little better treatment: "C'est un homme profondément dissimulé. Son regard fauve trahit, malgré lui, ses mauvais instincts. On le croit capable de tous les forfaits."<sup>180</sup> On the other hand, an anonymous <sup>th</sup>author is found to say, "Tannous Schahin était un homme simple, naïf, dépourvu de l'intelligence et de la capacité dont est doué, d'ordinaire, l'homme du peuple qui s'élève subitement; mais il était aimé pour sa probité et son désintéressement. Les paysans se servaient de lui comme d'un drapeau et lui avaient donné une importance dont il ne se souciait nullement. Paisible et point ambitieux, il eut préféré ne pas avoir à jouer le rôle dangereux de tribun et de chef d'insurrection."<sup>181</sup> The same writer asserts that the Patriarch tried to persuade Tānyūs to leave Kisrawān; the latter called on him in great pomp, riding a white mule and refused to give in, claiming to have a great mission to fulfill.<sup>182</sup>

---

179. Syria Correspondence, II, p. 152.

Dufferin to Bulwer, April 20, 1861.

180. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 61.

181. "Un témoin oculaire," Souvenirs de Syrie. Expédition de 1860, pp. 10-11. These impressions are belied by Letters No. 30, No. 31 and No. 34 of Chapter V.

182. Ibid., p. 11.

The deeds of Tānyūs and his insurrectionist followers against the landlords have been much exaggerated. "The crimes committed by the Christian followers of Tannus Shahin, on the persons of some of the unfortunate ladies of the Khāzin family, exceed anything that has ever been laid to the charge of the Druse nation," wrote Lord Dufferin. "It is also, I am assured, a fact too notorious to be disputed, that the rebel leader and his adherents ... were encouraged and countenanced in their excesses by Bishop Tobia and some of his brother ecclesiastics."<sup>183</sup> Actually, only three murders were charged to the rebels.<sup>184</sup> That they seized the Khāzin

---

183. Syria Correspondence, I, p. 519. Dufferin to Bulwer, Jan. 18, 1861.

184. The wife and daughter of Shaikh Diyāb al-Khāzin were shot, and a second daughter badly beaten. The bodies of the first two, it was charged, were stripped, left for days, and then dragged to a wall that was demolished and made to collapse on them as a means of burial. (Syrian Correspondence, I, p. 520. Accusations brought by Khāzin shaikhs against Tānyūs Shāhīn.)

A second charge was that Shaikh Du'aibis al-Khāzin, while returning to Ghūṣṭā, with the sanction of the Patriarch, to recover his property, was seized by the people of 'Ashqūt and pounded to death in an oil-press. (Ibid., I, p. 577. Dufferin to Bulwer, Feb. 11, 1861.)

properties, collected their harvests, and cut down trees is generally agreed, but the Khāzins were not permanently expropriated: only the produce of their property was commandeered by Tānyūs for peasant use.<sup>185</sup>

Kisrawān remained in the hands of this peasant band throughout the massacres and their aftermath until March of 1861, when, as we shall see, they were expelled by Yūsuf Bey Karam. The Khāzins returned and normal conditions restored; but the interlude of revolution had had effects that reached farther than Kisrawān itself. Some of these had to do with the massacres, others with the system of government that in 1861 replaced that of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs. But apart from these fragmentary results, the movement is more significant as a symptom, a manifestation of the social change taking place in the Lebanon. The traditional vested interests of feudalism had been repeatedly shaken since the time of Bashīr II Shihāb by successive rifts between Druse and Maronite, governor and landlord, clergy and landlord, and now landlord and peasant. The trickle of emigration had begun; commerce grew; missionary education spread. A weakened Ottoman authority, lacking the means to enforce order in these decades of transition and hampered by the insistence of European rivalries, sought inevitably to salvage some vestige of prestige for itself by exploiting dissatisfaction in the country wherever it appeared, with the result that the social conflicts were all the more extreme.

---

185. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 61.

Commentary by the Editor

Page 59

(Quotations):

"The Khāzin family is famous for stirring up trouble..."

-Mr. Alison, secretary of the British Embassy in Constantinople.

"As for the policy the Turks<sup>are</sup> following, and from which they have never relented, its aim is to direct their efforts in the Druse and Christian Qā'im Maqāmiyyahs to cause the troubles in Lebanon to continue, hoping to annul the (present) regime there..."

-Mr. Moore, English Consul in Beirut to his Ambassador in Constantinople.

"As for the purpose behind Khūrshīd Pāshā's conduct in the Lebanese question and his intentions which I have tried to see through, they are the very intentions of Turkey, that troubles should rule Lebanon, in the hope that she (Turkey) can, in the midst of the general disturbances, annul the system there which she has always regarded with a jaundiced eye."<sup>186</sup>

-The same Consul to his foreign minister.

---

186. None of these three quotations is in the original English.

"An order has been given by the Seven Powers to free the Christians, and they must not remain the slaves of anyone. And if you wish to be freed, no man can prevent you, neither the Mushīr nor the Qā'im Maqām..."<sup>187</sup>

-Tānyūs Shāhīn to the people of Jubail  
on April 3, 1860.

\*  
\* \* \*

Page 61

In the following section the late Anṭūn Ḍāhir al-'Aqīqī presents some of the causes of the popular revolt in Kisrawān against the Khāzin family, and relates some of its particulars.

We say, "some of the reasons" and "some of its particulars" and do not generalise, because it was not in the power of that faithful historian, though sound in logic, to know everything, understand everything, and deduce everything, for the transmission and reception of news in that day were not what they are now.

We must remind the reader that the bad conduct of some of the Khāzins, and their despotism and cruelty, were not the only cause of the revolution, for indeed the clash of imperialist interests participated in igniting the fire;

---

187. See below, Yazbak page 210.

and the agents of the Ottoman State were not satisfied with the system of government that the covetous greeds of the powers had imposed on Lebanon, dividing it into a Druse regime and a Christian one, as we have seen (p. 45). For 17 consecutive years they (The Ottomans) worked to achieve that mutual hatred in the breasts of the sons of the one country.

The government of Constantinople arranged plots and promoted intrigues so that "The Lebanon shall have been involved in civil war - as a means of introducing direct Turkish rule, an object never lost sight of since the establishment of the existing Institutions..."<sup>188,189</sup>

Page 62

It was reasonable for them to be pleased with the evil doings of some of the Khāzins and the grumbling of the people at them, their irritation at them, and their anger against them, and with the revolt of the people against their rulers, so that the two sides would be thrown at their (The Ottomans') feet, which is just what happened.

---

188. Original English text, copied from British Consular Files, Beirut. Moore to Earl of Malmesbury, No 63, Nov. 1, 1858.

189. (Y) From the report of the English Consul General in Beirut to his Government on November 1, 1858. Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, p. 343, Vol. I.



The agents of the Sultanate were successful with many of their traps; and they compelled the Christian sons of Zahlah to ask for a Turkish Wali over them. <sup>190</sup> The

---

190. (Y) On the 20th of April, 1859, the English Consul General in Beirut wrote a report to his Ambassador in Constantinople about the condition of the Mount, in which he said, "As connected with the views of the Turkish Authorities in regard to the government of Mt. Lebanon, <sup>K</sup> I have to add that after the employment of every possible method to disgust the population against the existing institutions by exciting one class against another, at one time instigating the peasantry against the Sheiks, and at another affording the Sheiks the means of retaliating upon the people, the result has been a common determination by both parties to ask for a Turkish Governor as the only means of being permitted to enjoy tranquillity. The town of Zahlé was induced by the same manoeuvres to make a similar request. The Pasha informed the Deputation of the Zahliotes that their petition has been transmitted to Constantinople, but the result is still unknown." <sup>KK</sup>  
Al-Muharrarat al-Siyasiyyah, p. 359, Vol. I.

(K) Yazbak's Arabic contains the following distortion:

(Since I was connected with the intentions of the Turkish Government...)

(KK) Original English text, copied from British Consular Files, Moore to Sir Henry Bulwer, No. 17, April 20, 1859.

people of Zaḥlah were attached first to the vilayet of Syria, then to the vilayet of Sidon. The same was done to the Christians of Ḥāṣḥbayyā, and they asked "that the Turkish sovereignty be spread over them directly so that they would be rid of the aggression of the Druse chieftains; so the government immediately sent a force of organised troops, and the petition received due consideration."<sup>191</sup>

Page 63

It was to England's interest that the system of government in Lebanon should remain as it was, so that by means of her new "friends", the Druses, she could interfere in the affairs of the country at whatever hour she wished, and spread her influence in it so that one day she might gain complete rule over it and extend her occupation of the lands lying on the route to India, the source of her welfare and livelihood. And so she awaited the opportunity to step in, while France strove for the return of her influence. The desired chance came to her to show her "amity" for her friends the Druses; and against whom? Against their brothers! Her agents started in the Shūf to fan the fire of rebellion, and the winds were favorable.

As for France, she had preferred that her Shihābī agents remain as governors so that she might continue to

---

191. (Y) Al-Muharrarat al-Siyāsiyyah,  
Vol. I, page 367.

have the final word here (in Lebanon). But after the defeat of her policy and the collapse of Ibrāhīm's rule, she feared to lose her "friends", The Maronites, so she was pleased with the status quo in which she might preserve among them at least her dying influence. Then she began to encourage the ignorant among them to "take revenge"; and against whom? Against their brothers! and with the weapons of the foreigners!...

As for the Khāzins, they sought the help of all the consuls and asked them to intervene, and provoked the foreign powers against the rebelling Maronite population!..

The exposure of the colonialist quarrel over the division of the Lebanese appeared in its clearest deceitfulness since the positions of London and Paris in their traditional policies were at odds with each another. The English Consul set about befriending the Khāzin family against the rebels - and the Khāzin family had for long been the agents of French colonialism, as is known - so the French Consul went to befriend the rebels in order to punish their former agents who were now with the English. The agents of London were inciting the Khāzins against the Christian Qā'im Maqām, and when the latter was dismissed from his post, the agents of Turkey and France began to incite the followers of the Qā'im Maqām against the Khāzins;

and the free men among the people seized the opportunity to throw off the feudal yoke, and revolted against the Khāzin family. The intelligent men will see an appalling consideration in this policy of playing with two ropes (i.e., pulling in two directions at once), namely:

Politics is treacherous and tyrannical, not fulfilling obligations nor showing mercy, selecting individuals from the people as its "friends" in order to accomplish its object, by means of them then letting them down and neglecting them, and then befriending their enemies for the same purpose; and thus alternately...

It was really sorrowful when one of those pretended leaders, whether Christian or Druse, did not understand the game of imperialist politics. The Druses did not understand the reason for the "friendship" of the English Consul, nor did the Maronites understand the French Consul's "friendship" for all of them.

It must be pointed out that the Khāzin family did not all behave the same, and among them were individuals of zeal, manliness, generosity, and praiseworthy conduct.

More than once they called the attention of their relatives to the need to treat the people fairly, avoid impoverishing them, and lessen their (bad) conditions; but levity prevailed over reasonableness, and provocation reached its farthest limit, with the result that the great wrath (of the people) was unleashed and raged in the mountains and

vall̄yes of Kisrawān, from the pines of Ṣarbā to the snows of Fārayyā, and made the oppressors taste real torture.

There remained a group of the people who were loyal to the Khāzins out of regard for the most just and the best among them, who took (upon themselves) the sin of their relatives and suffered calamities, though they themselves were innocent.

As for Ṭānyūs Shāhin, leader of that revolt, he was a noble and high-minded example to the Lebanese, zealous for his own and his Mountain's honor. He breathed his democratic and pure spirit into his brothers, but he did not allow any of them to shed the blood of any of the hated Shaikhs, even though it was in his power not to allow a single one of them to remain. During his "republican" rule he distributed justice among the people in Kisrawān, and displayed a strong Lebanese tendency. If he had had the good fortune to achieve his aims and if he had been well educated, the face of history in this country would have been changed...

Anṭūn Ḍahir-al-'Aqīqī said in his manuscript which we left on page 55:

\*  
\* \* \*

Then the landowners began thinking their evil thoughts of how to depose the Amīr from the government and started to submit petitions complaining of him the Wāli

of Beirut, who applauded them and bribed government officials to do this. The governor of Beirut at that time was Wāmiq Pasha. The first to become partisans against the Amīr were the people of Zaḥlah, who set up a "Shaikh Shabāb" (chief) at their head and convened a council composed of six elderly men. They decided not to accept Amīr Aḥmad as governor, so his grace set out for Zaḥlah to attend to the question. He stayed there about three months and built buildings <sup>192</sup> there, but could not undo their work, although his ardour to silence the affair abated somewhat. He then returned to Bait Marī and Brummānā to live, but this poison began to spread throughout all the districts. In the meanwhile there came a clamoring from the people of Ghazīr against the Shaikhs of the Ḥubaish family, avowing that they would not accept its Shaikhs. They set up a Shaikh Shahāb (chief) following the practice of Zaḥlah and wrote compacts concerning their activities in this matter. When the Shaikhs learned of this they began to threaten the peasants concerning their actions. An uproar arose between them and several were injured. The matter was laid before his Grace, and he seized a number of men from both sides and put them in

prison for a time, then released them. The Amīr's government came to be reduced in authority bit by bit although the Wālī of Beirut intervened in favor of the Amīr because he had been bribed by him and those with personal aims were unable to achieve their aim of deposing him from the government. Finally in the year 1855-6 his Grace the Amīr authorized the arrest of some of the Shaikhs of the Khāzin family and rounded up some of them because of a number of incidents. The Shaikhs in this situation then handed together and planned to agitate against the Amīr. They addressed some of the Amīrs and Shaikhs on this idea and a party was formed of them. The agitation in the country increased and grew day by day. They organised the first assembly in Zūq al-Kharāb, and this assembly was attended by people from the Khāzin family and Amīrs from the Abū al-Lama' family, such as Amīr Bashīr 'Assāf, and they

193

addressed the people of Zahlah blaming the Amīr. Afterwards some of them went down to Beirut and presented the consuls with a complaint regarding their situation and saying that all the subjects were oppressed by this government. Their words were answered by Churchill Bey, the Englishman, who commanded them to present their petitions to the authorities. So they began to submit petitions on the subject of the above-mentioned Amīr

---

193. (Y) The writer of al-Muqāta'ah al-Kisrawaniyyah says - p. 328 - that the meeting of Zūq Kharāb was on the 15th of March, 1857,<sup>K</sup> and in it those assembled from the Bani Khāzin decided on "the increase of the parties complaining against the Amīr. They carried out this decision by establishing agents for the villages of southern Kisrawān and had seals made for them so that they could seal the petitions of complaint against the Amīr... When the news reached the ears of his Beatitude Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad, of their meeting and appointing of agents for the villages and other measures such as this, it distressed him because he realised that these deeds might be interpreted to their disadvantage, as one who seeks death by his own claws (who digs his own grave)".

(K) Actually March 15, 1858. (See British Consular Files, Moore to Alison, No. 22, March 16, 1858.)



(Aḥmad), bringing charges against him to the government's attention in which they exposed everything insulting about his Grace (the Amīr), concerning the injustices and influence of selfish interests and the acceptance of bribery and his lack of regularity in following the straight path of religion. They also presented those charges to the other consuls, and as for the Consul of France, he was straightforward with the Amīr, as opposed to the English Consul who wanted the Amīr deposed, while the Amīr was trying to clear himself from this (deposition). And the petitions which were coming forth were from certain people who did not desire peace, but unleashed evils and troubles; and indeed all their petitions were corrupt. Things remained in this condition for some time.

After that, an assembly was formed by some of the Shaikhs of the Khāzin household in the School of Raifūn, and all those having personal aims attended, all of them being members of the society and enemies of the Amīr. They called it the Assembly of the Brotherhood, and allowed no one to enter it except those of their own religious community. They installed as head of its transactions Shaikh As'ad Ibrāhīm al-Khāzin, as general president, Shaikh Ḥuṣṇ Bishārah as first director, and Shaikh Saqr Ḥuraiqah as second director. These men were conscripted

for this work. Whatever losses and costs, <sup>these were</sup> these were to be borne by all. From there (Raifūn) the said Shaikh As'ad went to Beirut to deal with the Amīr, and the two directors went with him to help him. The others stayed behind in the country. And if they submitted petitions, the whole party would sign and seal them without further consideration. They began to suffer many losses and could not carry out all their work, but they always had a promise of help from the English Consulate. Then they elected the Amir Bashīr 'Assāf to be Qā'im Maqām, <sup>194</sup> since they thought him suitable for the general tranquility. The said Amīr agreed with them in this idea, as did several of his relatives. He ('Assāf) started paying them (the Assembly) a part of their losses and costs. He went down to Beirut frequently to make complaints against His Grace the Amīr (Ahmad) and to contradict what he said. As for His Grace, he was bribing the Pāshā a great deal, and for this reason his affairs progressed unhindered, for bribery blinds those in authority. But His Grace was unsuccessful in governing and (the people) caused him much

---

194. This of course was purely a demonstration of sympathies, having no legal standing. Bashīr Ahmad remained in office.

trouble. An accumulation of debts piled up on him, and had he not been wealthy he could not have put up with this opposition. Nevertheless he sold a part of his property to pay his debts which he had sustained from this (opposition) for all at once he sold an amount worth 190,000 piasters,

195

---

195. (Y) On January 28, 1856 Mr. Moore, the English Consul General in Beirut, wrote to Mr. Alison, Chargé d'affaires of the English Embassy in Constantinople a report on this subject, in which he said, Ku... The decided support given by the Turkish authorities to Emir Beshir Ahmed is easily explained. Without being at present prepared to charge Khorsheed Pasha himself with venality, I must state that nobody seems to doubt that of the Defterdar, KK who exercises great influence over His Excellency and who is known to be a warm supporter of the Kaimakam. The greater part of the large debts, about two millions of piastres, incurred by the Kaimakam, of which the authorities to this day have not enforced payment, have in all probability been expended in bribery. Another reason for Turkish support is the policy which has never been abandoned of encouraging a state of disorder in the Lebanon upon which to find a pretext for the abolition of the existing institutions. The same system is pursued in the Druse Kaimakamiya.

In the case of Emir Beshir Ahmed a fanatical feeling is mixed, inasmuch as it is now generally believed that he is only nominally a Christian. He is born a Druse, a faith which permits the external profession of any other creed, which may suit their policy. (sic.!!!)

The Druse Kaimakam is a Mussulman and observes all the rites of that faith. Thus though the Porte is pledged to give to the Druses a Druse and to the Christians of Mt. Lebanon a Christian

and likewise Amīr Bashīr 'Assāf in a period of two months

---

Governor, they have virtually fulfilled neither condition."KKK  
Al-Muarrarat al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. 8  
p. 293.

(K) Original English text, copied from British Consular Files, Beirut, Moore to Alison, No. 5, January 28, 1858 (not 1856).

(KK) Yazbak's Arabic version twists the meaning slightly:

(although if I had the evidence with which to charge Khūnshīd Pāshā with taking bribes I must state that no one doubts that the Defterdar does (also)).

(KKK) Poujade states that after 1845 the Druse Qa'im Maqām, Amīr Aḥmad Arslān, regularly attended worship at the mosque, as did other Druses. (op. cit., p. 234.)

The statement that the Druse religion permits profession of another creed, which Yazbak finds so incredible, is indeed attested to on good authority. Philip K. Hitti (The Origins of the Druse People and Religion, p. 48) writes that "when the Egyptian Ibrāhīm Pasha insisted on enforcing his conscription laws...many Druses, in order to evade the draft, began to patronize the Christian churches of their Maronite neighbors. A few years ago (Hitti was writing in 1928) when the great Druse leader, al-Amīr Mustafa Arislan, who had held many high governmental positions under the Turks, died, his funeral services were conducted

Page 70

lost about 50,000 piasters, not counting what the Khāzin Shaikhs lost. As for a second group of the Khāzin Shaikhs, it was their desire that His Grace the Amīr (Aḥmad) should remain; and they submitted petitions of commendation of his works. Incitement to violence increased and grew between the two factions, and the Khāzin Shaikhs disagreed among themselves on their affairs; the evil increased and they were evenly divided in number, each of their factions striving to overthrow the other. Conditions remained in this state for about two years until 1857. Then an order was issued from the Wāli for the cessation

---

according to the Sunni Moslem rites." Elsewhere he states that the Shihābs in the 18th Century, though outwardly Muslim, "secretly showed sympathy with Drusism, the religion of the majority of their subjects." (Ibid., p. 7.)

The Abū al-Lama' of which Amīr + family  
Bashīr Ahmad was a member had only been converted to Christianity within the lifetime of its older living members of the time. While some of them, notably Ḥaidar Ismā'il, the first Christian Qāim Maqām, were devoted Maronites, others were scarcely known for their piety and perhaps justly suspected of being Christians in name only.

(See Churchill, Mount Lebanon, Vol. I, p. 100).

of the government of His Grace the Amīr (Ahmad) <sup>196</sup>

---

196. (Y) We have no official document confirming the date of the staying of the hand of the said Qā'im Maqām: the author of al-Muqāta'at al-Kisrawāniyyah says (p. 331): "On the 28th of September (1858) a high order was issued to stop Amīr Bashīr Ahmad, the Qā'im Maqām, from his work, and substituting Amīr Ḥasan al-Lama'ī (Abū al-Lama') in his place. The enemies of the former rejoiced and were very much pleased in their satisfaction at his misfortune and hoped for his dismissal soon."

But Mr. Moore, the English Consul General in Beirut, wrote on September 14 of that year to Count (Duke) Malmesbury,<sup>k</sup> the English foreign Minister, saying to him: "I have the honor to state that the Lebanon affair has made but little progress since my last reports. The only two changes in the situation are the nomination of an acting Kaimakam pending the pretended inquiry into the Kaimakam's (Bashīr Ahmad's) conduct but without suspending the latter in accordance with the Sixteenth Article of the Regulations of the Empire. The person selected to act (is) Emir Hassan Bellamaā, relative of the Kaimakam and his warmest adherent and quite unqualified as to capacity and personal consideration for the appointment. I need scarcely say that under the circumstances his selection has given universal dissatisfaction.

"The second measure adopted by the Turkish authorities is the dismissal of the Emir Beshir Assaf..."<sup>KK</sup>  
al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. I, p. 333.

Then the said consul wrote to his

except in the matter of government tax moneys which had  
to be collected despite the suspension (of Amīr Aḥmad),<sup>197</sup>

---

minister on the 1st of November saying:  
"The recent discovery of a secret compact said to be favored by the Mushir (Khūrshīd Pāshā), entered into by the Metualis of Mt. Lebanon and a party of Druses, adherents of Emir Beshir Ahmed and notorious for their intrigues, directed against the Christian complainants, has confirmed the belief that it is the intention of the Turkish Authorities not to dismiss the Christian Kaimakam until the Lebanon shall have been involved in civil war - as a means of introducing direct Turkish rule, an object never lost sight of since the establishment of the existing Institutions..."<sup>KKK</sup>  
Vol. I, p. 343.

(K) James Howard Harris, Third Earl of Malmesbury (neither Count nor Duke). See Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th Edition, Vol. XVII.

(KK) Original English text, copied from British Consular Files, Moore to Malmesbury, No. 54, September 14, 1858. Moore's dispatch continues:"... dismissal of the Emir Beshir Assaf from his post of Mokatadji, an act of injustice and vindictiveness which Emir Beshir Assaf has done nothing to merit..."

(KKK) Original English text, copied from British Consular Files. Moore to Earl of Malmesbury, No. 63, Nov. 1, 1858.  
197. On the contrary: The British Consular Files make it clear that Bashir Aḥmad was made to desist from tax collection two months before being suspended from other duties. (See Moore to Alison, No. 59, July 17, 1858).

because his Excellency Wāmiq Pāshā had been removed  
from the Vilayet of Beirut <sup>198</sup> and had gone to the Vilayet  
of Syria, and another Wālī came to Beirut, <sup>199</sup> with the  
result that the order was issued to suspend the Amīr. <sup>200</sup>

At that time the incitement to rebellion increased in  
Kisrawān among the Shaikhs and those with selfish  
interests. The two parties began to increase in hatred  
for each other, contrary to what was thought of them, and  
His Grace the Amīr (Aḥmad) started to employ trickery to  
debase the Khāzins from their honor, as they had done to  
him. It was no longer possible to distinguish between  
good and bad, but despite this there was no immediate  
result. As for the common people, they began to discuss  
their situation in connection with this business,  
considering themselves to have become as slaves in the  
hands of the landlords and to have no longer any say or  
consultation in anything. At that time there was  
discussion among the people about that, among some who  
were not leaders. This was done in each village of

- 
198. More correctly, the Vilayet of Sidon, of which Beirut was the Capital.
199. (Y) This was the above mentioned Khūrshīd Pāshā.
200. A full year elapsed between Khūrshīd's arrival in September 1857 and the suspension of Bashīr Aḥmad in September 1858.



Kisrawān without knowledge of the next village; for fear was falling on the hearts of all the subjects and especially fear instilled by the Khāzin family into the people of Kisrawān, for they no longer took account of their subjects, nor their chiefs or leaders, in anything. They used to say that the peasant and his possessions belonged to them, and they did not care in any way. The least of the Khāzins insulted the greatest of the people, not to mention killing, imprisonment and things like that. For example, Shamsīn al-Khāzin took the money of Mr. Shāhīn al-Qāmū' in 'Ajaltūn, and when the latter charged him, with that before the judge, who was the previously mentioned Amīr Ḥaidar Ismā'īl, the said Shamsīn came to Shāhīn's house at night and slew him and lit a fire over him <sup>201</sup>. And by the same

---

201. (Y) There is a second story of this Shaikh Shamsīn al-Khāzin concerning burning people with fire, the substance of which is that Mīlād al-Dīk of 'Ajaltūn used to trade in silk, buying it from Kisrawān and selling it in Damascus. He had friends among the Khāzins who would deliver their silk to him, confident of his trustworthiness, good judgment and management, and he would sell it and pay them its price by installments, so that they would not have all of it sold for a single payment. Shaikh Shamsīn sent to him asking for money, though having no silk (deposited with) him (Mīlād), and Mīlād answered, "I sent silk to Damascus, but I have not yet obtained its price, and as soon as I obtain the money I shall send His

token Mulḥim D'aibis of Ghūstā spoiled for a fight with

---

Excellency the Shaikh what he requested, even though he has no silk (deposited) with me."

The messenger took this reasonable statement to his master, and the Shaikh burned with anger and shouted, "Certainly he has it, he has money, but he won't lend me anything because I have no silk with him. I know how to teach the likes of this pimp who dares scorn a Khāzin. Whom does this dog depend on? On my cousin Shaikh Wadī? Doesn't he know that we, the sons of Khāzin, will slice a man in two parts if necessary, each of us taking a part, and that we do not differ on what pertains to raising the cause of the family? And we break the head of anyone who dares not to hasten to comply with our demands, whatever they be..."

The Shaikh carried his stick under his arm and went to the house of Mīlād al-Dik. The weather was rainy and the cold was strong, and he pushed open the door and went in, malice flying from his eyes. He found Mīlād warming himself by the fire and his wife and children asleep around him. He did not wait for him to stand up, but seized the brazier in front of him and threw it at the head of the unfortunate man. Then he drew his dagger and stabbed Mīlād in...and left him to breathe his last while he himself returned home as if nothing had happened!...

The cries of the wife and children were raised, and the neighbours came running in the night, and they found that Mīlād had met his end!

Page 73 Ibn Buyūs al-Shnī'ī for a trial of strength, and when  
Page 74 Ibn Buyūs defeated Shaikh Mulḥim, Shaikh Mulḥim struck  
him with a large knife and killed him. And again, he  
laid Ibn Fāris al-Biṭār in his grave while he was still  
alive, even though he was one of the leading people of  
the country. <sup>202</sup> And by the same token Shaikh Yūnis al-

---

202. (Y) The story of this Shaikh Mulḥim D'aibis al-Khāzin with Ilyās al-Biṭār is no less amazing than its earlier counterpart, the gist of which is that the Shaikh madly loved a girl of the people of Ghūstā and began to visit her against her will. She refused his efforts at seduction, especially since she knew that the Khāzins married only girls of their own family because they counted themselves of nobler origin than the people, this consideration having its source in feudal traditions practiced in many countries. The lover imagined that Ilyās al-Biṭār loved the girl and that it was he who encouraged her to reject him. The Biṭār family in Kisrawān was one known for its graciousness and good character, and the Khāzins hated them because the latter were their competitors for the local leadership. The Shaikh became angry at the aforementioned Ilyās and began to watch over his movements in order to assault him. One night he lay in wait for him near the church, in front of the door of the "corpse-house" (Khashkhāshah) (The mountaineers' name for the graveyard) and on Ilyās's return home the Shaikh leapt on him, put him in fetters, cast him in the graveyard, and returned to his house. It happened that someone passed by the burial place, heard the groans, lifted the stone from the door and saved the poor man from the grave and returned him to his people. History

Page 75

Badawī of Mazra'ah stripped Nādir al-Qasīm of his clothes as his Lord created him, made him ride on a she-ass, and began to beat him with sticks on his private parts and elsewhere; and by this process Nādir died<sup>203</sup> after a time had passed, The cause of his death

---

Page 75

says that the Bīṭārs did not dare complain because the Governor used to close his eyes to the deeds of the Banī Khāzin, his partners - in - booty. But the relatives of Shaikh Muḥim D'aibis met and agreed to take their cousin, hands bound, to the Bīṭār home and throw him on the ground so that the owners of the house could beat him; but they made the condition that the father of the "buried alive" Ilyās be flung on Shaikh Muḥim so as to keep the blows from him. And thus the "satisfaction" was complete!

203. (Y) Nādir al-Qasīm, nicknamed Abū-Ṭubīyyā, was an old man in his eightieth year, well known for his piety, the gentleness of his disposition, and his avoidance of evil and its causes. He worked as a miller in the mill of the village (in Wādī Jazīrah). Shaikh Yūnis al-Badawī al-Khāzin sent him some wheat with his servant to be ground, and it happened that the servant arrived at the moment when another man was starting his milling, so that the Shaikh's messenger was obliged to wait and was delayed in his return. When his master found him he asked about the cause of his lateness, and the servant told him. The Khāzin Shaikh was angry that a worthless individual like Abū Ṭubīyyā should not leave his milling of wheat immediately to grind his (Shaikh Yūnis's) wheat for him. He went to that old man, seized him by the beard, stripped him of all his clothes

being this deed. And by the same token, Shaikh Manṣūr  
Hannā Dandash was said to have killed the daughter of  
Ighnāṭiyūs 'Aql<sup>204</sup> for he shot her with a rifle in one

---

and made him ride the beast of burden of the mill. He brought him to the church of the village, and on the way rained blows on him with his stick. Then he cut a sharp thorn and placed it between his thighs... When the people witnessed this sad spectacle they were troubled and tears came to their eyes. History says: No one dared to protest against Shaikh Yūnis, and as for his relatives, they burst into laughter and guffaws! Two days later the unfortunate Abū Tūbiyya died.

204. (Y) My friend Sha'yā al-'Aqīqī has told me that this girl was Yūsufiyyah Ghantūs 'Aql Buṭaish, from a very poor family known as "Bū Qurūn", and God had favored her with a touch of beauty. As for her story with Shaikh Manṣūr al-Khāzin, its essence is this: Shaikh Manṣūr was living in Kafar Dabyān and was known for his wrong doing and tyranny. His madness led him to deflower the virginity of the unfortunate Yūsufiyyah whom we have already mentioned. She became pregnant by him and gave birth to a boy. It was a grave matter for the Khāzin family and they decided to kill the mother and child together, and that "what Shaikh Manṣūr had planted, he would uproot with his hand." So he went one day to Yūsufiyyah and took her with her child on a walk, and when he had brought her to a place called "Wādī al-Shawmarah" he took her into a cave and satisfied his desire for her for the last time. Then he slaughtered her and slaughtered the fruit of his sin and returned home heedlessly. In the evening Yūsufiyyah's family wondered what had delayed their daughter. They knew that

Page 77

of the caves for reasons which we do not know; God knows best, and let the reader understand. There are many other such occurrences whose introduction item by item we have omitted for fear of making the story too long.

The people took to holding meetings to find a way to preserve themselves from these oppressions, without any opposition from the authorities. First there was a meeting in the village of 'Ajaltūn<sup>205</sup> held by a number of young men,

---

she had gone out with Shaikh Mansūr, and they went to ask him about her. He cursed them and struck them and then said to them: "Go look for her in the cave of Wādī al-Shawmarah." They went to that place and found the slaughtered girl and her child covered with blood... History has said: The news spread the length and breadth of the country, and reached the Qā'im-maqām, Amīr Haidar Abū al-Lama'. He was weak-willed and faint-hearted and an ally of the Khāzin family. He sent an officer with several soldiers to investigate, and when the said officer arrived in Kafar Dabyān he was met by the relatives of Shaikh Mansūr who convinced him that the incident was of no great importance and that cutting some mulberry trees from the grounds of the killer would suffice for his punishment! So the officer went to a place called "the slope" (al-Muzahliq) which the said Shaikh owned and cut a few mulberry plants there ... and God used to love those who did good!

205. The name in Arabic is correctly written عَجَلْتُون, transliterated 'Jaltūn. The spelling "'Ajaltūn", however, is more comprehensible to the English-speaking reader.

Page 77

who made a compact among themselves that none would betray the other, and that if one of the Shaikhs should aggress against any of them, all of them would come to his aid to the point of blood. They set up as their first (chief) Wakīl Ṣāliḥ Jirjis Ṣfair, and as second Wakīl Dāwūd Maḥbūb al-Qāmū'. Whoever divulged this secret or delayed in coming to the others' assistance, all would be against him. <sup>206</sup> That remained secret for a time without

---

206. (Y) The late Philip and Farīd al-Khāzin have recalled this meeting as follows: "In the month of November, 1858, the disturbances (they meant, the revolution) of Kisrawān began, and there was a succession of meetings and plots in the villages against the Khāzin family, by order of the Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad to his delegate who ignited the fire (of rebellion), Ilyās al-Munayyir. The people chose their representatives to direct their affairs; and these are their names at the first meeting they held:

"Ṣāliḥ Jirjis Ṣfair, Yūsuf al-Zughbī, Yūsuf al-Biskintāwī, Makhlūf Barīdī, Sa'd Ghuṣn, (more correctly, Ṭannūs Sa'd Ghuṣn), Yūsuf Ṭannūs Tābit, from the people of 'Ajaltūn.

"Ḥasan Ṣfair and Buṭrus Kan'ān Kassāb from al-Qlāi'āt.

"Bākhūs Abū Ghālib and Yūsuf Anṭūn Naṣr from 'Ashqūt.

"Ilyās al-Munayyir, Anṭūn Bishārah Qaṭṭān, Ilyās Khaḍrā, Ḥabīb al-Jāmātī, and Yūsuf Ḥabālīn from Zuq Makāyil.

"Ḥābil al-Khurī, Ḥabīb Yazbak, Ilyās Ḥabaq, Dāhir al-Khurī from Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān.

"Saj'an al-'Uḍaimī and Bishārah Ghānim from Jūniyah.

"Hannā Dīb and Yūsuf Ighnāṭiyūs from Dar'un.

Page 78

anyone knowing of it. And similarly there was a meeting at Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān also, and they formed a compact among themselves. At first they were about 13 persons, no more. They installed a Wākīl Hābīl al-Khūrī al-'Aqīqī. All this remained secret without information passing between the two parties for about 8 months. After that, the Shaikhs began to carry on detailed conversations, and a way of action appeared to them, though without knowing what was the basis of these meetings (of Kafar Dabyān and 'Ajaltūn). As for the people of al-Mazra'ah, when they learned of the meeting of the people of 'Ajaltūn they sent messengers to them secretly. They began exchanging information until it ensued that they divulged to each other all their concealed thoughts, which were devoted solely to protection. As for the Khāzin family, because of their hatred toward Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad, they took to inciting the people, saying, "Hold a meeting and

Page 79

---

"Ṣalībī al-Qā'ī and Mārūn al-Qīm from Suhailah and its neighbouring farmlands.

"Then these agents began to incite the villagers to join under the banner of the uprising to get rid of the rule of the Shaikhs and they chose Ṭānyūs Shāhīn as its leader."

Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. I, p.390.



appoint a Shaikh Shabāb (chief), and present petitions rejecting Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad." And a second group said to them, "Do those things (appoint a leader and write petitions) but reject Amīr Bashīr 'Assāf, and ask for Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad, because he is a very good man." Each group desired its own success and the defeat of the other; and these Shaikhs did not know that the affair would end on their own heads, as it has been said - he who desires evil to his brother, it will return on his own head - for after a few days this business became known, first in the village of 'Ajaltūn, because (the villagers) made their meeting known in a way different from what was thought by the Shaikhs, that the purpose of the meeting was to oppose Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad or (Amīr Bashīr) 'Assāf; actually it was against the Shaikhs (themselves). They then asked the chiefs of the country to come to the village of 'Ajaltūn for a reconciliation between them and the people, and this meeting was attended by some of the well-regarded priests and gentlemen such as Ibn al-Biṭār and from the 'Assāf family and others. The two groups consulted together in 'Ajaltūn; that was in September, 1858. The people began to justify themselves, saying that they wished the Shaikhs to be as they had been at first, and that they had no harmful thought or (thought of) changing (anything). As

Shabāb (chief) over them, and with him representatives and assistants. Similarly in Jūniyah there was a great commotion and Shaikh Yūsuf Waradān was beaten, on October 2, 1858, and it was a painful beating. This sort of

Page 81

---

origin of the Munayyir family is from Hāmāh, from the "Hilāl" family, and their forebear was nicknamed "al-Munayyir" ("the framemaker") because he manufactured frames for the weaving of silk in al-Zūq. It is related about Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama' that in 1860 he borrowed 30,000 piastres from Ilyās al-Munayyir and wrote for it four receipts (to be repaid) over a period of two months. Three months passed without his paying it, and he died in debt. The creditor was obliged to appeal to his heirs, but he was unable to obtain his due. When Ilyās died, his heirs renewed the appeal to the heirs of the debtor, by means of the then famous lawyer, the late Ighnāṭiyūs Ziyādah, who returned their due to them after tens of years.

(K) "علم انفارزوق مكيل"

208. (Y) The writer of Al-Muqāta'at al-Kisrawāniyyah says - p. 335 - that this incident took place on Dec. 9 of the year mentioned, he being one of the eye-witnesses.

for the Shaikhs, some of them made sweeping threats against the people, that they would expel them from the country and kill some of them, while others (of the Shaikhs) treated the people well, and their duty as guardians kept them from any bad action. ~~But~~ <sup>With</sup> words such as these, the chieftains returned without benefit. During this time there were meetings in al-Mazra'ah, and they made the aforementioned Hābīl the "Shaikh Shabāb" (chief), and four men with him, and they took to chanting and singing and firing of rifles after they had endured many threats before that. Then similarly their brothers the people of Zūq Mikā'il came forth and assaulted Shaikh 'Abbās al-Khāzin, who fled from them and hid in the monastery of al-Bishārah al-Khāzin. The people of al-Zūq (Zūq Mikā'il) were aroused and installed Na'mān al-Munayyir as Shaikh

Page 80

---

207. (Y) In the possession of the publisher of these "Memoirs" is a statement of the names of the inhabitants of al-Zūq at that time, entitled: "The sign of the people of Zūq Mikā'il." It was copied by the priest Arsāniyūs al-Fākhūrī on April 12, 1861, from the "ledger of daily accounts" on the basis of which the taxes were imposed on the inhabitants of the village. I read those names one by one and found no individual called Na'mān.

Most probably, the late Antūn al-'Aqīqī, the historian of this tract, erred in writing the name, and in the truth it is Ilyās Niqūlā al-Munayyir, not Na'mān. This Ilyās was born in the year 1810 and died in June 1883. The

- Page 81 action took place in all the villages, such as 'Ashqūt, Raifūn, Faitrūn, Mairūbā, and all the villages. In each village they chose a Shaikh Shabāb. In Jūniyah he was Saj'ān al-'Uḍaimī, in 'Ashqūt it was Bākhūs Abū Ghālib, in Mairūbā, Nāṣīf al-Khūrī, and in al-Qlai'āt, Ḥassān Ṣfair. As for Ghūstā and 'Arāmūn, they remained quiet; and as for the Khāzin Shaikhs, they began to hold meetings among themselves and formed a number of organisations, but they did not agree in their opinions. 209
- Page 81 They wrote to all the Amīrs and Shaikhs, all of whom answered but took no action. Then they wrote to the Druse Shaikhs<sup>210</sup> such as the Janblāṭ and Talhūq families and others<sup>211</sup> but got no result from them. (Meanwhile)
- Page 82

- 
209. (Y) Not so; in fact they agreed to crush the popular spirit, and they registered the basis of their agreement in a compact which we have published under Numeral I in the Appendix to these Memoirs; let the reader turn to it. (Chapter V.)
210. مشايخ المدرسة :  
literally, "the Shaikhs of the School". This is a distortion of مشايخ المدرزة a phrase used by Christian writers meaning simply "The Druse Shaikhs." (This is the explanation of Shaikh 'Ārif Abū Nakad in a letter to me.)
211. (Y) This is the most faithful evidence to support our statement that the Maronite and Druse feudal chiefs were mutually agreed upon the oppression of the Maronite peasant and Druse peasant together... The reader will soon see how the struggle between the classes led to sectarian warfare whose preparation was presided over by the feudal chiefs and their masters in the foreign

there were agreements made in the land, compacts written,

---

consulates and the Ottoman Government. One of the most starting things to recall is that the first uprising, which was encouraged by the imperialists and feudalists in the year 1845, assumed the form of class struggle in a very clear and frank way. Monsieur Poujade, who in that day was Consul of France in Beirut, related that he received a letter from the Christians of Zahlah in which they complained of the treachery of the Turks to them; they then say, "K!". And among the benefits which we received on that day was confirmation that the Druses did not come to fight us except when compelled by the feudal landholders, who forced them to do this by blows of the stick. There is no denying that Lebanon will not enjoy tranquillity as long as her chieftains have their privileges and exemptions which the Amīr of the Mountain permitted them to have in return for their services, and which he may revoke whenever he wishes..."

Then the Christians say in their letter to Monsieur Poujade:

"The (Turkish) Government banished Sa'id Bey Janblāt, Amīr Muḥammad Arslān, Hamūd and Nāṣif Abū Nakad, Khaṭṭar 'Imād and Yūsuf 'Abd al-Mālik, but none of them has been punished, and they were allowed to return to Lebanon to stir up the Druses against us.

"Establishing peace would be possible between the Druse and Christian peasants, but that is impossible with their chieftains who wish to keep their privileges and authority over our brothers. Over this we are not pleased..." etc. - Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. I, p. 183.

We have said: What the Christians

and oaths that the stroke would be a single one and that all were brothers. Some of them they compelled to carry arms, and he who had no weapon they obliged to buy one. Then these met with Tānyūs Shāhīn<sup>212</sup> in Raifun Hābil al-'Aqīqī from al-Mazra'ah with several men; Nāsīf<sup>213</sup> al-Khūrī from Mairūbā with several men; Ṣāliḥ Jirjis from 'Ajaltūn with several men; the people of al-Qlai'āt; and Bākhūs Abū Ghālib from 'Ashqūt. They invited Tānyūs to join them in their rank and to have them appoint him as general Wakīl. After great arguments and disagreements, he accepted, and they appointed him Wakīl for the village of Raifūn, and later over all the villages of Kisrawān. He did more than what was expected of him

---

wrote about the Druse overlords, The Druses could write about the Christian overlords letter for letter...

- (K) See above, Yazbak p. 10, footnote, for French Text.
- 212.(Y) From the well-known family of Sa'adah in Kisrawān, born in Raifūn in the year 1815 and died on February 3, 1895.
- 213.(Y) He was of the well-known family of Sfair. He held the leadership of the popular movement at its beginning, the Wakīls of the villages - the "Shaikh Shababs" - having appointed him as a general Wakīl over all of them.

and began to address the Khāzin family in official speeches, and to strengthen the country. He seemed to them to be their redeemer, and to bring forth whatever they needed, of whatever sort it might be. He gave them rest from the shaikhs and took their wants into consideration; and he began to tour from place to place, everyone regarding him with the highest consideration. In every village that he entered, everyone would prepare him an excellent reception of joy and happiness and continuous shooting of rifles, as if it were the visit of a ruler to his people. At that time the shaikhs met in an assembly, which convened in Ghūstā and addressed the Wakīls of the villages concerning their (~~the~~ Wākīl's) requests. The Wakīls, replied to them, we desire nothing from you except the lifting of your impositions and the rest of your demands from us. We also wish that there should be only three Ma'mūrs (officials), one for each district ('uhdah) - for previously there were two Ma'mūrs for each - and that the rest of the shaikhs should be like the people.<sup>214</sup> Then, after there was a meeting and discussion back and forth, the shaikhs accepted that; but the people no longer accepted it and instead asked that

---

214. "ان يكونوا باقي المشايخ نظير الاهالي"  
- Meaning, presumably, "That the shaikhs be like the rest of the people" - i.e. without privileges.

there be one Ma'mūr from them over Kisrawān, and under him an assistant whom the people would elect; and this the shaikhs did not accept.<sup>215</sup> They wanted to petition the Government, and since Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad, the Qā'im Maqām, was suspended from office because they had been against him. They laid their petition to the government before the Wālī of Beirut. They sent representatives on their behalf, one of whom was Qa'dān Bey, and with him three of his cousins. And when the people learned that they were petitioning the government and intending to ruin Kisrawān, they held a meeting and reached a decision to expel the entire Khāzin family from Kisrawān, both women and men. They began to express themselves, saying that they would seize the property of the Khāzin family, and foremost among them was Tānyūs Shāhīn, whom they called Bey.<sup>216</sup> He began to

---

215. (Y) On the 13th of January, 1859, a meeting of the populace was held in the village of Dlibtā to discuss these requests and to make a final decision on them, and on the fourth day (January 17) the members of the meeting wrote to the Patriarch informing him of them. We have published their letter and their requests under Numerals 2 and 3 in the Appendix to these Memoirs, and let the reader turn to them.

216. This title is said to have been officially conferred upon him in June 1859, by Khūrshīd Pāshā. (Poujoulat, *op.cit.*, p.68) But his assumption of the title was cited in a memorial by the Khāzins listing their accusation against Tānyūs, with the implication that he was not entitled to it. (Syria Correspondence, I, p. 520.)



deceive the shaikhs in order to expel them from Kisrawān. Sometimes he would claim that they wanted him killed, and sometimes he would say that they had surrounded him in his house and fired bullets at him; and sometimes he would support his words with the words of the Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad who was then in office, although his Beatitude was very much opposed to this action, because all were his flock. Tānyūs' purpose in this was to instill enmity between the shaikhs and the people, and by this means he was arousing the populace against the shaikhs. <sup>217</sup> The hatred grew and the evil increased, until the shaikhs formed an assembly in Ghūstā and agreed to petition the government in Beirut. And at that time Saj'ān al-'Uḍaimī, the Shaikh Shabāb of Jūniyah, came up to them and with him a crowd from Sāḥil 'Almā, Ghādīr, and Dar'ūn, and they expelled the shaikhs from

---

217. An incident cited verbally by Yazbak to the translator is said to have contributed to the general outbreak of physical violence. A woman of the Abū Shabakah family, the grandmother of the currently known Lebanese poet Ilyās Abū Shabakah, was believed to be having an illicit affair with the Father Superior of the Zūq Mikāyil monastery, Yūsuf Rājī al-Khāzin. The incensed people of the town attacked and beat the priest; his Khāzin relatives sought to retaliate, and open hostilities began.

Seat, and a crowd came down to them from the villages and expelled them from there, so they headed for Hālāt and the Jubail country. Their departure from Kisrawān had been made in great fear of death and undeserved bloodshed, for unknown people had come and killed the wife of Shaikh Diyāb and her daughter in 'Ajaltūn<sup>220</sup> and took what they found of furniture and jewelry. At that time all the shaikhs left Kisrawān, some going to Bait Shabāb, some to Biskintā, some to Beirut, and some to the Jubail country and other places, and protested to the government against this incident and (protested) that the people of Kisrawān had stolen their money and property without right.<sup>221</sup> The government's order was issued for soldiers to go up to Kisrawān. They were led by the soldier Muḥammad Āghā al-Saq'ān, and with him were about 150 men,<sup>222</sup> of whom some were Albanians and some irregular forces.<sup>223</sup>

---

220. See above, Footnote No. 184.

221. For a summary of the Khāzins' grievances, see Syria Correspondence, I, p. 520.

222. Moore in a dispatch reported that Khūrshīd had sent "60 horsemen" to Kisrawān and quartered them on the ring-leaders of the peasant movement, and had issued a proclamation warning against further outrages. (British Consular Files, Moore to Bulwer, No. 5, Feb. 7, 1859.) Pujoulat puts the number of troops at 50, and states that Khūrshīd secretly told the peasants not to recognise the Khāzins' authority. (op.cit., p. 66.)

223. "Bāsh buzūq" (commonly known as "bāshi buzūqs").

Ghūstā, because they thought that the people of Ghūstā would help them. But when the people of Ghūstā saw that the land was agitated against the shaikhs, they stood aside.<sup>218</sup> All the shaikhs proceeded to 'Arāmūn and from there they dispersed to various places, some of them going to the Armenian Catholic Monastery of Our Lady of Bzummār, by way of al-Khalfā. Tānyūs knew about them and went to Bzummār with a great crowd from all the villages with the intention of attacking the monastery and demanding the shaikhs, but since His Beatitude the Armenian Patriarch Gregorius VIII was present in the monastery, and with him two bishops and some priests, out of consideration for His Beatitude<sup>219</sup> they desisted from this action for a time, and during the night the shaikhs went secretly from the monastery through Wādī al-Masailakh in great fear toward the district of Bait Shabāb. Then a number of the shaikhs were found at the monastery of Bkirkī, the Patriarchal

- 
218. Yazbak's explanation for this, which he expressed to the translator, is that Ghūstā being the home of Qa'dān Bey al-Khāzin, the Muqāṭa'ji of the area, he was inclined to treat the townsmen as his special wards, sparing them the abuses he practiced elsewhere.
219. Likewise at Ḥarīṣah a large group of Khāzin women and children were protected by Padre Raphaëlo, Father Superior of the monastery there, and by Mgr. Valerga, the Papal Legate, who provided the fugitives with a safe escort to Beirut. (Poujoulat, op.cit., pp. 62-3).

They made their headquarters in Jūniyah and al-Zūq, and afterwards a body of men went up to 'Ajaltūn and then a body to Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān. They stayed for a period of a month and a half in al-Zūq, and quartered themselves on the people of the land. The people of al-Zūq provided for those that were with them and charged (the expense) to the whole people of the land, and likewise the people of 'Ajaltūn. At this time the shaikhs offered bribery to Muḥammad Āghā al-Saq'ān so that he should increase the punishment of the people and report to the Wālī of Beirut the evildoing of the people, but this bribery went without benefit because this action (i.e. the evildoing) was in accord with the inclinations of the government. As for the people, they went immediately to Beirut, led by Tānyūs Shāhīn and the Wakīls of the country, who were Ṣāliḥ Jirjis from 'Ajaltūn, Hābīl 'Aqīqī from al-Mazra'ah, Ilyās Ḥabālīn from Zūq Mikāyil, and Ḥassān Ṣfair from al-Qlai'āt, and the rest of the villages, with a Wakīl from each village. The case was raised in Beirut, and Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad defended the people of the country because the shaikhs were against him, and the foreign consuls sometimes defended them (the people) and sometimes not. <sup>224</sup> As for

---

224. i.e., some consuls (particularly the French and Austrian) defended them, and others (particularly the English) took the part of the shaikhs.

the State, it left matters alone as was its propensity, and after numerous Divāns and conferences the troops were removed from the country and the people began to strip the possessions of the shaikhs by cutting the forests and breaking the doors of the shaikhs' mansions, and taking their produce of silk and wheat and oil and vines, and everything they could take. The mulberry trees of those shaikhs who had removed the raw silk with their own hands, they divided among the people. If they found one of the collaborators of the shaikhs taking anything to his master, they would watch him and take from him all that he had with him and take everything from him and insult him. Then in the days of the harvest of the year '59 the people made records of their money that was in the possession of the shaikhs, and they took some of what belonged to them - and far be it from us to know whether it was true or false. Finally Tānyūs Shāhīn collected some of the shaikhs' properties on the coast and in the mountains, whether silk or wheat, and put them in his house, and he took this by the authority of the populace. He opened the provisions his house to people going and coming, distributed munitions, behaving as owners of great houses do, so that his name was spread through every district. Every village that did not heed his words would

have crowds sent to it from the other villages to make it obey. He gave orders for the procuring of rights and punishment of the wrong-doers however he willed, without opposition, and he spoke with the authority of the "Republican Government". He came to be regarded as great, and his orders penetrated to everyone. Then after the shaikhs had lost hope from the government and had grown tired of expenses and paying money, no one had given them any help because this was the customary practice of the government, and the common people were against them, and against the Amīrs also, as they were against the Khāzin family, because this poison was growing in all places and fear overwhelmed everyone. There was no longer refuge for anyone, whether of the people or the landowners.

Page 89 Everyone was afraid for himself, and no longer was anyone safe with anyone else, nor could anyone trust his own brother. Evil abounded, hypocrisy increased, and supplies became short. Those with personal aims demanded what they wanted, and the people would watch each other closely so that if they saw anyone taking anything to the shaikhs, whether he were one of their colleagues or not, they would take it from him forcibly. By this process poverty came over everyone, both among the shaikhs because of the seizure of their properties and the increase of their expenses, and among the people, from their lack of employ-

ment to give them the means of subsistence, and from their resorting to evil practices. Great difficulties arose, and when evils reached this sad state, the shaikhs resolved to put an end to this course, and they resolved to set the people against one another and to return to their lands. But this went in vain, for they desired to take Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān and make it their headquarters. They promised its people that they would treat them as they (the people) wished, by refraining from pressing claims against them and so on, and they promised to give them money as well. They wrote conditions which they promised to fulfill which they sent by means of Qa'dān Bey al-Khāzin, representing his cousins, and made an agreement with some men from the families of al-'Aqīqī and Abū Khalīl of Mairūbā, and they lived in al-Mazra'ah without fear. When Ṭānyūs Shāhīn learned of this agreement, he and the other village representatives immediately collected a great crowd from the country and sent two groups, one to al-Mazra'ah and one to Mairūbā to discipline the two villages. In Mairūbā they barred by force of arms the entrance of the crowd into their village, and intended evil. As for al-Mazra'ah, the crowd entered with the greatest ease, for the inhabitants had no knowledge of the coming of the

crowd. But afterward they drove the crowd from the village. Since the people of al-Mazra'ah were divided among themselves, they were unable to decide what their opinion was; and if the reformers <sup>225</sup> had not intervened, the evil would have increased all the more. But when the reformers came in, they righted what was amiss among them (the people of Mazra'ah) and brought before Ṭānyūs Shāhīn in Raifūn those who had taken part in this action (i.e., dealing with the Khāzins), and Ṭānyūs threatened them severely. Afterward he released them and peace came among all. The purpose of the shaikhs in this undertaking was not realised, and their hopes were disappointed.

---

225. i.e. Ṭānyūs' faction.



CHAPTER III.

1860

### CHAPTER III

#### Commentary by the Translator

Enough has been written about the massacres of 1860 to make further comment on them largely redundant. They were the culmination of twenty years of social and political unrest in Lebanon. They brought to the fore more than ever before the inadequacy of Turkish rule and the interest of Europe in the affairs of the Levant. Details of the massacres were reported in full detail in a mass of diplomatic dispatches, books, and pamphlets -- often inaccurate, prejudiced, presumptuously passing judgment, but sufficiently voluminous to cause one reasonably familiar with them to read 'Aqīqī's account with no great sense of discovery.

In some respects 1860 was a repetition of 1845. The troubles of both years seem in part to have been precipitated by a certain arrogance on the part of the Maronite clergy and general lack of public security in the country; on both occasions the Turkish authority displayed a mixture of active intrigue and cynical indifference.

But the fifteen years that had passed since 1845 brought added cause for bloodshed. There was now a memory of past antagonism: Druse and Maronite in 1860 were more accustomed to regard each other as enemies. The system of government of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyāhs did not provide order in 1845 because it had not been satisfactorily instituted.

In 1860 it had been proved a failure. Perhaps it need not have been so; but without a minimum of support from Turkey and the Powers and without the requisite cooperation among them, no form of government could be effective.

Furthermore, whereas in the early 1840's Lebanon was experiencing the immediate effects of the overturn of Ibrāhīm Pāshā and Amīr Bashīr II, in 1860 the causes of social unrest were more deep-seated. They were rooted in the decline of such traditional institutions as feudal landed authority and inter-family ties that cut across sectarian lines, and in the disintegration of previously close-knit interests of clergy and aristocracy. Churchill, perceptive if not always reliable, ascribes the abstention of Amīr Bashīr Ahmad and his Lama'ī relatives from participation in the civil war to their belief that "the triumph of the Druses was that of feudalism... The deadly enemies of the Druses were not the Maronite aristocracy, but the Maronite clergy. The former never embarked heartily in any move against them... None of the Maronite sheikhs from the north stirred at all." These feudal lords saw what had happened to the Khāzin family; they sensed a community of interest with those Druse shaikhs of the Mixed Districts who faced troubles of their own with their Christian tenantry. Only the Maronite Shihāb Amīrs, dispossessed of all prestige but their name, lent their services to the Maronite clergy.<sup>227</sup>

---

227. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 178-9.

For in the Mixed Districts on the eve of hostilities the Christians showed some signs of losing patience with the order of affairs, with stimulation from the churchmen in Kāsrawān. They found their Druse overlords oppressive and the authority of their own wakīls reduced to impotence. Churchill considered Sa'īd Bey Janblāṭ "among the most wayward, overbearing, and unscrupulous of these feudal marauders," with his confiscation of property and forging of Christian testimonials to his just rule. The continued support by the British Government of Shaikh Sa'īd, in Churchill's view, a bad moral effect on Druses and Christians alike.<sup>228</sup>

If the Maronite shaikhs of the north were apathetic, the same cannot be said of the peasantry. Letters Nos. 42-46<sup>of Chapter V</sup> give some indication of the zeal of Ṭānyūs Shahin's followers in organising a force to send against the Druses. Before the actual outbreak of hostilities, a peasant force under Ṭānyūs marched to Nahr al-Kalb (Dog River) and encamped there, three hours' march from Beirut. This had the effect of making the Maronites to be the aggressors: although the river was not the dividing line between the two Qā'im Maqamiyyāhs, it was the border of the Matn district, the only partially Druse area of the Christian province. Ṭānyūs crossed into the Matn, though not across the borderline of the Druse Qā'im Maqamiyyāh at the Damascus Road. He refused Khūrshīd's order

---

228. Ibid., pp. 98-101, 158. See also Souvenirs de Syrie, p. 11.

to withdraw; the Druses also invaded the Matn, and on May 29 Bait Mirī and 40 other villages were burned. After this first reversal, Ṭānyūs retired to Kisrawān and took no further part in the fighting.<sup>229</sup>

The class tensions of the Christians which alienated the feudal lords from the peasants and clergy prevented them from uniting in a well-organised effort, whereas the Druses, whose cause was "the cause of feudalism," presented a comparatively solid front. It may be true that "the jealousy between the Yazbakites and the Janblāṭites, complicated by the ambitions of the Nakadites, the Malikites, and so on, had much to do with the chiefs of those factions being unable to restrain their followers when these had smelled the blood of their traditional enemies."<sup>230</sup> But this

---

229. Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 27-36. Lord Dufferin later wrote, somewhat inaccurately, "Flushed with success, and taking advantage of the popular excitement which various causes had combined to produce, Tannus (sic) Shahin and his supporters seem to have been active in promoting the hostilities which were designed against the Druses, and it was this individual who led the first armed band that passed the Christian frontier into the Mixed Districts."

(Syria Correspondence, II, p. 34. Dufferin to Bulwer, March 29, 1861.)

230. Abkarius, op. cit., footnote by Scheltema, p. 108.

was a very different sort of division than that which split the Maronites; it did not separate the follower from his leader. The social changes which we have referred to appear to have affected primarily the Christians; relations among the Druses continued to follow the old patterns of family rather than class rivalry. If this is true, then we infer that it was in the Mixed Districts that these changes led to sectarian friction, as a by-product of tension in the feudal relationship of landlord and tenant.

It may seem paradoxical that a weakening of the feudal order should be accompanied by increased sectarian consciousness and assertion by the Maronite Church of its political aims. Nervous energy, however, is not a sign of latent strength: the intrigues of Maronite clergymen, insofar as they existed, may have been more symptomatic of concern for the Church's continued prestige than of new confidence. On the other hand, the new antagonism of the peasant toward his chief gave the Church an opportunity to champion the cause of the former. The avowed intention of France, furthermore, to safeguard Christian political interests could only encourage the Church to do likewise.

By thus creating an issue where there had been none before, France perhaps did her protégés no good. "Et pourtant," asked Vogüé, "quel a été le fruit de cette alliance, la récompense de cette fidélité? La protection

française a été la cause indirecte de plus grands malheurs. N'osant attaquer la France en face, on l'a attaquée et humiliée dans ses alliés."<sup>231</sup>

The sectarian issue once having been raised, of course, most Frenchmen could hardly be expected to view their role in this light. The Christians of Mt. Lebanon were an enclave surrounded by infidels. France was their hope; France owed them protection. It was this sense of obligation, misplaced or not, that constituted French "sentimental attachment" to the Christians of Lebanon. This attitude was expressed by one: "On peut donc le dire, le jour où le drapeau tricolore cessera de flotter dans la montagne biblique, la croix sera déracinée de cette terre où elle demeure debout depuis dix-huit siècles, arrosée du sang des martyrs, en dépit de toutes les invasions et de toutes les conquêtes."<sup>232</sup>

In any event, it is clear that the material means for civil war were well supplied from outside the country. According to Lord Dufferin, "customs-house returns can prove that upwards of 120,000 stand of arms and 20,000 pistols were imported into the Lebanon between January 1857 and the spring of 1860, while the sinister influence exercised by Bishop Tobia and his associates was so universally recognized

---

231. Vogüé, op. cit., p. 13

232. François Lenormant, Histoire des Massacres en Syrie en 1860, p. 131.

that his withdrawal from Beirut was insisted upon by the French Consul as a necessary preliminary to all chance of peace."<sup>233</sup> With such weapons on hand, it is not surprising that on the eve of the massacres the British Consul should report, "Assassinations and reprisals are of almost daily occurrence between the Christians and Druses."<sup>234</sup>

What was the responsibility of the Porte? It is easy enough to say that Lebanon being a part of her empire, it was her duty to keep order; not only did she fail in this, but she lent active assistance to the Druses. Those whose analysis stops with these facts may conclude simply that the massacres were "une vaste conspiration ourdie par les soins des autorités ottomanes." The Druses were only a Turkish instrument for destruction of the Christians; later the Druses would be punished in their turn, and both sides would thus be annihilated.<sup>235</sup>

This oversimplified view need not be dismissed altogether. We can surmise that Turkey had her motives for bitterness not only toward the Christians of Lebanon but toward French protection of them. The Ottomans were aware that Anglo-French participation in the Crimean War was not disinterested, and that it carried with it no respect for

---

233. Syria Correspondence, I, 423, Dufferin  
British Foreign Secretary Lord John Russell,  
Dec. 19, 1860.

234. British Consular Files. Moore to Bulwer,  
No. 18, May 18, 1860.

235. Vogüé, op. cit., pp. 8-9.



Turkey; it implied nothing, in fact, but Turkey's own weakness. They were aware of Western sympathy for the Christians of the Ottoman Empire and of the devotion of the Greek Orthodox subjects to Russia. The Porte could secure Western help against Russia, but in their internal problems all they received from France and England was troublesome interference.<sup>236</sup>

Rif'at Pāshā, onetime Ottoman Foreign Minister, referred to the Qā'im Maqamiyyāh arrangement as "la guerre civile organisée."<sup>237</sup> Under the circumstances this may be true. The plan was not Turkey's. She knew of the problems it involved -- mixed populations fearful for their security and agitated by their leaders; local chieftains dependent for advice and support not on the Turkish Pāshā in Beirut but on French, British, or Russian Consuls; and disagreement among these diplomats on how the affairs of the country should be directed. When Churchill asserts that the 1860 troubles would have been avoided had the British Ambassador in Constantinople intervened during the last three years to secure the removal of certain Turkish officials,<sup>238</sup> one is tempted to ask whether the very intervention that had imposed the partition system of government in 1842 and had affected its workings for the next 18 years had not been ill-advised.

---

236. Cf. Poujade, op. cit., pp. 226-30.

237. Ibid., p. 225.

238. The Druses and the Maronites, p. 257.

For Turkey to supervise the Qā'im Maqamiyyāhs effectively, in the face of their shortcomings and unpopularity, required military force which she did not have.<sup>239</sup> It also required that the Mushīr of Sidon have a reasonable freedom from the interference both of the Consuls and of his own Turkish colleague in Damascus.<sup>240</sup> From 1861 to 1914 Lebanon was governed directly by a Turkish official -- admittedly with several restrictions, but under an arrangement acceptable to the Porte -- without any repetition of the earlier disorders. Without drawing hasty conclusions, one may ask if a freer hand for Turkey from 1842 to 1860 would not have been to the benefit of Mt. Lebanon.

x x x x x x x x x x

---

239. The French Ambassador in Constantinople wrote to his government, "Le difficulté n'était pas dans les dispositions de la Porte, mais dans ses embarras. On ne pouvait, avec sécurité, envoyer en Syrie des troupes nouvelles sans les payer; c'eût été joindre aux pillards des hommes mécontents et prêts a désobéir.

"Aussitôt qu'on a pu se procurer de l'argent pour solder l'arrière de mille hommes, on les a expédiés..." (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Documents Diplomatiques, 1860, p. 201. Marquis de Lavalette to Thouvenel, July 18, 1860.)

240. Cf. Abkarius, op. cit., introduction by Scheltema, p. 25. Khūrshīd Pāshā in his own defense complained of the enmity of Aḥmad Pāshā, the Wālī of Syria and Commander in Chief of the army of Arabistan.

The massacres of Christians in Damascus from July 9 to July 13, 1860, touched off by events in Mt. Lebanon, had causes of its own and merits some separate consideration.

Unlike the Lebanon, Damascus since the Ottoman conquest had been included in a province directly administered by a Turkish Pāshā, with the exception of the few years of Ibrāhīm Pāshā's conquest. Here the Christians were a small minority in an ancient and sacred Muslim city,<sup>241</sup> traditionally without political or social privilege. To some Europeans they seemed so inobtrusive as to make the attack on them appear to be completely unprovoked;<sup>242</sup> within the last few decades, however, changes had taken place. Sectarian equality had been enforced by the Egyptians and confirmed in 1856 by the reforms of the Hatti Humayun, which lifted the poll tax from the Christians

---

241. The author of Souvenirs de Syrie numbers the Christians of Damascus in 1860 at 20,000 and its Muslims at 100,000 to 120,000. (p. 165.) Poujoulat's figures are higher: 25,000 to 30,000 Christians and 140,000 Muslims. (Quoted in Lenormant, op. cit., p. 94.)

242. Poujoulat wrote: "On ne saurait rien imaginer dans le monde de plus pacifique, de plus humble, de plus soumis que les 25,000 ou 30,000 chrétiens de Damas, placés en face de 140,000 musulmans. Les chrétiens de cette ville n'ont aucune espèce d'armes dans leurs maisons, ils n'en ont jamais eu, et c'est à cause de cela que les cannibales et les voleurs sont tombés sur eux." (Quoted in Lenormant, op. cit., p. 94.)

The writer of Souvenirs de Syrie contrasts their peaceable behaviour with that of the Maronites of Lebanon. (p.166.)

and placed military conscription on a basis of equality. The Christians took advantage of their new liberties. Some dressed in green -- a colour traditionally reserved for descendants of the Prophet -- and others opened wine-shops in public places; Muslim resentment was aroused.<sup>243</sup>

The Christians were the commercial class of Damascus, large-scale land ownership being closed to the wealthy among them. Over the government financial service they held a virtual monopoly. Those who prospered in such service excited suspicion of dishonesty in the minds of Muslims.<sup>244</sup>

The Christians did not furthermore enjoy an unblemished reputation for good will among themselves. In 1857 a bitter quarrel broke out within the Greek Catholic Church over the order from Rome to adopt the Gregorian calendar. The Sharqi party -- those who refused to change -- sought support from the Greek Orthodox churchmen, while the Gharbi's advocated acceptance of Rome's decision. The quarrel extended into the highest echelons of the clergy; the patriarch had to flee for his life, and the Turkish authorities were compelled to restore order.<sup>245</sup>

---

243. Abkarius, op. cit., pp. 126-7.

244. Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 166-8.

245. Ibid., p. 162. In 1843 Pujade had found the Greek Catholics and the Orthodox of Damascus to be on unfriendly terms. (op. cit., p. 209.)

As in Lebanon, the Turks were not free of blame for encouraging the massacres. Early in March 1860 a meeting of prominent Muslims was convened by Aḥmad Pāshā, attended also by Aḥmad Effendi, financial controller of the Sidon pashalik. The group considered complaints made against the Christians of the city; a fatwa is then said to have been issued by the Muftī, 'Abdullah al-Ḥalabī, declaring that the Christians could not be considered legal equals of the Muslims or excused from the tributary Kharāj tax, and that should they flout the law of Islam in these matters their extermination would be sanctioned.<sup>246</sup>

Another provocation was the wide circulation of the text of a letter written during the Lebanese massacres by a Damascene Muslim to a friend in Ḥamāh, calling for extermination of the Christians and claiming religious sanction. Neither the author of the letter nor its distributor were identified.<sup>247</sup>

There appears to be no clear evidence of any direct part taken by the Druses in inciting the bloodshed in Damascus. Churchill gives it as the opinion of Amīr 'Abd al-Qādir, the Algerian protector of the Christians during the attack on them, that the massacre was stirred up by the Druses and would not have occurred otherwise.<sup>248</sup> But no details are given

---

246. Lenormant, op. cit., pp. 7-9. The same author states that 1800 rifles were imported into Damascus before the massacres as part of a plan prearranged by the Muftī and the Wālī. (Ibid., p. 100.)

247. The text of this letter is given in French in Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 112-7.

248. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites. p.275.

to support this. A French writer states that at the time of the outbreak no Druses had entered the city; only on the night of July 9, after the killing had begun, about 150 Druses came in from neighbouring towns, and later more from Ḥaurān. About 600 Bedouins came to Damascus on July 11, most of them remaining just outside to loot the fleeing Christians; very few entered the town.<sup>249</sup>

x x x x x x x x

At the close of the massacres in Lebanon, as fresh troubles threatened Beirut and the Christian areas of the north, Khūrshīd Pāshā called the Druse and Christian Qā'im Maqāms and other leaders to Beirut to negotiate peace. The Druses insisted that this be only on the basis of the principle of maḍā mā maḍā (what has passed has passed). To this Khūrshīd assented; the Christian Qā'im Maqām, Bashīr Aḥmad, was advised by the Consuls that such an agreement could not bind the Porte or the Powers not to seek due reparation for the Christians. Accordingly, the peace was signed on the Druse terms.<sup>250</sup>

The convention recognised that "since the commencement of these disturbances, the government, the chiefs of the country ... have never ceased to prevent their taking place." Neither party would have the right to raise the

---

249. Lenormant, op. cit., pp. 112-3.

250. Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 147-8.

least claim for damages, but all would cooperate in returning the refugees to their homes and restoring their properties, and the Christians voiced their appeal to the Mushīr to secure for them their legitimate rights, which gives the impression of an attempt to circumvent the principle of maḍā mā maḍā. The Druse declaration threw the blame on the Christians, and by implication especially on Bishop Ṭūbiyyā; what had happened was "the work of Providence."<sup>251</sup>

As the Christians expected, the questions of reparation and retribution were taken up by the Porte and the Five Powers. The duties of the international commission<sup>252</sup> which sat from September 1860 to the following March were defined by Thouvenel, the French Foreign Minister, as follows:

- 
251. The text of the peace convention is quoted in French in Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 149 ff., and in English in Abkarius, op. cit., p. 196, taken from the London Times of July 30, 1860. For the latter see Appendix B of this paper.
252. The commission members were Fu'ād Pāshā for the Porte; L. Béclard, former French Consul General in Wallachia; P. von Weckbecker, Austrian Consul General in Beirut; von Rehfues, secretary of the Prussian Legation in Constantinople; E. Novikoff, Councillor of the Russian Legation in Constantinople; and Lord Dufferin and Claneboye as the British representative. (Abkarius, op. cit., conclusion by Scheltema, p. 160.)

"(Le devoir de la commission) devait consister à rechercher les circonstances qui ont amené les derniers conflits, à déterminer la part de responsabilité des chefs de l'insurrection et des agents de l'administration locale, ainsi que les réparations dues aux victimes, et enfin à étudier, pour les soumettre à l'approbation des Gouvernements et de la Porte, les dispositions qui pourraient être adoptées pour conjurer de nouveaux malheurs."<sup>253</sup>

The Commission estimated the total destruction of property at 3,000,000 pounds sterling, including 1,250,000 sterling at Damascus. This figure was later reduced; Fu'ād Pāshā eventually insisted that the question of indemnities be referred to the Porte, ruling out European intervention in the matter. Two months later it was announced that the Turkish Government could only secure payment of an indemnity of 350,000 pounds sterling in Damascus. The Ottoman authorities did not maintain the refugee relief payments instituted, and in November would have stopped altogether had Lord Dufferin advanced 5,000 sterling from his own fortune.<sup>254</sup>

As for punishment of the guilty, according to Churchill, a group of sixteen Christian deputies was named by Fu'ād Pāshā to submit a list of those Druses who had been "the most barbarous." A list of 4,600 was given; it was rejected as being too long, and the Christians were accused of

---

<sup>253</sup>. Ibid.

<sup>254</sup>. Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 260-2.



having demanded 4,600 executions, which was not the case. The list was pared to 800, then to 300. The sixteen deputies were called upon to serve as accusers at the trial, but refused to do so on the grounds that they had not personally been witnesses. In the end, about 240 Druses were exiled to North Africa.<sup>255</sup>

While the Commission deliberated in late 1860, the Druse Qā'im Maqamiyyāh was abolished and placed directly under Turkish control, pending a final arrangement,<sup>256</sup> while Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad was at last deposed as Christian Qā'im Maqām and Yūsuf Bey Karam appointed in his place.

The deliberations of the Commission on an organic law for the country and the eventual institution of a new regime are the beginnings of another story which lies outside the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say that the British representative, whose government had since 1843 supported the experiment of the Qā'im Maqamiyyāhs, now considered the country unfit for self-rule. "Were we actuated by no other considerations than such as regard the tranquility of the Mountain," he wrote to Sir Henry Bulwer at Constantinople, "I have no hesitation in saying that the only sensible plan would be to deprive its inhabitants of all their anomalous

---

255. Ibid., pp. 234-46. Lord Dufferin wrote to Lord John Russell on December 19, 1860: "Only yesterday, Fuad Pasha received, through the bishops of their communities, a demand for the heads of 4,500 persons, that is, the whole tax-paying Druse population of the Lebanon." (Syria Correspondence, I, p. 424.) Scheltema reports a demand for 4,600 executions. (Abkarius, op. cit., p. 163.)

256. Syria Correspondence, I, p. 339.

privileges, and to place them under the immediate control of the Turkish Ruler of the province... All the bloodshed which has taken place during the last twenty-five years would have been spared had the jurisdiction of the Turks over the Lebanon been unlimited."<sup>257</sup>

The Commission, to be sure, was free of all "other considerations than such as regard the tranquillity of the Mountain;" but in limited measure the principle of direct Turkish rule was recognised. An Ottoman of Catholic faith would be named, with the Powers' approval, as Mutaşarrif or Governor of all parts of the Lebanon, assisted by an administrative council (majlis al-idārah) representing the various sects. This plan, with subsequent modifications, stood until 1914<sup>258</sup> with reasonable success.

No one can say precisely how large a toll of lives and property was taken by the events of 1860. We shall however quote the widely divergent estimates of two writers.

Churchill's figures (apparently including only Lebanon) are as follows:

11,000 Christians massacred.  
100,000 "sufferers" from the civil war.  
20,000 widows and orphans.  
4,000 Christians dead from exposure and destitution.  
3,000 Christian houses burned.  
2,000,000 pounds sterling of property destroyed.<sup>259</sup>

---

257. Syria Correspondence, I. p. 463. Dufferin to Bulwer, Jan. 1, 1861.

258. A detailed evaluation of the Mutaşarrifiyyah may be found in the London Times of September 6, and October 14, 1907.

259. The Druses and the Maronites, p. 219.

Lenormant gives two tables of figures. His estimates of the lives taken in Lebanon are broken down into districts:

The area of al-Matn, al-Gharb, and Beirut	- 400.
Sidon, Jazzīn, and the land between them	-1800.
Hāṣbayyā and Rāshayyā	- 2500.
Zahlah	- 250.
Dair al-Qamar	- 2200.
Bait al-Dīn	- 121.
The Ba'albak area	- <u>500.</u>
Total	7771.

Also:

360 villages destroyed.  
560 churches "overturned."  
42 monasteries burned.  
28 schools destroyed, once occupied by 1830 students.  
91 million francs of property destroyed in toto.<sup>260</sup>

For the toll at Damascus, Lenormant lists 8500 Christians killed and 3800 houses burned. In addition, 30,000 died in Lebanon and Syria as a result of exposure.<sup>261</sup>

---

260. Lenormant, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

261. Ibid., pp. 123 and 130.

Commentary by the Editor

"The feuds (of the Druses and Maronites) are not religious but tribe wars, (and) their social interests are identical.

"It is the universal opinion of every person whose experience of the country entitles him to entertain one, that, if a tolerable government existed, and no sinister influence were allowed to engender discord between them, the Druse and Christian populations would be inclined to live in perfect harmony."<sup>262</sup>

- Lord Dufferin to the British Ambassador in Constantinople, 1860.

"There is reason to believe the Russian and Greek interests in this country, foreseeing the danger which they incur of finding themselves suddenly placed under the domination of a Maronite ascendancy, have been, lately, busy in devising schemes for securing to their own community a separate and independent jurisdiction... (the inhabitants of the) Greek Christian villages, it is to be remarked, assisted the Druses (in the civil war)... It is well known that the Consul of the King of Greece has been encouraging

---

262. Original English text, copied from Syria Correspondence, I, p. 329. Lord Dufferin to Sir Henry Bulwer, Nov. 14, 1860.

the exodus from Damascus..."<sup>263</sup>

- Lord Dufferin to the British Ambassador in Constantinople, 1860.

"When the news (the intentions of the Maronites of Beirut to attack the Druses of the Matn) was communicated to As'ad Jāwīsh, he went to Bishop Ṭūbiyyā ('Aun) and asked him about the purpose of this plan, to explain to him what ruin would result from it. His Eminence replied: 'If you, the people of Dair al-Qamar, do not obey, and refused to march against the enemy, then I shall persuade both the Druses and the Christians to attack you.'

"Then the Bishop sent Bishārah Far'aun to Ṭānyūs Shāhīn to hasten his attack. He also sent al-Shantīrī to the Matn and al-Qāṭi' to gather the people of the district. As for the leaders of this movement among the Maronites, they were Khalīl Effendi Naqqāsh, Na'ūm Qīqānū, and As'ad Thābit...

"And when we saw that, As'ad Jāwīsh and I, we foresaw the ruin of the country, and we went together to the Bishops of our sect (Roman Catholic) and informed them of what was happening, It seems that they were completely

---

263. Original English text, copied from Syria Correspondence, I, p. 336. Lord Dufferin to Sir H. Berlwer, Nov. 15, 1860.

ignorant of these matters, and they told us to go to the English Consulate General. We did this, and informed the Consul of what had happened...

"The Roman Catholic Church wrote to its sons in Zahlah advising them to remain steadfast in peace and to inform the people that the promoters of this movement were the Maronites alone. It is an established fact that the Roman Catholics did not participate in the movement after the arrival of these proclamations to them.

"The Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholics in Beirut refused to join the Maronites in their deed, but despite this the Maronites assert that the Orthodox and Catholics wanted war, while they (actually) were seeking to avoid it..."

- From a letter from Habīb 'Akkāwī, a Catholic, to Sa'īd Janblāt.

"It did certainly appear, considering the history of Syria for the last twenty years, that (England) was deeply responsible for these atrocities (in Syria)... We, in opposition to France, and (I believe) to some of the other Powers of Europe, recommended ... that there should be a chief of the Druses and a chief of the Maronites, and that there should be a Turkish Pasha over both..."<sup>264</sup>

- Member Monsell in the English House of Commons, 17 August 1860.

---

264. Original English text, quoted from Hansard, Parliamentary Debates, Vol. CLX, Columns 1479-80. (See Appendix C.)

"(I have stated, and repeated in the House of Commons,) that I felt ashamed of the part which I had taken in the affairs of Syria. I was sent under the orders of the Government, and I did my duty, though very unwillingly. When the country was held by Mehemet Ali it was peaceable and quiet...

"The Turks did everything they could to stir up rebellion in Mount Lebanon... Lord Ponsonby sent an agent into Mount Lebanon (to tell the inhabitants) they would be better used by the Turks as an inducement to take up arms, and if they had not joined us it would have been quite impossible with our small force to have turned 30,000 or 40,000 Egyptians out of Mount Lebanon, and finally out of Syria."<sup>265</sup>

- Sir Charles Napier in the House of Commons on the same day.

"My friend (Mr. Monsell) has said that the blame for the situation that has arisen in Syria falls on the British Government. I deny that I have the slightest share in this responsibility, and in any case it does not fall on Her Majesty's Government...

---

265. Ibid., Columns 1480-1.  
Yazbak's Arabic version has Napier identify himself as Ponsonby's agent (actually it was Richard Wood).  
(See Appendix C.)

"Rumors were broadcast among the Christians a few months ago warning of events such as these in Syria in the spring, and a quantity of European arms was distributed to the Maronites. I ask: Where did they come from, and who gave them? I am sure they gave arms other than those they bought openly in Beirut...

"My friend (Mr. Monsell) said that the word is on every tongue that the English Government 'protects the Druses whatever outrages they commit.' I tell you flatly: That is a base accusation which has no element of truth, and I declare that the English Government had had no tie to the Druses at a time when it was established that another Government (meaning France) had a connection with the Maronites..."<sup>266</sup>

- From the reply of Lord Palmerston, English Prime Minister, to the two preceding speeches in that session.

"You (the Maronites) foresaw it, and we (the Druses) foresaw it, and both of us fell into it..."

- Sa'id Janblāt to Ghandūr al-Sa'd.

---

266. Translation of Yazbak's text. The original text of Palmerston's remarks made in reply to Monsell and Napier on August 17 is reproduced in Appendix C. Only the first paragraph quoted here by Yazbak appears to be taken from that speech.



"I fear that the (Ottoman) State is employing us to strike someone else, and will not hesitate to return and deal savagely with us..."

- Shaikh Husain Talḥūq.

Page 100

Once again we find ourselves compelled to interrupt Anṭūn Dāhir al-'Aqīqī in order to call the reader's attention to the need for him to be steadfastly on his guard and to be cautious, in his reading of the following chapter. For its pages deal with the unfortunate events which took place in the year '60. In the minds of the people the picture has been imprinted with reprehensible agitation and beastly slaughter between the Christians and their brethren and countrymen the Druses. The misleading history set down by the agents of imperialism and their allies began to poison spirits and intellects and instill in them the notion that the Christians killed their brothers the Druses because they followed a different religion! And that the latter took revenge on their Christian brothers because they were Christians!! This poison circulated among the Lebanese, devastating their spirits, until we have come to a time in which the entire people, cultured and ignorant alike, believe in a falsehood and, sad to say, that these fearful and accursed events are the result of abominable bigotry, and are imbued with

the feeling of enmity which that kind of imagining makes inevitable.

In the preceding pages we have seen several earlier events which brought us to these results and they are all, as the reader has seen, social, economic, and political reasons created by Lebanese feudalism and foreign colonialism together.

We knew in the preceding pages, that the Lebanese were, until the beginning of the Shihābī rule, divided in their partisanship into Qaisites and Yemenites, and none felt in his political life that he was a Druse or a Christian. Then they became Janblāṭīs and Yazbakīs (and some remained neutral), and we found both Christians and Druses on one side, proud of their partisanship, and holding fast to its trifles, fighting with a single outlook and a single weapon their opponents the Druses and Christians, who were also united, on the second side.<sup>267</sup> But the rule of Ibrāhīm Pāshā, covetous of occupying this country and reaping its benefits forever, was unable

---

267. The leading Maronite families at one time had all formed connections with Druse factions: the Khāzin and Khūrī Ṣālīḥ families to the Janblāṭs, the Dahdāhs and Hubaishes to the 'Imāds:  
(Perrier, op.cit., pp. 313-4.)

to achieve his wishes for him as long as he saw that national unity in the Lebanese and that partisan solidarity among them. With the help of his pack-animal Bashīr Shihāb the Maltese, he began to breathe the poison of religious bigotry in their hearts to divide them, and paralleling his efforts in this wicked plan were the agents of England, Turkey, and France; and they succeeded to a great extent. Among the reasons for their success were the authority of feudalism and the ignorance of the people, led by their leaders like sheep, and the effect on them of their personal grudges and hatreds. In this connection, the Amīr Bashīr III (Abu Thīn)<sup>268</sup> had scarcely been installed by the English as ruler over Lebanon, in place of his namesake and relative, when he began treating some of the Druse leaders in a scornful way, detracting from their self-esteem, and abusing their traditions whenever he encountered them. The Druses are all famous for their reserve, for holding their tongues, their courtesy in council, and sobriety in speech. Then in agreement with the Turks and the English he worked for the restraint of their welfare. He formed a Dīwān to deal with complaints and installed as judge over it Shaikh

---

268. Bashīr Qāsīm Shihāb.

Bishārah al-Khūrī Sālīh. Shidyāq said:

"They abolished the positions of the Druse (landholders) in that Dīwān, and they (The Druses) were most strongly displeased, and began to seek from the Amīr fulfillment of their rights and safeguarding of their interests. He mocked them, saying that he needed no one, and began to speak openly of his desire to divide their estates among his relatives. At that time they all united together with some of the Christian Shaikhs (to work for his dismissal <sup>269</sup> ..."

Page 102

\*  
\* \* \*

The governor put his words into effect by withdrawing the village of Shimistār from the authority of the 'Imāds, who had held it solely by right of occupation, and expropriated the "Ramādah" land in the village of 'Anjar and its mills from the Talhūqs and distributed them among his relatives. Then he began to incite the peasants of Dair al-Qamar against their Nakadī Shaikhs. 270

---

269. (Y) Page 615.

270. <sup>بوضع اليد</sup>  
i.e., without positive title.

Evildoing took place and colonialism took advantage of it as a chance to intervene actively in the Mountain. England began to support the Druses and the French supported the Maronites, while the Turks, for their part, encouraged both sides at once, acting on the idea of Ahmad Pāshā, Wālī of Damascus, "that in Syria there are two evils, the Christians and the Druses, and whenever one slaughtered the other the Ottoman Sultanate profited!" Thus the innocent blood of the people was shed unavenged on the altar of feudalism and colonialism.

Despite the poisoning of hearts and minds by the winds of that lamentable civil war, there remained people in Lebanon who understood that the slaughter between those innocent brothers was only to the interests of the land-owners or those inciting them to evil, and that religion was not one of its causes. Our basis for this opinion is that the Christian landholders were of various inclinations and points of view in the ignition of that evil civil war, and some of them joined their colleagues among the Druse landholders in fighting the Christians!!! We are informed by Tannūs al-Shidyāq that the Lama'īs worked to "strengthen the Druses in order to occupy Dair al-Qamar and remove Amīr Bashīr from the governorship"; and that the Hūbaishīs agreed with the wife of Shaikh Amīn al-Dīn

in 'Abbaih during the heat of the battles "to return all together to the coast. They were bribed and decided to return;" and "that they, that is, the Hubaishīs, were meeting secretly with some of the Druse dignitaries and made a compact with them that on the battlefield they would desert the Christians, and the Druses would attain their ends..."<sup>271</sup> Shidyāq also informs us in his published history<sup>272</sup> that the Roman Catholics in 'Ālaih were in the ranks of Shaikhs Mahmūd and Nāsīf Talhūq, fighting against the Christians who were led by Amīr Qais Shihāb in Mt. Kahhālah!!!<sup>273</sup>

---

271. (Y) The manuscript Tārīkh al-A'yān al-Aṣīlah, in the possession of Yūsuf Ibrāhīm Yazbak: p. 385 ff.

272. (Y) p. 705 (Akhbār al-A'yān).

273. A celebrated instance of good will between the Catholics of the Upper Gharb and the Talhuq family is the episode of Dair al-Shīr, the Catholic monastery located between 'Alaih and Sūq al-Gharb. During the month of massacres in 1860 a body of Druses led by a shaikh of the Abū Nakads came from 'Abbaih to destroy the monastery, Shaikh Mahmūd Talhūq sent a force from 'Alaih to bar the way. The marauders, in token fulfillment of their oath to destroy the building, were allowed to break a few chips of stone from the outside; but the Christians of the district remained then and after unmolested.

After the arrival of the French expeditionary force in August, the Talhūqs and other Druses were obliged to flee, the men to Jabal Druse and the women to Ghābūn. Their valuables were deposited at

He tells us also that some of the notables of Zahlah had "intricate plans" to deceive their countrymen.

These incidents are many, and they all confirm the soundness of our belief that there was no sectarian enmity like that cultivated and base enmity which we see today among us. It was personal hatred in the breasts of individual landholders who dragged the people with them, and who were aided in their crime by the agents of Turkey, France, and England.

This was the state of affairs in the year '60. We know from our grandfathers that individual Christians were in the ranks of the Druses, just as we know that many Druses refused to slip into that fearful abyss.

---

the monastery and guarded by the monks until they could return and reclaim them.

Since that year this mutual aid between the monks and the shaikhs has been annually commemorated in a ceremonial visit paid by the monks to the Talhūqs in 'Alaih on Easter Monday, and a return visit by the latter to Dair al-Shīr on the following day, in which the eldest shaikh is invited to sit in the chair normally reserved for the highest dignitaries of the Catholic Church. (Information received from 'Afīf Talhūq, great-grandson of Shaikh Maḥmūd.)

It may be noted, however, that the benevolence of the Talhūqs did not extend to the Christians of Hadath and B'abdā, Shaikh Maḥmūd, a participant in the raid on these towns, fled and escaped trial after the massacres; Shaikh Ḥusain of 'Aitāt was among those condemned to death. (See Syrian Correspondence, I, pp. 440-8).

Many of them opened their houses to welcome the passers-by and to protect those in flight. We recall in relation to this that Shaikh Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn of Kafar Mattā participated in the battle of Daqūn and fought gallantly there in the defense of his co-religionists who were the victims of aggression. When the battle of Dair al-Qamar developed, the said Shaikh Muḥammad hastened to it with others among the people of his village, to aid the Druses; but he did not fire a single shot. When he returned home and was asked about the reasons for his conduct, he replied: "It is not right or manly for us to attack the innocent. At Daqūn we were defending. As for Dair al-Qamar, the Druses were the aggressors, and this will not do!"

If we looked at those unfortunate incidents of which we shall read in the following pages, with an alert eye and a calm mind, far from being swayed by our abominable sectarian upbringing, we would find that the Lebanese of diverse faiths were - and still are - firewood in the hearths of disgraceful feudalism and criminal imperialism.

Antūn Ḍāhir al-'Aqīqī resumes his narration, saying:

#### Continuation of the Manuscript

Hatred continued to grow between the Shaikhs and the people until differences arose between the Christians and the Druses in the area of the Shūf country. That was



in the beginning of the year '60,<sup>274</sup> and the reason for its occurrence was that some of the people of that region desired to rid themselves of the landholders, such as the Amūs of the House of Abū al-Lama' and other shaikhs, Druse and Christian, and began their corrupt activity. The Druse Shaikhs learned of this news and took to oppressing the people by means of trickery, and they caused disturbances between the two sects. Then differences arose between them (the sects), the apparent reason being on account of the collision of pack-animals with each other; for the animal of one of the mule-drivers collided with the animal of the other, who was a Druse. They fought and struck each other with lethal weapons, and some were wounded on both sides. The cry of alarm went up from both sides, and a battle ensued in the southern Shūf district. Then afterwards there were discussions between the two sects, and also each sect by itself. Priests went to his Beatitude the Patriarch, Būlus, who was at that time Patriarch of the Maronites, and he forbid the occurrence

---

274. 'Aqīqī does not cite the outbreak of August, 1859, in Bait Mirī, between Druses and Christians. Starting with two boys' quarrel over a chicken, the affair ended in a pitched battle in which 12 Christians and 20 Druses were killed. (Abkarius, op.cit., pp. 62-3; Jessup, op.cit., Vol., I, p. 166.)

of (events such as) this shameful affair. But at that moment His Eminence Bishop Tūbiyyā 'Aun, Bishop of Beirut, <sup>275</sup>  
encouraged the Christians and protested to the Consuls.

---

275. One finds numerous descriptions of Bishop Tūbiyyā, many of them unfavorable. He was "the man who, next to the Patriarch had done more than any other Maronite to precipitate this awful civil war." (Jessup, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 193).

"With regard to Bishop Tobia," wrote Lord Dufferin, "who may be considered one of the chief causes of all the misery and bloodshed which has existed in the Lebanon, I would only say that his removal from the country is an absolute necessity. Unfortunately, it will be difficult to discover any direct evidence against him... (his) ambition and passion for intrigue verify one's conception of the worst specimen of a medieval ecclesiastic." (Syria Correspondence, I, p. 519. Dufferin to Bulwer, Jan. 18, 1861.)

Tūbiyyā was regarded within the Church itself as something of an upstart. Poujads considered him "un des hommes les plus distingués que j'aie rencontrés en Orient. Il ne parle que l'Arabe, mais son esprit supérieur lui a fait deviner le génie Européen, et c'est lui qui a joué le plus grand rôle dans les affaires politiques du Liban. Il avait été moins et s'était mis à la tête d'une rébellion dans le convent de Saint-Antoine, contre l'abbé de cet ordre.

"A cette occasion, il avait été exilé à l'île de Chypre par les ordres de la sacrée congrégation de la Propagande. Depuis, sa conduite exemplaire lui a valu d'être successivement évêque de Saint Jean d'Acre in partibus et de Beyrouth, l'un des plus importants diocèses du Liban, à cause de la résidence du muchir et des Consuls Généraux. J'ai rarement vu réunies au même degré la simplicité, la douceur et la fermeté, la sagacité, la hauteur d'âme et l'humilité du Chrétien." (Poujade, op.cit., p. 158.)

The agitation increased in the Shūf country and the district of Jazzīn and Dair al-Qamar and that area. They addressed the people of Kisrawān through Tānyūs Shāhīn, asking whether they would help them or not, and Tānyūs Shāhīn answered that he would help them against the Druses and that he had about 50,000 men under arms, if needed, whom he could bring. At that time the Christians living in those regions strengthened themselves and began seeking trouble. As for the Druses, they were constantly meeting and holding discussions among themselves everywhere, and they communicated with the Druses of Haurān, Hāṣbayyā, and Syria, and making secret agreements among themselves that their efforts would be united. The Sublime State (the Turks) was strengthening them and giving them force (arms) secretly so that they might annihilate the Christians, with the knowledge of the English government. Both sides strengthened themselves and prepared for the advent of troubles, and not two months went by before trouble began in the district of al-'Arqūb in the Shūf country. There was trouble there, and four Christians and three Druses were killed. This was after the Druses killed a priest who was passing on the road and who was instigating trouble near the district of Jazzīn. At that, the troubles became notorious, and each side met with its own party. The leaders of the

Druses in the fighting was Shaikh Khaṭṭār Bey 'Imād, the son of Shaikh Ḥusain Talḥūq, two of the shaikhs of the Abū Nakad family, and Shaikh Sa'Id Bey Janblāt. He (the latter) would always stay in his headquarters, al-Mukhtārah, and send on his behalf people on whom he relied; and all of the Druses depended on his word.<sup>276</sup>

---

276. Shaikh Sa'Id's role in the 1860 troubles was a matter of great controversy. He was said to be small, of peaceful temperament, and dressed not as a Druse but as a "modern Turkish Effendi." "Il est fait qu'ostensiblement il ne participa pas à la lutte de 1860, et qu'on ne le vit nulle part tremper personnellement les mains dans le sang des Chrétiens. Au contraire, il donna même asile, à Moukhtara, à tous ceux qui furent assez heureux pour arriver jusqu'à lui, et les mit en sûreté." (Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 45-7).

Jessup, on the other hand, accuses Sa'Id Janblāt and his sister, Sitt Nā'ifah, of responsibility for the slaughter of 800 Christians at Hāsbayyā. (op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 178-81). They were exonerated in the reports of British diplomatic representatives, with whom Shaikh Sa'Id was a great favorite. (See Abkarius, op.cit., footnote by Scheltema, p. 40.)

Shaikh Khattār 'Imād was a more war-like type, "bravé jusqu'à la témérité." Known as "the sword of the Druses," he directed much of the military operations and frequently appeared on the scene of battle during the massacres. (Souvenirs de Syrie, p. 47.)

We may note on page 111 of Yazbak that 'Aqīqī lists Sa'Id Janblāt among the Druse leaders in the attack on 'Zahlah.

The State (the Turks) strengthened the Druses with even more than they needed. This was in the time of the Lord of the Royal Power (Sultan) 'Abd al-Majīd Khān al-'Uthmānī, the Lord of his Age and the Unmatched of his Times. This intrigue was not his doing but that of his brother 'Abd al-'Azīz, who wrote letters to all Ottoman cities to rise against the Christians and kill them; and some of them heard and obeyed, while others took account of the consequences of time and refused. That was his purpose, in order to remove his brother from the Throne and sit in his place. As for the Christians in the Shūf country, they were strengthening their means, but without profit, for lack of someone to lead them and for lack of paying attention to the consequences, for they were mindful of all the money in the world, but not of their own dignity. During this time the Druses met and caused trouble with the Christians in the Shūf. The Christians were defeated before them and they (the Druses) burned the houses of the Christians and drove them from their places. Killing began between the two sides, but most died from among the Christians, and foremost among them Abū Samrā of Jazzīn. Then afterwards there was trouble in the region of al-Matn, where several places of the Christians were burned. Then trouble arose in Dair

al-Qamar. The Druses were repeatedly defeated and could do nothing against the inhabitants of al-Dair, so then the Druses left Dair al-Qamar and headed for al-Matn, in order to take al-Matn and Ḥammānā and the rest (of that area) and afterward return to Dair al-Qamar. They left several men around Dair al-Qamar to be always on the watch and to keep the inhabitants of al-Dair occupied so that they would not go out. And when the Druses arrived (in Matn) and many troubles arose between the two sides, and they took a part of al-Matn and Ḥammānā, the people of Zaḥlah strengthened themselves and went out to face the Druses, (but) the Druses had headed for the coastal region. They took B'abdā and burned it <sup>277</sup> together with the rest of the village around it. The people of Kisrawān had gone to B'abdā, and when the fighting began, because of their being strangers in that region and because they had

---

277. "Emīr Bishir el-Kassim (sic.), ex-Governor of Mt. Lebanon, a man 85 years of age and quite blind, whilst being led away from his house at B'abda by his servants was attacked it is stated by Bashi-Bozooks (Ottoman irregulars) when his servants fled and left the Emir to his fate. The body on being recovered was found wounded by sword cuts and the throat cut."  
(British Consular Files. Moore to Bulwer, No. 24, May 31, 1860).

no longer any one to be at their head, immediately they turned tail, for they were dispersed.<sup>278</sup> Some of them stayed in Baīt Mirī and some in Antilyās, and some in Rūmiyyah, the seat of the Bishop of Beirut, in order to protect it. Nevertheless the Druses did not return. Ottoman troops came up from Beirut and settled in al-Ḥāzimiyyah to strengthen the Druses, who were still burning the country, killing the people, and plundering the wealth. They burned Bait Mirī<sup>279</sup> and Brummānā, except for the house of Amīr Bashīr Aḥmad and his cousin Amīr Amīn, and they burned the residence of the Bishop of Beirut and the entire sea coast. Its inhabitants who escaped death went down to Beirut with their women and children and you could hear weeping and wailing from every direction; and the smoke from the fires

- 
278. Jessup states that Ṭānyūs from his encampment at Nahr al-Kalb (Dog River) sent 300 men to protect B'abdā and Hadath on May 28, but the next day they dispersed, on the orders of Khūrshīd, who pledged himself to defend the district. On May 30 the Druses burned the two villages. (Op.cit., Vol.I, p.172)
279. Vogüé wrote that Khūrshīd's departure with his Turkish forces for B'abdā (actually, Ḥāzimiyyah) was announced by the customary artillery salute; this was a pre-arranged signal for the Druses to attack at Bait-Mirī. (Op.cit., p. 6).

extended as far as Nahr Ibrāhīm. Fear fell on all the Christians in all places, and as for the people of Dair al-Qamar, they remained inside the Dair in the citadel. There came to them those among the Christians present in the region whose places had been burned, and all stayed in Dair al-Qamar. The Ottoman troops were present there, and the Mutasallim as well, but they did not know what was happening because they were cut off from news from travelers going and coming. Then after the burning of the country there was a second agreement that soldiers would come from Kisrawān to the Druses' center in al-'Ubaidiyyah, since all the Druses were there, and that they (the soldiers) would come to them from below, from the direction of the West, and that Yūsuf Āghā al-Shantīrī would also come to them from above to the East, and the people of Kisrawān together with a few men from the Dair al-Qamar area who had left Dair al-Qamar before the siege. Their total number was about 150 men. They went to al-'Ubaidiyyah and troubles started; and since the Christians' ascent was from an extremely difficult position, they could not attain their end. But they displayed their bravery to excess, burning two or three houses of al-'Ubaidiyyah. They took courage from what Yūsuf Āghā al-Shantīrī had promised them, that he would



Page 110  
come to them with his men, the people of Bikfayyā and al-Qātī', from the other side. From this they took courage, but when he broke his promise and did not come, the Druses defeated them and routed them after they had been close to victory, because their location was poorly situated. Sixty of them were killed, each of whom was equivalent to 20 fighters - and what a sad thing for the dead! About seven of the Druses were killed, not counting the wounded. Then after that the people of Kisrawān returned home in shame, burning (with anger) at the betrayed of the compact with the above-mentioned Yūsuf Āghā. It was said that the government troops in al-Ḥāzimiyyah fought on the side of the Druses. This is the more likely because shell-fragments were found; and some of the military men disguised themselves so that they should not be known. The foreign consuls fell into a great perplexity, and especially the Consul of France, since the Mountain was under his protection; and the Wālī was indisposed with this deed. At that time the people of Zahlah, totaling about 600 rifles went forth to encounter the Druses in 'Ain Darah, in the district of the mountains of al-Matn, and there was trouble between them and the Druses for the first time, and the Druses were put to flight for an hour's distance. And on the third day there

was a second battle in which the people of Hammānā and that area joined them (the Christians), and the Druses were victorious over the Christians. The cries of alarm extended to Zaḥlah and those districts, but no one helped them; the people of Zaḥlah were routed, took to their heels, and returned to Zaḥlah. As for the Druses, they all met together and (decided) to place a group of men to watch over Dair al-Qamar while the rest of them set out in the direction of Jazzīn, al-'Arqūb; and Bakāsīn. They defeated the Christians and expelled them from their places. Then they reached the Biqā' country and seized the places of the Christians. Every village that they took, they burned, and they killed everyone they found. The Christians fled before them from everywhere, and gathered in the dwelling places and in the direction of the coast. They went to Beirut with their women. In the Dair al-Qamar area they went to the Dair, and in the areas of the Biqā', al-Shūf, and Hammāna they went to Zaḥlah. All the Christians suffered great hardship from the killing and bloodshed, the looting, and the burning, until there was not a single Christian to be found in those districts. Then the Druses went to besiege Zaḥlah, and they established their headquarters in Qubb Ilyās. At their head were Shaikh Sa'id Janblāṭ and Khaṭṭar Bey al-'Imād, and some of the Ḥimādahs.

They made agreements with the Mutawālīs and the Muslims, with the aid of several men of the Sublime State (the Turks) and sent a message to the people of Zahlah telling them to surrender to them. The people of Zahlah were unwilling to surrender and put their trust in the large number of men they had from all parts of the country.<sup>280</sup> Disagreements and hatreds fell among them. At that time the Druses began to gather from all places, from Hauran, the Shūf, the Matn, and elsewhere. They sought help from the Arabs (Bedouins) and Mutawālīs<sup>281</sup> to take Zahlah, for

---

280. i.e., refugees.

281. It may be recalled that in 1855 there had been a dispute between the people of Zahlah and the Mutawālī family of Harfūsh in the Biqā', and a settlement favorable to Zahlah had been imposed by the French Consul. (See above, p. 43)

The Maronites and Greek Catholics of the town were reputed for bigotry and intolerance toward the Orthodox and Protestant inhabitants. (Abkarius, op. cit., Scheltema footnote, pp. 89-90). Their rejection of the Qa'im Maqām's authority and alternate attempts at self-government and requests for a Turkish governor, together with the factionalism within the town, made Zahlah easier prey to a Druse attack. (See Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, p. 181).

they (the Druses) <sup>were</sup> afraid of Zaḥlah because they had been defeated by them previously, in 1843 and 1842. For this reason they devoted all their concern to taking it, after they cut communication between Zaḥlah and Dair al-Qamar, so that neither would receive any further news about the other. The people of the Dair were perplexed over the quietness of the Druse, for the Druses had only placed a guard over the Dair while the rest of them concerned themselves with the matter of Zaḥlah and strove with the greatest efforts to destroy Zaḥlah. And when they did take it, they took all the people of the country. Meanwhile the people of Zaḥlah appealed to all Christians everywhere in Kisrawān, Bisharry, and al-Zāwiyah to help as much as they could. As for the people of al-Zāwiyah, they were afraid of the people of al-Ḍinniyyah because of the fact that there was enmity between the two parties. So a part of the Christians remained there, for the sole purpose of keeping watch. Yūsuf Bey Karam made preparations and sent from the people of Zghartā and those districts about 250 men. He collected (men in the Batrūn and Jubail country and came with them to Kisrawān. He collected about 4,000 men and went with them in the direction of Bikfayyā and Bḥirṣāf, intending to go with them to Zaḥlah

in order to defend it. He gave the troops all they needed of ammunition and explosives, which came to him from some of the leading Christians of Beirut and the Mountain,<sup>282</sup> and he spent as much as possible on the soldiers. When he determined to go to Zaḥlah, messages came to him from the Wālī of Beirut<sup>283</sup> and from some of the consuls, asking him not to go to Zaḥlah, and saying that if he did go, he would be responsible, and that the Wālī would prevent the war by other means. Likewise the Amīrs prevented him from proceeding, so that he should make no advance. He delayed in setting forth and stayed quietly in Bikfayyā while the people of Zaḥlah constantly asked for him and the Druses worked zealously at completion of their goal. They assaulted Zaḥlah and the fire of war was ignited between Qubb Ilyās and Zaḥlah. The people of Zaḥlah were routed and returned to their town. Again on the third day the fire of war was lit, but without result to Zaḥlah. On the fifth day the Druses attacked Zaḥlah from every side, they, the Arabs, and the Mutawālīs, but

---

282. He is also said to have been supplied by the French Government. (Vogüé, op.cit., p. 8.)

283. i.e. Khūrshīd Pāshā, Mushīr of Sidon whose headquarters were in Beirut.

they left a way open to the people of Zaḥlah on the north side. The fires of war blazed, banners waved, and horsemen collided from all directions; swords and rifles flashed and there were stabs and blows between the two sides. The people of Zaḥlah thought that Yūsuf Bey Karam had come to their aid from one direction, because the banners were marked with crosses, but this a trick of the Druses. Nevertheless, Yūsuf Bey Karam had on that day started with his troops from Bikfayyā, intending to help Zaḥlah, against the order of the Wālī of Beirut, because of what he had learned of the difficulties of the people of Zaḥlah. <sup>284</sup> And when the war intensified, the

---

284. A French writer's version was that the people of Zaḥlah at first refused to allow a Maronite relief force to enter their lines, "attribuant au Général Joseph Karam des projets de conquête." (Abkarius, *op.cit.*, Jules Ferrette, quoted by Scheltema in footnote, p. 94.)

Karam himself later explained that he had been notified by Count Bentivoglio, the French Consul, that if he left his camp at Bikfayyā he would incur the disapproval of all five leading European Powers. Nevertheless he sent 200 of his 800 men ahead to Mār-Shwayyā, six hours' march from Zaḥlah; these were fired upon by Turkish troops, sent by Khūrshīd Pāshā to "enforce" the peace. When Karam learned of the attack on Zaḥlah, he hastened to it, but arrived to find the houses in ruins and the Druses already gone. ('Abd al-

Page 113 Druses rushed on Zaḥlah and set fire to it; and at that moment the people of Zaḥlah were routed and started to leave from the eastern side (of the town), together with their women, carrying what they could. The hour was nine o'clock in the morning. Everyone found in front of the Druses was killed, except for the women. What a great onslaught and a dreadful defeat! I need not tell you of the crowds of people from all places then taking refuge in Zaḥlah. How could they go out at such a frightening hour? And what was the state of the women and children, with the fires lit? This is a thing from whose description tongue and pens shrink.- At last, in the evening, not a single Christian still remained in Zaḥlah. Then plunder began in every direction in a ferocious way. At four o'clock at night the Druses were alerted by their leaders to leave Zaḥlah, after they had burned a part of it, and to abstain from interfering with the women. So the Druses departed from it (Zaḥlah)

---

Rahmān 'Adrah: Brūtūkūl Lubnān, Appendix II: Letter from Karam to the French Government and to the Pope.) It is, then, a gross exaggeration to say, as at least one writer does, that Zaḥlah fell with a Maronite army of 15,000 men only six hours away, who did nothing because of the jealous quarrels over leadership in Kisrawān. (Jessup, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 185-6) Churchill's explanation for the Christian failure was that it was "owing to the treason of their selfish aristocracy and the bombastic ravings of their bigoted and contemptible priesthood." (Quoted in Ibid., p. 186.)

after taking what they could, and then the Arabs, M̄tawālīs, and Muslims began to loot Zaḥlah because there was nothing to prevent them. Add to this that they also burned a part of the town. They remained thus for about eight days. As for the people of Zaḥlah, they came to Kisrawān naked and weak from hunger. There had not been enough (food and clothes) for them, and no longer could anyone help any of them, until children were abandoned on the roads by their mothers. They were scattered everywhere in the villages of Kisrawān, until it was clear that Kisrawān had room for no more people, because besides those from Zaḥlah, the Biqā', the Shūf, al-Matn, in the Ba'albak country as well the M̄tawālīs and Muslims had risen against the Christians and dealt with them thus. Then the Druses and Muslims rose against the Christians in the regions of Ḥāṣbayyā and Rāshayyā<sup>285</sup> and caused trouble for them. They expelled the Christians from there, and whoever escaped death went to Damascus,

---

285. Still ruled in 1860 by Muslim Shihābs, who were generally on good terms with their Christian wards and at odds with the Druses. Ḥāṣbayyā was inhabited by approximately 6,000 Greek Orthodox and 1,500 Druses. (Jessup, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 163-4).



page 114 while these places remained in ruins. At Zaḥlah about 20 were killed, including the sick and the aged, and as for Ḥāṣḥbayyā, approximately 40% were killed. Then when these deeds took place and Yūsuf Bey Karam returned disappointed because the defeat at Zaḥlah took place before his arrival. Some of the Abū al-Lama's formed a society, and Yūsuf Bey Karam was in consultation with the chiefs. The meeting was in Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān, and (it was agreed) that each one would collect as many men as he could, and they would go forth to the Druses in order to protect themselves. Besides this Yūsuf Bey Karam brought his men to al-Mazra'ah and stayed there about four days. Then the Druses, after doing what they had done, set forth to take Dair al-Qamar, and they lit fires of joy before the Dair in order to frighten them (The inhabitants). As for the sons of the Dair, they took courage at that time and began to encourage one another everywhere. They distributed weapons and took up their swords. On the second day the battle began between the two sides, and during all this time none of the Christians (outside Dair al-Qamar) was able to know what was happening in the Dair, nor were any of the inhabitants of the Dair able to know what had taken place outside; for until that time the people of the Dair had not known what

had happened in Zahlah and the other places. Because of that, they were greatly frightened, although they took courage somewhat. The Druses sent them a message to give themselves up, but they did not accept, and strengthened their means of defense and prepared themselves for war, and their courage grew. Old and young among them carried arms, and they asked the help of Divine Grace. Then the Mutasallim stationed in the Sarai (citadel) of the Dair representing the Sublime State sent a message to them ordering that all Christians in Dair al-Qamar should come to him in the Sarai and deliver their arms to him, and he would guarantee to keep them from all harm. This was deception on his part, for he had been bribed by the Druses, since they knew that they had no chance against the Christians of the Dair except by deception. The Christians, from the smallness of their intelligence, the excess of their carelessness, the simplicity of their hearts, the greatness of their exhaustion from the struggle, and especially their lack of information of what had happened elsewhere, delivered themselves to the government, except for some few young men who did not give themselves up. The others turned over their arms and entered the Sarai in order to be safe and to have the protection of the Government Troops from

the enemy. After they were divested of their arms and had become as sheep, their enemies the Druses rushed on them, while the Ottoman Troops, instead of preventing them, helped them, and they started attacking them (the Christians) and murdering at will without hindrance. They slaughtered the Christians like sheep, and took them to the roof of the Sarai on the southern side until they formed a great heap. Then they attacked those outside the Sarai and overwhelmed them, and plundered what they found, and set fire everywhere, burning the Churches and monasteries. They killed every male they found, whether in the houses or the market, however they could kill him. As for those Christians remaining of the people of the Dair, they collected themselves and some of the women and children together and fled secretly or openly and went down to Sidon, from whence they could proceed to Beirut on the customary road. A very few of them fought off the Druse Shaikhs. As for those who went to Sidon, they were met by the Muslims who wanted to rob and attack them as they had done with the people of Jazzin. They slew about thirty of them (i.e. the Muslims slew the Christians) in the gardens of Sidon, but could not defeat them because they (the Christians) had armed themselves. They knew that they no longer had any means of living, wherever they went, except in this way.

They remained there that night and then came to Beirut penniless. The people (of Beirut) pitied them and the people of Jazzīn and those districts, and laid the matter before the foreign consuls. The consuls, monks and priests, merchants, and notables in Beirut, and everyone whose feelings stirred him, proffered means of life to the destitute, each according to his ability, with abundant gifts and a generous hand. Letters and telegrams went to all corners of the world concerning the atrocities that had taken place, whose equal had been unheard of in Syria. Then the people of Ḥāṣḥbayyā and Rāshayyā and those living in that area, after they had been struck with disaster by the Muslims and Druses and their places had been burned, went to the capital city of Syria (Damascus), and stayed there for a time. Then during this time the Muslims in Damascus became agitated, and before this happened there had been preparation on both sides, Muslim and Christian. The Christians began to flee secretly when they saw what was happening among the Muslims concerning them. They petitioned the government, - but it did not reply but rather (tried to) quiet them - and the consuls. As for the Consul of France, he encouraged some of them and drew the government's attention to the need for preventing the occurrence of any incident. But the government reassured him and forbid those Christians who wanted to leave to do so, because Zahlah had been

taken by the Druses and burned, as already mentioned. Travel became very difficult for the Christians because they were separated from their co-religionists and the presence of enemies on the roads. But the French Consul exhorted the zeal of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Maghribī - who had formerly reigned in the west (Algeria), was expelled from there, and now lived in Damascus - to prepare the Algerians living there so that if incidents took place, they would protect the Christians from this misfortune. He (the Consul) paid him ('Abd al-Qadir) a great deal of money so that he could assign (this task to) the Algerians, by hiring them if necessary, and buy arms for them. The consul collected money from the Christian merchants, on behalf of the Consulate, and paid it to 'Abd al-Qadir to complete these plans. Al-Maghribī ('Abd al-Qadir) gathered together all the Algerians living in Damascus and divided among them the weapons and money. They were to be ready, should they find the slightest reason, to come to him. They numbered about 250 men. And he gave likewise to some of the leaders and notables of the town. As for the inclinations of the Government at the time, they were opposed to this, for it (the Government) desired the annihilation of the Christians. The agitation increased day by day, and the Christians were in great fear.

As for the Jews, they paid a large amount of money to the Muslim notables and were given security for their persons and property. Then not a moment passed until the general agitation began, and the Muslims attacked the Christian quarter, on Monday, at the end of June, 1860<sup>286</sup> A.D. They began to loot the houses and burned two or three houses. Then the Government sent troops to the Christian quarter to protect it, equipped with cannon. They stationed themselves in the middle (of the quarter) and the Muslim men drew back somewhat. Then the troops were withdrawn and the Muslims attacked the Christian quarter all that day and looted it. Then on the next day, Tuesday, fires were lit in the Christian quarter. Men were killed and women carried off, and shameful acts committed. Tuesday and Wednesday the killing, looting, and outraging of women continued. They burned the entire Christian quarter and killed whomever they found without mercy, and it made no difference whether he professed Islam or not.<sup>287</sup> They burned the monasteries, foreign and otherwise, along with churches and homes. And what misfortunes, the likes of which have never been seen! But to

---

286. Actually, July 9.

287. i.e. by repeating the Shahādah in order to save himself.

hear about it is not like seeing with one's own eyes, for you would see the men flung on the ground like sheep, The women naked, the children screaming, fires burning, and cries raised from all directions, until the mother would no longer know her son, and the firing of rifles and blow of the sword, and destruction of houses, a thing indescribable and unimaginable to the human heart. The stores and shops in the city were not harmed. Meanwhile 'Abd al-Qādir sent his Algerian men to bring the French Consul to him with his belongings, and protected them in his house. Similarly he sent for the monks of St. Lazarus, with the nuns and the boys and girls with them. He sent all the Algerians present in groups to the Christian quarter and ordered them to bring the Christians under protection without any harm or molesting. Whoever obtained the help of the Algerians kept his life while those who did not, fell dead. The Algerians expended their efforts to rescue the Christians, and likewise the Muhāyinah family in the quarter of al-Maīdān protected the Christians in al-Maīdān without harming them, and protected some in the town as far as possible. The Christians were very much afraid. Some of them fell into wells, some of whom they (the Muslims) rescued and others they killed. Conditions remained in this manner for three

days, with striking, killing, destruction, and burning, and such things. Finally the Christians gathered together with their women and children who escaped from the killing, to confine them in the citadel, and some with 'Abd al-Qādir, chief of the Algerians, because he had kept and protected a large group of Christians by means of his abundant zeal. And after the incidents occurred in Damascus and the Christians were summoned to the citadel, those who remained sent them food so that they should not die, and they remained about 15 days in this manner. It was said that about 4,000 souls were killed in Damascus during this incident, and a large number of women and girls taken captive. As for the English Consul, the Government sent him a detachment of troops for his protection, and as for the Franciscan monks, they were slain in their monastery with those Christians who were with them. The number of those present in their monastery was 35, of whom ten were priests and monks and the rest the people of the town. Now we return to Mount Lebanon.

After Zaḥlah, the Biqā', the Ba'albak country, Dair al-Qamar, Jazzīn, and all those areas were burned, - since there was a general uprising against the Christians - as well as Ḥāṣḥayyā, Rāshayyā, and Damascus, compacts



were made (by the Powers) that the Powers would come with soldiers by sea. (Meanwhile) the Druses from the Matn districts, and the Mutawālīs from the direction of the east in al-Jurd agreed that they would come to Kisrawān and wipe out the Christians from Lebanon. The people of Kisrawān, when they learned that the Mutawālīs and Muslims had sided with the Druses at Zaḥlah, and had plundered and defeated the Christians in the Ba'albak country and the Biqā', and driven them out of their places, - when they learned of this, they rose against the Mutawālīs living in Jubbah al-Munaiṭarah and Lāsā and those areas, defeated them, expelled them from their places, looted their property, and killed some of them.

- 
288. The Druses were prepared to invade Kisrawān, says Churchill, and Khūrshīd had two regiments ready to go there to "protect" the Christians, when the Consuls sent a message to the Druse chiefs, demanding in the strongest terms their forbearance. This had the desired effect.  
(Churchill, The Druses and the Maronites, pp. 199-205).  
Lenormant asserts that it was the final union of the Maronites under Yūsuf Karam that averted the Druse invasion, but I find no corroboration of this.  
(Lenormant, op.cit., pp. 86-7).

Because of all this, at this time this agreement was made by all anti-Christian parties, with the result that the Muslims of Beirut and Tripoli thought to molest the Christians, as had been done in Damascus. But since the Christians of Beirut were more numerous than its Moslims, even not counting the (Christian) strangers and these from Dair al-Qamar, Jazzīn, the Shūf, the Matn, who totaled a great number, they (the Muslims) could not do what they had wanted to. As for Tripoli and al-Dinniyyah, because of the presence of the brave men of Zghartā, Bisharrī, and al-Zāwiyah, they also did not dare fulfill their plan, but instead remained waiting to see what would happen; and (meanwhile) the threat of an uprising became general. <sup>289</sup> As for the people of Kisrawān

Page 120

---

289. Sunday, June 24th was the date set for massacre of the Christians in Beirut. 2,000 Druses had infiltrated the town and were concealed in Muslim houses. (Jessup, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 189). A few days before this, the corpse of a Muslim butcher-boy was found at dawn in the market, apparently killed by a fellow Muslim, since his throat had the cut of a butcher-knife and all Beirut's butchers were Muslims. A Maronite was seized, dragged to the Sarai, and accused of the crime; two witnesses were produced who with the aid of bribery testified to his guilt. Although this was insufficient evidence according to Muslim law, he was convicted and hanged. The Mufti was dismissed by Ahmad Effendi (Khūrshid's deputy) for refusing to sign the sentence. (Lenormant, op.cit., pp. 81-4).

they became afraid and wary of this agreement as much as they could be. Before the (uprising) could take place, in accordance with the above-mentioned compact telegrams were sent to the (European) commanders. First of all a frigate arrived, sent by the Russian Government. Since they (the Russian crew) were determined to proceed,<sup>290</sup> it arrived in Beirut about 4 a.m., although the agreement had been that it would arrive at 8 a.m., when preparations could have been made. When this warship arrived at Beirut, immediately it fired its cannons and displayed signs of great wrath. It fired its cannons like a continuous fire (continuously) and sent word to the government that unless there was restraint (of those planning to attack the Christians) it would fire on Beirut and destroy it. At that, the execution of the intended plan was stopped in order to see what would happen. At 10 a.m. came four French units (ships) loaded with troops and the necessary supplies and munitions, and they fired their cannons like continuous fire at Beirut. The enemies (the Muslims of Beirut) then gave up fulfilling

---

"از هم مهتمين على المسير". 290.

291  
their plans. Afterward ships arrived from all the  
European powers, a unit or two from every kingdom,<sup>292</sup>  
and they fired their cannons. Then other units also  
arrived on behalf of the French Government with 6,000  
equipped troops.<sup>293</sup> They disembarked at Beirut and  
encamped at the pine forest, with their cavalry and all  
that they would need for a period of two years. Then  
ships arrived sent by the Ottoman Government, and with  
them was his Eminent Excellency Fu'ād Pāshā, sent by  
the government to set right and appraise what had  
happened; he was at that time Foreign Minister.<sup>294</sup>

- 
291. This was due not only to the presence of the warships but to the arrival on June 23 of 1800 Ottoman troops under the command of Ismā'il Pāshā (an erstwhile Hungarian Protestant named Kmēly), who took stern steps to assure order. (Jessup, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p. 190)
292. These included five French ships, two British, one Dutch, two Austrian, two Sardinian, one Russian, two Greek, and three Turkish. (Abkarius, *op.cit.*, footnote by Scheltema, p. 144.)
293. These arrived on August 16, under the command of General Beaufort d'Hautpoul, who 20 years before had served in Syria on the staff of Ibrahim Pāshā. (Abkarius, *op.cit.*, introduction by Scheltema, p. 36.)
294. Fu'ād Pāshā reached Beirut on July 17, not after the French army as 'Aqīqī states. He was equipped with absolute powers delegated from the Sultan, with the particular duties of "repression, reparation, and reorganisation." (*Ibid.*, pp. 37-8).

Immediately upon his arrival the blazing fires died down. He set to work, making full use of his superior wisdom, to please the representatives of the Powers who were present. He executed several Druses and banished about 25 of the Druse leaders, including His Excellency Sa'id (more correctly - As'ad) Bey Talhūq, and members of the Janblāt and Abū Nakad families.<sup>295</sup> The French soldiers went up to Dair al-Qamar, and some Englishmen with them, and witnessed the destruction of life and property that had taken place. With them were a crowd

---

295. Khūrshīd Pāshā, his military commander Tahir Pāshā, Sulaimān Nūrī Bey (Turkish commander at Zaḥlah), the Kākhiyā Waṣfī Effendi, and the comptroller Ahmad Effendi, all received sentences of life imprisonment. Eleven Druse shaikhs were sentenced to death, including Sa'id Bey Janblāt, Husain Talhūq, As'ad Talhūq, Qāsim Abū Nakad, As'ad 'Imād, Amīr Muḥammad Qāsim Arslān (a relative of the Qā'im Maqām), Salīm Janblāt, Jamāl al-Dīn Hamdān, Muḥī al-Dīn Shiblī, 'Alī Sa'id, and Bashīr Mīrī Sa'id. Amīr Muḥammad Arslān, the Qā'im Maqām and a youth of about 20 years, received no sentence. Among 33 Druses who had fled and escaped trial were Khaṭṭār 'Imād and Maḥmūd Talhūq. (For a summary of the charges against the above persons and their sentences, see Syria Correspondence, I, p. 440-8).

Churchill asserted in 1862 that "none of these sentences have been carried into execution, whether of death or of penal imprisonment." (The Druses and the Maronites p. 233.)

of the Christians of that area. As for the Druses, they fled before them, and some were hunted down and killed. Fu'ād Pāshā dealt with matters as gently as possible, by financial compensation and soothing people's minds, until he had pleased everyone. He began the rebuilding of Dair al-Qamar with the Sublime State's funds, and with much money indemnified what had been burned and stolen.

He took a great amount of money from the Druses and Muslims. Then a group of the French troops went up to Qubb Ilyās, and Fu'ād Pāshā and some French officers went to Zaḥlah and Damascus and saw what had happened. Immediately after arriving in Damascus Fu'ād Pāshā executed the Pāshā who had been governor of the town at the time of the incidents, for it was confirmed that he had been the cause. He also executed more than 50 of the notables of the town, and took a large amount of money from the Muslims and paid the Christians the value of what had been stolen and burned. The Christians

---

296. Aḥmad Pāshā.

297. Scheltema reports that punishments in Damascus totalled 70 hanged, 115 shot, 147 sentenced to hard labor for life, 186 sentenced to hard labor for a term, 248 banished, and 83 condemned to death by default (in absentia). No one was spared on account of rank or influence. (Abkarius, op.cit., p. 154). Churchill estimates that the 200,000 pounds levied on the Muslims of Damascus for indemnity equalled only a tenth of the value of property destroyed. (The Druses and the Maronites, p. 232).

came back to their homes. The French Army was pleased with such deeds. It had come in order to defend the Christians by whatever means necessary, even if it meant starting war - and its presence, in the opinion of the other states, was for just that purpose. His Excellency Fu'ād Pāshā satisfied the Powers with this work, and he distributed money to the dispossessed Christians of Jazzīn, Dair al-Qamar, the Shūf, the Matn, Zahlah, the Biqā', Ba'albak, Damascus, Hāṣbayyā, Rāshayyā, and everywhere else. How much money he distributed on account of these incidents is not known. A part of it he took from the Muslims, and this was the greatest part. He sent for some of the Christians, so that they should submit a petition acknowledging that he had returned their rights to them. This was done, with the result that he was able to send the French Army away from Lebanon; for only by this means could he accomplish that.<sup>298</sup> Then a new Pāshā ruled over Damascus and Beirut.

---

298. The last French soldier left Syria on June 8, 1861. The original convention between the Powers had provided for an occupation of no more than six months; this however was later extended. (Jessup, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 209).

Page 126 Further Commentary by the Editor

(Quotations):

"As Yusef Karam is supposed to be very much in the hands of the Bishop Tobia ('Ann), I did not think it inadvisable to allow the Greek portion of the Lebanon to have an opportunity of ascertaining the kind of administration they might expect were the whole Mountain consigned to the domination of the Maronites.

"Mr. Novikow (Russia's delegate on the International Commission to organise the affairs of Lebanon) has assured me in confidence that, unless constrained by his Government, he would never consent to have his co-religionists under the sway of such a ruler."<sup>299</sup>

---

299. Original English text, copied from Syria Correspondence, I, p. 358. Dufferin to Bulwer, Nov. 20, 1860. Yazbak's text contains a distortion which reverses the meaning of the first paragraph:

"I think it fitting that the Greeks be allowed to erect an independent government for themselves, if it is desired to extend the rule of the Maronites over the whole of Lebanon."

It is on the basis of this distortion that Yazbak, in the first two pages of his commentary below, makes the implication that Dufferin's intention was to encourage creation of an Orthodox State.



- From Lord Dufferin to the Ambassador of England in Istambul.

"The Druses, like the Christians, are untrustworthy and clothed in hypocrisy..."

- Alison, secretary of the English Embassy in Istambul.

"The Christians of Lebanon are a tribe of ruffians and barbarians, incapable of managing their affairs for themselves, and with the clergy and the aristocracy consumed in mutual hatred, the fires of enmity are now being kindled in their breasts. The peasants of the Maronite feudal estates are rebellious against their chiefs, the holders of the estates."<sup>300</sup>

- Lord Dufferin to the English Ambassador in Istambul.

---

300. This is Yazbak's Arabic version. It may be compared with the original English, which is found in Syria Correspondence, I, p. 463, as follows:

"The various elements which compose its (Lebanon's) population are incapable of governing either each other or themselves. While perpetual strife has deluged the Mixed Districts with blood, an internecive warfare between the peasantry and their feudal chiefs has rendered the Christian Kesronan the theatre of anarchy and crimes not less sanguinary." (Dufferin to Sir H. Bulwer, January 1, 1861)

"The Damascenes are simply fanatical assassins: but...to depict the quarrel between the Druses and the Maronites as an onslaught of savage heathens on the in-offensive followers of Christ's religion, is a simple misrepresentation. It was a feud between two equally barbarious tribes, in which the victors inflicted on their enemies the fate with which they themselves had been threatened. If the contest was distinguished by circumstances of more than usual brutality, it is to be attributed to the interference of the Turks, and the intensity of the hatred which the previous threats and arrogance of the Christians had provoked. In their day of triumph, these last have not proved themselves a whit<sup>301</sup> less blood thirsty than their enemies..."

- Lord Dufferin to the Foreign Secretary of England.

Page 129 We have seen in the foregoing that the Consular Agents of France and Britain, and the officials of the Ottoman Government, succeeded, alas, in inciting rebellion among the Lebanese, and in making it appear that most of the incidents were due to sectarianism.

---

301. Original English text, copied from Ibid., I, pp. 423-4. Lord Dufferin to Lord J. Russell, Dec. 19, 1860.

The masses were driven behind their self-appointed leaders, susceptible as they were to this hateful agitation, and evil spread.

The European Powers were on the lookout for that awaited day, and in its course they did much. France hastened to send a military force whose ostensible purpose was to protect the Christians, but whose real aim was the final occupation of Lebanon and Syria. London was worried by these measures and worked with the European powers to send a commission to Lebanon, representing the Ottoman Sultanate, Prussia, Austria, Russia, France, and England, on the pretext of establishing a system of rule there, indemnifying its (Lebanon's) victims, and preventing recurrence of the outbreaks there. But the real intention in all that was to thwart the plans of the Paris Government, with which she was competing to plant her foot in lands neighbouring the route to India.

A new theme appeared which the Mountain had never heard before that time. This was none other than the finding of an "Orthodox entity!" Having succeeded in slicing Lebanon into Druses and Christians, imperialism was not satisfied with this disaster that it had brought down upon the country. Lord Dufferin,

England's representative on the International Commission, began to urge his colleague the Russian delegate to ask for an Independent Orthodox Government so that the sons of this community should not be subordinated to the yoke of the Maronites...

Participating in the hatching of this new plot were the clergymen of the American Missions, all of whom worked in this path, intriguing and deceiving. England's intention was to lessen the French influence which used to, and still does, unnerve and disturb them in this part of the East. Lord Dufferin himself admitted in one of his dispatches that he had resolved to incite his French and Russian colleagues on the International Commission to disagree in their opinions, in order to execute his own policy. <sup>302</sup> In all the

---

302. (Y) On the 15th of November 1860, Lord Dufferin, English representative on the commission to reorganise the regime in Lebanon, wrote to the Ambassador of his Government in the Turkish capital in which he said to him:<sup>K</sup>

"I have reason to believe that Mr. Béclard (the French member of the said commission) is striving to secure the appointment of Yusef Kerami (Yüsuf Karam) as Amir of Lebanon. This Yusef Kerami may be looked on as the tool of Bishop Tobia ('Aun) and the Maronite clergy.

political records one finds a large body of such scandals

---

His appointment to the Kaimakamship will prove distasteful to the aristocratical portion of his own nation (sect), while the extension of his jurisdiction over the members of the Greek Community would displease Russia in that it would be harmful to her interests.

"From a conversation I had to-day with Mr. Novikow (the Russian delegate on the International Commission), it is very evident that he attributes the formation of this plan to Mr. Béclard. I am not as yet prepared to say whether, if unable to carry out his idea of an Independent Greek Autonomy, it would be from the domination of the Turks or from that of the Maronites he would prefer to rescue his co-religionists. Hostile as he is to the former, I think his horror of the latter (i.e., for the Maronites) is still greater...

"...at all events, it is pretty certain Russia would not behold with pleasure the undisputed ascendancy of the Maronites in Lebanon.

"Under these circumstances I propose to encourage the French and Russian Commissioners to urge their respective positions. Should it become apparent that their views are irreconcilable, it might then be a not unfitting opportunity to propose the adoption of that plan which, to my mind, offers, with all its drawbacks, the least objectionable solution of the difficulty."

Al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah, Vol. III, p. 87.

Page 131 committed by European and Ottoman imperialism, to divide our country against itself and gain control over its destinies, neither merciful nor compassionate.

The Druses expected that the Turkish officials would look favorably on their action in slaughtering their brothers, the Christians, because they were Muslims like them, even if they were of a different sect. They submitted to this belief, ignorant of

---

(K) This text follows Yazbak's Arabic version and contains a number of departures from the original English, which is found in Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria, I, p. 337.

The incorrect passages appear in the original dispatch as follows:

"I have reason to believe that Mr. Béclard entertains a faint expectation that the Yusef Kerami I mentioned in my last dispatch may be worked up into a Prince of the Mountain..."

"...the extension of his jurisdiction over the members of the Greek Community would be considered by the Russian interest an intolerable indignity."

"...it is very evident that (Mr. Novikow) dreads the consummation of such a plan as has been devised by Mr. Béclard, but I am not as yet prepared to say whether, if unable to carry out his idea...it would be to the domination of the Turks or to that of the Maronites he would prefer to deliver over his co-religionists..." (Dufferin to Sir. H. Bulwer, Nov. 15, 1860).

the fact that Turkey's sympathies in their regard were that the two groups should destroy each other and be wiped out together, so that Turkey might govern the Mountain directly. When the evil intentions of the Turks became clear to some of the (Druse) elders, they conceived an uneasiness in their minds, and Shaikh Husain Talhūq uttered his historic phrase: "I fear that the Ottoman State is employing us to strike at others (i.e., to strike at the Maronites) and that it will not hesitate to return and attack us." When the fears of this leader had been borne out, and disaster had settled on the Druses, Sa'Id Janblāt said to Ghandūr al-Sa'd who had come to visit him in his prison: "You (the Maronites) foresaw it and we (the Druses) foresaw it, and we both fell into it..." The two statements indicate bitter repentance, but the hour was too late to repent.

303

---

303. (Y) Most of the paragraphs published in the introductions to the chapters of this book, which are quotations from politicians on the affairs of Lebanon and its incidents which we are dealing with, have been taken from Majmū'ah al-Muharrarāt al-Siyāsiyyah.

There is no better indication of the wickedness of those Ottoman officials and of their evil intent, than their wrath against the best of the Muslims who retained their spiritual virtues and their human sympathies and were unmoved by the intrigues of the Turks, but rather were sympathetic with the dispersed unfortunates. Lord Dufferin related in one of his messages to the English Ambassador in Constantinople that the Turkish Government was "disturbed by those Muslims who protected the Christians during the massacres,"<sup>304</sup> in Damascus, and that the Wālī, Amīn Pāshā, "removed from membership in the Council (Majlis) one of the principal Muslims who was well known for his help to the Christians and saving their lives..."<sup>305</sup>

Page 133 Anṭūn Dāhir al-'Aqīqī mentioned that the generous family of al-Muhāyinī, which was devoutly Muslim, holding fast to the teachings of its religion, protected the Christians, and many who possessed humane qualities followed their example. Some of the most virtuous Druses acted likewise at a time when they were in the midst of the conflagration. The

---

304. (Y) Al-Muharrāt al-Siyasiyyah,  
Vol. III, p. 106.

305. (Y) Ibid., p. 404.



leader of the French expedition, De Beaufort, says in one of his reports to the Minister of War in Paris that it was many of the Muslim chieftains in the cities of Palestine who protected the Christians from... The Government officials, and that "when the Christians (in Galilee) had escaped, all declared that when they had no confidence in the Turks' officials, because of the confirmed bad intentions and incompetence of the latter, they owed their salvation to 'Aqīl Āghā, the Bedouin Chief."<sup>306</sup>

All this testimony confirms that the sons of these lands were not created for bigotry and hatred, and that that fiery storm that raged over them was lighted by the feudalists and fanned by the foreigners.

We do not know to what extent it is reasonable to accuse the Khāzin family of prearranging this civil war so that the foreign powers might intervene in the affairs of Lebanon, in hopes of putting an end to the republican government proclaimed by the noble and patriotic revolutionary and glorious popular leader, Ṭānyūs

---

306. (Y) Ibid., p. 294.

Shāhīn, and in hopes that they - the Khāzins - would return to their previous authority. We have seen them (p. 81) sending messages to their colleagues and allies, the Druse feudalists, urging them to crush the popular awakening in its cradle. In other words, Maronites were asking Druses for help in defeating Maronites... Then we saw them inciting the Consuls against the rebels in Kisrawān. When the fires of civil war were lit and the Consuls, the feudalists, and some Maronite bishops worked to widen the breach, the people were affected by this sinful incitement. They forgot about their oppressors and hastened to take the field against their brothers, oppressed like them. But the misleading claim represented them (the Druses) to them (the Maronites) as enemies, and the course of the revolution was changed!

What the Lebanese reaped from that was that they were subordinated to the intrigues of the foreigners and made their (the foreigners') desires come true, only to receive insults and scorn in return! The representatives of the Powers, and especially the English, started to vilify the reputation of the Druses and Christians together, and depict them to European public opinion as rascals, barbarians, and wild beasts!

To this day we still hear the words: "Sales

Syriens! Sales Libanais! ... "from all foreigners,  
and yet insist on prostrating ourselves at their feet!

CHAPTER IV.

YŪSUF BEY KARAM

## CHAPTER IV.

### Commentary by the Translator

This chapter may be regarded as a postscript to the body of Yazbak's publication, the chief concern of the latter being the events of 1840 to 1860. The career of Yūsuf Bey Karam has little to do with those events, and a brief comment on him is appropriate only because the following pages of translation from part of 'Aqīqī manuscript.

We have already had a few glimpses of Karam, in his quarrel with his brother Mikhāyil over title to the Muqāṭa'ah of Bisharrī and in the part he played during the massacre at Zaḥlah in 1860. In 1845 he had taken the lead in protecting the newly elected Patriarch Yūsuf al-Khāzin at al-Dīmān by driving off a crowd of the Patriarch's opponents who sought to intimidate him into renouncing his  
307  
new position.

He enjoyed a great reputation for piety and sense of honour and was by 1860 a favorite with the Maronite clergy and population at large;  
308  
there was little love lost between him and the

---

307. Poujoulat, op.cit., pp. 373-4.

308. See Ibid., p. 374, and Souvenirs de Syrie, pp. 48-50. Poujoulat refutes the legends that Karam was a godson of the Prince de Joinville and that he had been educated at the Lazarite College at 'Anṭūrah.  
(op.cit., p. 371)

English in Lebanon generally. In 1857 the British Consul at Beirut reported Karam and his followers from Ihdin and Zghartā had picked a quarrel with the people of near-by Bisharrī. Karam, wrote the Consul, represented those Maronites considering themselves "les Francais de l'Orient;" the Bisharrī inhabitants were more reliant on England and were becoming known as "the English party." Karam, under close French sponsorship, was in frequent consultation with the French Consul and receiving French arms; a minor war was raging between the two parties.<sup>309</sup>

Lord Dufferin wrote in 1860 of Karam, "He is a young man of about 33 (he was actually 37 at the time), speaks French, and seems pretty intelligent; but I observed nothing in his conversation or countenance that impressed me ... The antecedents of his family are obscure. His father was the first of the race who assumed the title of Sheikh, and Yusef himself only shared a Mokata with his elder brother."<sup>310</sup>

In the summer of 1860, after the massacres, Karam was charged with formation of a squadron of 200 Maronite horsemen to police the coastal area between Beirut and Tripoli.<sup>311</sup> On November 18 he was named Qā'im Maqām of the

---

309. British Consular Files. Moore to Stratford, No. 47, July 21, 1857.

310. Syria Correspondence, I, p. 357. Dufferin To Bulwer, Nov. 20, 1860.

311. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 28.

Christians, replacing Bashīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama', thereby becoming the first Maronite chief since the Turkish conquest in 1516 not to be of noble family origin, a fact which was viewed with great distaste by the amīrs and shaikhs of the country.<sup>312</sup> On the eve of his appointment Dufferin had commented that "it is probable his appointment will cause great dissatisfaction among the Maronite Sheikhs, who dread his anti-feudal tendencies and despise his mean extraction." Karam was "the tool of Bishop Tobia and the Maronite clergy."<sup>313</sup>

The French liked him. "Il a l'insigne honneur d'être detesté par les Anglais," was Poujoulat's opinion. "Aussi bien, il ne serait pas Karam si les Anglais pouvaient l'aimer! Joseph est Maronite-français, catholique, je ne puis me lasser de le dire..."<sup>314</sup>

After Karam had asserted his authority as Qā'im Maqām by occupying Kisrawān and expelling Ṭanyūs Shāhīn for the refusal of the latter to cooperate in tax collection,<sup>315</sup>

---

312. Ibid., p. 368. After three months in Office he was said to have "thrown into prison certain Christian notables for having addressed him as 'the eminent and revered Bek' (Bey) instead of 'the Majestic Bek'." (Syria Correspondence, I, p. 628. Dufferin to Bulwer, Feb. 15, 1861.)

313. Ibid., I, p. 536.

314. Poujoulat, op. cit., p. 372.

315. See below, 'Aqīqī text and Footnote No.

opinions began to change. In reporting Karam's success Lord Dufferin commented that "the conduct of the Christian Kaimakam seems to have been most praiseworthy," while Tānyūs received the protection of France, much to Karam's irritation, inasmuch as he had orders from the Turkish Government for Tānyūs' arrest.<sup>316</sup> The latter went to Beirut and took refuge with the French Consul, who called on the Qā'im Maqām to restore his property to him.<sup>317</sup> General Beaufort, commander of the French expeditionary force, and the Maronite Patriarch then brought Tānyūs and Karam to a partial reconciliation by which the latter renounced his personal charges against the rebel but refused an official pardon, while Tānyūs was to leave Kisrawān and remain on good behaviour.<sup>318</sup>

---

316. Syria Correspondence, II, p. 152. Dufferin to Bulwer, April 20, 1861.

317. Ibid., II, p. 134. Moore to Bulwer, April 11, 1860.

318. Ibid., II, pp. 152-4. Statement by Karam to Moore. April 15, 1861. The French tried without success to prevail upon Ahmad Pāshā, the Mushīr, to admit Tānyūs' innocence; Beaufort threatened that were Tānyūs arrested, he would release him by force. (Ibid., II, p. 144. Col. Burnaby to Dufferin.) A further source of irritation between Karam and Beaufort was the former's complaint that the French Commander and his subordinates were engaged in soliciting petitions for the return of Shihāb sovereignty to Lebanon, the favored candidate being Amīr Majīd Shihāb. (Ibid., pp. 152-4.)



This episode had brought a turnabout in Karam's position and for the time led him under British favor against the French. When his brief period of office came to an end in May, it was to the British Consul that he wrote to express his gratitude for the support received from that quarter and to pledge his future loyalty.<sup>319</sup>

In these circumstances, it appears that Karam's later opposition to Dāwūd Pāshā was in part conditioned by his disappointment in the fall of his own political fortunes and in the failure of France and the Maronite Church to continue to support him, as well as the more evident fact that it was Dāwūd who succeeded to Karam's authority.

Nevertheless Karam, once in exile, reserved his greatest bitterness for Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad, whom he held responsible for preventing his return. In a letter to the French Government and the Pope, he complained that Mas'ad's policies had proved ruinous to the Maronites and that his encouragement of Tānyūs Shāhīn's rebellion had led to the 1860 massacres and thereby lost for the Maronites their remaining degree of autonomy.<sup>320</sup> He accused Mas'ad of fomenting trouble among the Maronites, giving his own bishops no chance to express their sympathy for Karam, abetting Dāwūd Pāshā's

---

319. Ibid., II, p. 277. Moore to Bulwer, May 18, 1861.

320. "Et cela (the Kisrawan revolt) fit croître l'esprit de dissention entre les chefs et les habitants dans tout le Liban." ('Adrah, op. cit., Appendix II, p. 4.)

disregard of the law, and in general leaving the Maronite community weak in the face of the dangers confronting it. Most important, "le Patriarche voulant suivre son ancien projet de ne pas accorder aux maronites un chef civil, s'efforce de convaincre et d'amener le Moutsarref (Dāwūd) à m'interdire le retour au Liban."<sup>321</sup>

After the fall of the French Empire, Karam sought the good offices of the Third Republic to secure his return from exile. The French Ambassador at the Porte, Comte Melchior de Vogüé, obtained a favorable view from the Ottoman authorities, but the question was referred to Mas'ad, who declined to assent on the grounds that Karam's return would be "inappropriate" and likely to cause trouble. The Porte persuaded Vogüé that the Patriarch in his "zeal and far-sightedness" knew best, and the case was closed.<sup>322</sup>

What were the Patriarch's motives? Karam's biographer sums them up as follows:

"Yūsuf Karam had always supported the principle of separation of the spiritual and temporal authorities and said that the Maronite Patriarch, in his capacity as head

---

321. Ibid., p. 29. He went so far as to accuse Mas'ad of financial dishonesty, saying that Michel Tūbiyyā, a well-known and wealthy benefactor of Karam, had on his death left a third of his estate in the charge of the Patriarch to be given to a medical college. The college was later abandoned and the money disappeared. (Ibid., p. 21.)

322. Saj'ān al-Khāzin, Yūsuf Bey Karam fī'l-manfā, pp. 113-6.

of the Maronite Church, should only concern himself with affairs of the Church, and that only in this good work could he preserve his authority and high station, and should everyone tender him respect and obedience ... Karam had defended this valid principle in his youth, at the time he was Qā'im Maqām of the Christians of Lebanon, and during his conflict with Dāwūd Pāshā. He likewise defended it throughout the period of his exile. It was evident that Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad would oppose Karam's return to Lebanon, as long as he was the standard bearer of freedom in the country'." But he concealed these motives, saying instead that "Karam's return to Lebanon would in itself excite disturbances in the country."<sup>323</sup>

Yūsuf Karam's exile continued from the day he sailed for Algeria in 1867 to his death in 1879. He remained only one year in Algeria, going from there to Paris, then Brussels, Vienna, Rome and Corfu. At Corfu he made an attempt to organise an armed force with which to return to Lebanon; failing in this, he returned to Rome.<sup>324</sup> Following the death of Franco Pāshā, who had succeeded Dāwūd for a brief period as Mutaṣarrif, Karam went to the Ottoman capital to seek permission to return, but without success. He was offered by the Grand Vizier, Rashīd Pāshā, a "suitable" post in the Ottoman Government, which he declined.<sup>325</sup> Before leaving

---

323. Ibid., p. 117

324. Ibid., pp. 85-95.

325. Ibid., pp. 173-5. The writer does not state where the post would be. Karam himself wrote of the effort of Patriarch Mas'ad

Constantinople he made one more attempt, no more fruitful than the first, to organise an armed expedition to "save" the Lebanon.<sup>326</sup>

He returned to Italy and in 1878, according to Khāzin, abandoned politics "to devote his life to the service of God." He made two final appeals to the Porte in 1888 and 1889 to be allowed to return peaceably to his native land, pledging his obedience to the authorities; both requests went unanswered. Yūsuf Dibs, Maronite Bishop of Beirut, attempted to secure a reconciliation between Karam and Patriarch Mas'ad which failed when the exile consented to "forgiveness" between himself and the latter only on a reciprocal basis.<sup>327</sup>

He died on April 7, 1889, in Razzina, Italy, of pneumonia, having spent the last 22 years of his life in exile.<sup>328</sup> His body was brought to his native village of Ihdin a few months later<sup>329</sup> and may still be seen preserved in state in the village church, honoured to the present day as the remains of a martyr to the Maronite political cause.

---

to persuade him to accept employment in Dāwūd Pasha's administration in Lebanon (this was before Karam's visit to Constantinople), thereby signifying his subservience to the Mutaṣarrif; but he was unwilling to end his exile on these compromising terms. ('Adrah, op. cit., Appendix II, p. 11.) -

326. Saj'ān al Khāzin, op. cit., pp. 235 ff.

327. Ibid., pp. 388-91.

328. Ibid., pp. 391-2

329. Ibid., p. 444.

The Manuscript

Page 135

Then Yūsuf Bey Karam of Ihdin ruled over all of Lebanon. He employed all means to secure the removal of the French troops from these parts, and after he had employed effective measures for six months, the French soldiers were removed from Lebanon and went away empty-handed. Yūsuf Bey Karam ruled over all of Lebanon <sup>330</sup> for about four or five months by order of Fu'ād Pāshā, the Grand Vizier; <sup>331</sup> the situation was calm and conditions were quiet in all parts (of the country). Rebuilding of what had been burned began in all districts, and the Christians returned to their homes everywhere. Yūsuf Bey Karam ruled in the Mountain, as mentioned. During that time there were some causes of trouble between him and Ṭānyūs Shāhīn. He (Karam) went up to him from Jūniyah to Raifūn, and with him were some people from Ghūṣṭā, Ghādīr, and al-Zūq. Ṭānyūs had men from 'Ashqūt, al-Qlai'āt, and elsewhere,

---

330. More correctly, only the Christian Qā'im Maqāmiyyah.

331. Nā'ib al-Shaukatlū: literally, the deputy of him who has authority (the Sultan).

and the two parties clashed above 'Ashqūt.<sup>332</sup>  
There was light rifle fire without anyone being harmed, except for one of Yūsuf Bey Karam's followers from the region of Ḥāṣḥbayyā who was wounded. Finally Ṭānyūs fled with those who were with him. Yūsuf Bey came to Raifūn and settled in the Raifūn schoolhouse, and ordered the looting of Ṭānyūs Shāhīn's house. They plundered it of everything in it, and Ṭānyūs took to his heels secretly.<sup>333</sup> It was said that all that was the idea of his Beatitude (the Patriarch), for certain reasons. Since Ṭānyūs was especially under the protection of the French Order of St. Lazarus,

---

332. The cause of trouble was Ṭānyūs' refusal to collect and pay the mīrī tax; Karam had come to enforce payment. (Syria Correspondence, II, pp. 152-4. Statement by Karam to Nevin Moore, British Consul at Beirut, April 15, 1861).

On November 16, 1860, an assembly of the people of al-Zūq had announced their willingness to pay taxes to no one but Yūsuf Karam. It was in part for this purpose that he was named Qā'im Maqām two days later and encouraged by Fu'ād Pāshā to expel Ṭānyūs Shāhīn. (Poujoulat, op.cit., p. 367.)

333. On March 29, 1861, Lord Dufferin wrote to Sir Henry Bulwer at the Porte that Karam had established the authority of his government in Kisrawān. "A few days ago Keram took advantage of a hostile demonstration on the part of Shahin, to march into his country, disperse his followers, and garrison all the revolted villages with his own police. Shahin himself is now in flight." (Syria Correspondence, II, p. 34.)

and the commander of the French troops, called Abū Fūr (Beaufort) had visited him previously, he (Ṭānyūs) remained hopeful, but to no avail. Then afterward Yūsuf Bey returned to Sakhr Jūniyah and began to send tax-collectors to all places, after he had become Kapudji Bāshī<sup>334</sup> by order of the sublime government. Affairs progressed and conditions improved somewhat, and he collected the collective village (Mīrī) taxes from the country. His orders were issued to everyone, landholders and others, and no order was disobeyed. He seized a number of hostages from the country and put them in prison. All that was before the departure of the French army from here, and great honor was done to him. As for the Khāzins, they remained outside Kisrawān because of the fear that was upon them and all that had happened to the Khāzin Shaikhs in the way of persecution, hatred, expulsion from their homes, contempt, sequestration of their property by injustice, tyranny, and

---

334. "قبجي باشي"  
Literally in Turkish, "head of the door-keepers." A high officer in the Sultan's palace retinue; here, a military rank.

335  
aggression. But despite all this we see not a single one of them turning away from his upright faith, and nothing occurred neither on the part of all of them as a group, nor of the individuals among them, that would damage their religious and temporal reputation. Indeed they were steadfast in keeping to their principles of piety and personal honour, and their homes and places of residence remained - even though they were outside their original homes - in accordance with their station and their honour. Nevertheless it seemed to some of them, and to others, that the source of what had happened to them lay chiefly with the clergy; and yet we saw them enhanced by every laudatory description and reputed for pious works, despite all they were offered by others to depart from their principles, whether by the Protestants or by others.

---

335. The Khāzins, wrote Dufferin, were unable to regain their rights and return to Kisrawān because of the hostility of Bishop Tūbiyyā and the Maronite clergy. They had been "a little too tenacious of their aristocratic privileges," and offended by Karam's invitation to submit their claims to his court "because it was not couched in the precise terms of honour they consider due to their station." Karam, for his part, as their inferior in origin was "a little too imperative" in setting his conditions." (Syria Correspondence, II, p. 34. Dufferin to Bulwer, March 29, 1861.)



They took no account of that; to them it was better to lose their temporal honour and their wealth, so long as they kept their religious honour, which is unceasing. In truth, they are a noble family. They deserve every measure of pride, praise, and eulogy, and I ask Him, may He be exalted, to be gracious unto all of them, that they may be an example to others; for a man is known by testing.

As for the presents they offered to the government, they were intermittent. They bribed the Ottoman Wālīs for the return of their rights, and they followed these methods without benefit, for the purpose of the Wālīs was the destruction of persons of rank, them (the Khāzins) and others. Because of this, action of this type was not effective for them, and they paid so much bribery to the Wālīs that a great deal of expenses accumulated on them, until most of them were deep in debts which increased with daily interest rates. Add to that the barrenness of the harvests and the lack of income from the fruits of the earth, and you have another reason why their debts increased, while they continued to maintain their standard of living and their generosity, etc. Then, after the time had passed of Yūsuf Bey Karam's government in Lebanon, there came to

this Mount on behalf of the Sublime State, by high decree and on the advice of the Allied Powers, after the excellent reforms and measures of the Powers, His Excellency Effendi Dāwūd Pāshā, an Armenian Catholic, to be Mutaṣarrif over Mount Lebanon in its entirety, in accordance with the new order that took place in Istambul the Sublime, on advice of the Powers. His arrival here was late in the year 1860,<sup>336</sup> in the days of His Majesty 'Abdul 'Aziz, for His Majesty 'Abdul Majīd Khān had died during these events, and his brother, 'Abdul 'Aziz Khān, had occupied the throne. So His Excellency Dāwūd Pāshā arrived, and was under the surveillance of the esteemed Government of France. He started to stamp out the fires of discord between the Christians and the Druses in the region of Jabal-al-Shūf and elsewhere. Buildings belonging to the Christians increased daily in Dair al-Qamar, Zaḥlah, and everywhere. He ruled with the greatest justice, and appointed in Lebanon a director (Mudīr) under him in every district (Muqāṭa'ah). He set up a Council (Dīwān)

---

336. More correctly, he was invested in office June 22, 1861. (Syria Correspondence, II, p. 331.)

to be especially under him, which he named "consultative" and then in the capital of his Mutaṣarrifiyyah - first in Dair al-Qamar and then in Bait al-Din - a judicial council (Majlis) composed of six judges, one from each religious sect, and a member to represent himself. He also established an administrative council composed of one member from each Muqāṭa'ah; a council called the Arab Office (Qalam 'Arabī) and another called the Foreign Office (Qalam Ajnabī); <sup>337</sup> a center for the postal service and one like it for the Lebanese Gazette, for which he imported a printing press at his own expense. He arranged that every village would have a Shaikh Ṣulḥ (Justice of the Peace) together with a Mukhtār (Mayor) or two Mukhtārs, according to the size of the village. In every Muqāṭa'ah he established a Judicial Council composed of members in accordance with the sects located in that district. He gave orders to the Druses to remain in their own localities, in order that there should not be a second cause (for disorders), and to this end he ordered that Dair al-Qamar should be for the Christians,

---

337. For interior and foreign affairs, apparently.

without Druses living there; that was by official decree. He also urged the Druses to remove the full amount of their property from the Dair, and this they refused to do, although a few of them complied, while some have not done so to the present time. Some of them went to Ḥaurān and some to the Qadās of Shūf and Matn. Reconstruction began in the Dair and the other places that had been burned. The people were at peace, but they had scarcely calmed down for a moment when agitation began in the north of Lebanon against the Mutaṣarrif, Dāwūd Pāshā. Some wanted him replaced and presented their reasons for it, and spoke about him in an unnecessary (improper) way, in every part of North Lebanon. As for His Excellency, he began treating the people gently and promising them improvements, saying that he desired the success and tranquillity of the country and its rebuilding, as in truth he did, relying on the support of France. But these incidents were prompted by the intrigues of several agents of the Sublime State. As it is said, God knows best. Some people objected that he was taking more (money) from the country than the requested amount, for the amount requested of the country had previously been fixed at no more than 3500 bags, and he was now asking for 7000 bags.

Page 139 As for His Excellency, he replied that this matter was dependent upon the Government (at Istambul), not on him. He urged his Beatitude Patriarch Būlus, who was the incumbent Maronite Patriarch, and the bishops and the leaders of the country to present the grievance about that to the Sublime State, saying that he would give them what help they needed to the best of his ability; but this was to no avail. He ordered that a survey of property be begun, starting with South Lebanon, by six teams, or rather squadrons, each team being composed of six selected men, one sent by each sect. Each team had one chief and two clerks, plus one clerk who was of the village where the squadron was, to keep one register in the village, and the survey officials, headed by a Maronite and a Druse. They surveyed the property until the year 1863, and had completed the survey as far as Dog River (Nahr al-Kalb) when troubles began in the country and the agitation increased. His Excellency (Dāwūd Pāshā) at this time organised the Lebanese Army, totalling about 800 men and officers. Its commander and organiser was the then famous Frenchman Altap.<sup>338</sup> He sent a squadron of men to

---

338. Spelled by 'Aqīqī " <sup>قَطَاب</sup>  
(Qaltāb) but by Karam "Altap".  
(See 'Adrah, op.cit., Appendix II,  
p. 15.)

Jūniyah. His Excellency also went to Jūniyah and stayed in the soap-factory, to supervise the country. Some people were submissive and obedient to him, and others not. He stayed for a time and then went to Ghazīr, where he stationed a body of troops. Then he went up to Dair Bzummār and then went on to Jubail, Batrūn, al-Zāwiyyah, and Bisharrī, and returned to Bait al-Dīn. Governing these areas under his (Dāwūd's) command was Amīr Majīd Shihāb. The collective village (Mīrī) taxes continued to be paid to the amount of half what had been asked for a three year period, for he (the Amīr) had arranged for it to be taken in two parts, as a boon to the people. They paid a part and left the other. <sup>339</sup> As for His Excellency, he advised them to behave amicably and peacefully and not to do anything that would require punishment. He was most generous to all. No one who has come to Lebanon has equalled his munificence and zeal. He was wealthy, but was not concerned with his wealth; he had a very penetrating mind and abundant zeal, especially with his mediators, the French Government. But his efforts went

---

339. i.e. pending a decision on their complaint.

uselessly, without benefit, although he was well prepared to make Lebanon independent by itself, and one of the great vilayets, for he arranged its affairs well and made it worthy of imitation. Despite all this, unhappily for the country, he could not accomplish what he desired, for no time passed before disputes arose between him and some of the people, especially in the area of al-Zāwiyah. The people there were led by Yūsuf Bey Karam. He staged meetings and sent messages in all directions in this particular. Among other things, when his Excellency was in Jūniyah together with a body of soldiers, some of the ignorant people of the country came down to just above Ghādīr and began unseemly chanting and fired bullets. <sup>340</sup> The

---

340. Karam's own later explanation was that he had come to pay a visit to the Mutaṣarrif, and that the armed body of supporters accompanied him and fired bullets in the air in accordance with the legitimate custom of the country. Dāwūd Pāshā mistook this for a hostile demonstration and attacked Karam's men. Karam thus became an outlaw unwillingly through this misunderstanding; the Pāshā vowed to take him dead or alive. ('Adrah, op.cit., Appendix II, p. 12.)

soldiers who were with him came up to meet them, after he enjoined them (the soldiers) not to shoot to kill, since he was well aware of the smallness of their intelligence and of their ignorance. He did however find some people of reasonable mind, such as Yūḥannā Bey Abū Ṣa'b. The Bishops were present with his Beatitude at the monastery of Bkirkī. They intervened and kept the people of the country from what they wanted (to do). Nevertheless his Excellency underwent a change of mind over this affair which was full of ignorance and wanted to send troops to 'Ashqūt, Dar'ūn, and elsewhere; but the Bishops laid their plea before him and persuaded him to issue a decree of pardon to those ignorant men, and so they (the Bishops) prevented these infections and harmful incidents from happening.

Page 141

Conditions became quiet for a time. Then he stationed a squadron of troops in Ghazīr, and a few men in Jūniyah and Jubail. At that time communications were sent by the people of Kisrawān to His Excellency Yūsuf Bey Karam of Zghartā, that they did not want the government of Dāwūd Pāshā in Lebanon. The movement continued to grow and increase until the year 1866, when the agreement was made that Yūsuf Bey would come with his men to the sea road, while the people of Kisrawān would come down from there and drive the troops from Ghazīr and



Dāwūd Pāshā from Jūniyah. An agreement was reached with some of the people of Ghazīr also, and there was intrigue on the part of certain men of the (Ottoman) Government in order to drive Dāwūd Pāshā from Lebanon, because he was protected and supported by the government of France. Fearful of the consequences, they employed these means. Yūsuf Bey Karam arrived at the sea road together with Amīr Sulaiman al-Ḥarfūsh, who had incurred the Government's anger, and a large army from al-Zāwiah, al-Jabbah, Batrūn, and the Jubail country. They came to al-Raṣīf. A crowd meanwhile came down from the country (of Kisrawān) and they joined together at Ghūstā. Then on the second day they descended on the troops in Ghazīr, in accordance with the agreement, and Yūsuf Bey came up to al-Raṣīf, and the trouble began in the two places with the troops. But the people of Ghazīr betrayed their promise and fought on the side of the troops, who numbered about 400 men, while Yūsuf Bey Karam was defeated at al-Raṣīf and retreated. Of his forces two men were killed, one of whom was taken to Jūniyah to Dāwūd Pāshā. The forces of Kisrawān were also defeated. One of their number was killed, a man from 'Ashqūt, and five were wounded. As for the army (of Dāwūd Pāshā) they lost one man killed and an unknown number wounded. The

fighting continued until three hours before sunset. Then the army descended on its return as far as the village of Shnan'ir, looted it, killed four of its men, and returned to Ghazir. Here relations with the people of Ghazir became estranged because of the treachery. That was at the beginning of the year 1867. After that Dāwūd Pāshā wanted to send an army to the villages of the country and arrest persons who had been the cause of this affair. Among them were Bākhūs Abū Ghālib of 'Ashqūt, Ṭannūs Sarābyūt (more correctly: Sarābyūn) and As'ad Ramyā of Ghūṣṭā, Nāṣīf al-Khūrī Khalīl of Mairūbā, Hābīl 'Aqīqī of Kafar Dabyān, and several others as well. The agent ('Āmil) at that time in the mountain villages was Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn of Raifūn, whom we have mentioned before. He laid his plea before His Excellency, with the result that the latter gave up the idea of sending the troops, although he continued to demand the men. Then a plea was put before him while he was at the monastery of Mār Anṭūnyūs Khashabū concerning the excessiveness of communal (Mirī) taxes, and asking that he not collect the first part, that is half of what had been asked for the period 1277 A.H. to 1280 A.H. and that he ask the state at this time to renounce the money, on account of the poverty of the country. After

Yūsuf Bey Karam had returned to his home he remained rebellious against His Excellency. He would not permit payment of taxes on any basis other than that of 3500 bags (i.e. half the tax levied). He threatened the Government officers and would not accept them. The authorities did not have their complete freedom (of action), while there were plots by certain people from Kisrawān, that they and he (Yūsuf Bey) would work along similar lines. His Excellency had imposed the "Dīmūs" (tithes) in Kisrawān, also, and in the Jubail country, and imposed a tax of 1/12 on each load of paper, 1/12 on each bucket of wheat, <sup>341</sup> fifteen piastres on vineyard products, and olives, and on other items 1/24. When his Excellency learned of this agitation against the Government, he ordered the arrest of those mentioned above. Bākhūs Abū Ghālib, Hābīl al-'Aqīqī, Ṭannus Sarābyūn, and As'ad Ramyā of Kisrawān. He declared that whoever brought one of these men to him would receive great honours from his generous hand. As for Nāṣīf al-Khūrī of Mairūbā, he employed a mediator and sought the favor of His Excellency's and

---

341. "بدار من الفح"

as for Tannūs Sarābyūn, there was no news of him. As for the three from Kisrawān - Bākhūs Abū Ghālib, As'ad Ramyā, and Hābīl 'Aqīqī - the demand for them continued, until he posted notice in Jūniyah that whoever brought one of them to him would receive honours. Those whose names we have mentioned fled from place to place, until one day Bākhūs Abū Ghālib was discovered by chance in 'Ashqūt. The officers (who found him) were four in number, and he fled before them, with a man from 'Ashqūt whose name was Manṣūr Dūmiṭ. He took refuge in the valley, and there was shooting of rifles between them, and he fled. The demand for them continued. Yūsuf Bey Karam formed an illustrious society in al-Zāwiyah in the area of Zghartā, distributed munitions, and taught them how to fight. All preparations were made for trouble. His Excellency sent troops to the Zāwiyah district. Yūsuf Bey confronted him and denied him entrance to the town. He came with his men near Bilād Jubāil and began to threaten the constables of the Government wherever they were. With him were some men from Kisrawān and also from Bilād Jubail, al-Jabbah, and Batrūn. Finally there was fighting between him and the people of Amyūn. He came and robbed them and injured some of them because they were on the side of the

Government. He stayed a few days in al-Kūrah, in a place called Rās Kaifā. Then troops from Tripoli came to him and there were a number of incidents between them, but without result. The forces of the (Turkish) State and the national (Lebanese) troops were watching over him without result. Finally an army came up from Tripoli numbering about 2500 troops, plus the national army of about 600 men. The trouble between them started near Zghartā, without either side being defeated. Then it was renewed by the two sides and a great second battle was fought. The Government (Turkish) troops entered Zghartā and erected fortifications around the town. Yūsuf Karam retreated with his men. The army caught 40 lawbreakers and others from among the people of Zghartā and took them to Tripoli, and from there sent them by sea to al-Batrūn, since His Excellency was in Batrūn and had a frigate there named, after him, al-Dāwūdiyyah and which he nicknamed al-Lubnāniyyah. From there he sent them to Beirut by sea. Meanwhile the disturbances continued in al-Zāwiyah, from place to place. Then Dāwūd Pāshā went to Zghartā with one of the Pāshās of the State and the army. They wrote to the Wālī of Damascus, the Sirr-'Askar, and he came with an army of about 5,000. They besieged Yūsuf Bey in a place in al-Zāwiyah but could not defeat him, and lost

a number killed between al-Kūrah and al-Zāwiyah.

Then later there was an incident between the army and Yūsuf Bey, known as the incident of Bnash'<sup>342</sup>ī.

It began at sunrise and lasted for a time. Yūsuf Bey was defeated in the valley and overtaken by the troops. As for his men, they concealed themselves in the valley, turned on the government troops, and drove them out.

They followed in their tracks after the defeat and took a large number of weapons from them. They were said to have killed about 300 of the State (Turkish) troops, not counting the wounded, and four of the National (Lebanese) army, while ten of Yūsuf Bey's men were killed by cannon fire. Among them were Buṭrus Tūmā, famed for his courage. They continued to pursue the State's army until they entered Zghartā as far as Asnūn (<sup>343</sup>?)

- 
342. Just before this incident, according to Karam, he had met with Amīn Pāshā, the Turkish officer who was pursuing him with 9,000 men. Karam offered to submit to the Mutasarrif if he were assured of a fair trial; Amīn departed to transmit this message to Dāwūd, but meanwhile his troops opened the attack. (Ibid., pp. 12-13).
343. The question mark is Yazbak's.

Page 145

Conditions became unpleasant. Then after these battles the dispute intensified. The anger of the Government was aroused by this business and it wanted to annihilate the people of the country. One of the army leaders went to Yūsuf Bey by way of al-Maṣālā. He sent after (Yūsuf), who was with His Eminence Bishop Būlus at his residence, in order to communicate with him. This was a trick, for while they were in consultation the State troops patrolled around in order to catch Yūsuf Bey. The patrol reached him and he ran in flight amid firing of rifles between the two sides. The matter passed; then there was another incident in the district of Qazhiyyā, and then another in the Ihdin area. Then Yūsuf Bey went with his men to 'Ain Qarnā and stayed there for a time. The army reached him, taking him by surprise, and he fled. They took about eight of his men, among whom was As'ad Būlus, famed for his courage. Yūsuf Bey had but a few men with him at this time. In his flight he fell into the river, but escaped by God's help. Then he fled secretly to an unknown place. The State forces went to Ihdin, and with them three Pāshās: Darwish Pāshā, Muṣṭafā Pāshā, and Dāwud Pāshā. They lived in Yūsuf Bey's quarters for a time, taking a great amount of goods from it. As for Mikhāyil Bey Karam,

the brother of Yūsuf Bey, he was in agreement with the government and cooperated against his brother, for he was displeased by the activities of his brother. His (Mikhayil's) son Buṭrus Bey was under the guardianship of his uncle Yūsuf Bey and with him constantly. Then Yūsuf Bey disappeared for a time and Amīr Sulaimān went toward Ba'albak. He fell sick there in the wilderness and sent for a doctor to attend him. But the messenger betrayed him and informed the government, with the result that several soldiers came on behalf of the government and took him captive to Damascus, where he died in 1866. Yūsuf Bey then went to the area of al-Laimūnī and stayed in hiding there for a while. Afterward some soldiers came to him from the Mutasallim of Ba'albak to take him, but they could not overpower him, for he fought them, though he had only six men with him <sup>344</sup> while those who had come to get him were about forty cavalrymen. He killed one of them and captured two of their horses. Then after the army departed from Ihdin, leaving a few individuals behind, Yūsuf Bey came to Ihdin, drove the

---

344. Only four, according to Karam.  
(*'Adrah, op.cit.*, Appendix II,  
p. 14).



soldiers from his home, and entered it victorious. After he had remained there for a time the troops again came for him in force, with four Pāshās. He got out of their way and they looted his house of all its furnishings, taking countless valuables and ruining a part of the building. They stayed there for a time and became a burden to the villagers, for they looted some of the churches of the village and its environs and took captives from them. They caused ruin in the entire district until it became a thing to sadden the heart. Yusuf Karam then went to 'Ain Qarnā and stayed there for a time with a few men. Sometimes he had about 200 men with him, sometimes he had even more, and other times only eight. One day the army laid plans. They went to him secretly, after dividing into four parts and after one of the army officers had gone up to him to interview him with the (ostensible) intention of improving relations between him and the government. The result was that the army reached him and trapped him by means of deceit. A group of men came to Yūsuf Bey, the army having surrounded him, and rushed on him. The men that were with him were only a few, so he fled, only to find that the soldiers were in all directions waiting on the lookout for him. He thought that the end had come. He

called to those men who were with him; they asked the aid of the All-Powerful (God) and attacked like preying lions. They set fire (to the house), it being late morning, and killed several of the troops. From among Yūsuf's men two were killed and five captured, including the courageous As'ad Būlus.<sup>345</sup> As for Yūsuf Bey, when he saw that he must surely drink the poisoned cup, he threw himself at one of the groups of soldiers, crying to them, "Make way for Karam!" and firing at them. His clothes were changed (disguised). The soldiers opened a path, and Yūsuf Bey rushed through with five of his men. After he had passed, the soldiers realised that this was Yūsuf Bey. They followed on his heels and overtook him somewhere, and fired their rifles at him. For his part, he threw himself from a high place. They thought him dead; he entered a mill by one door, left it by another, and fled unharmed. He went secretly into the wilderness, where news came to him from all places of what was happening concerning him. His strength and his name became known to all the Powers, and he caused great annoyance to the (Ottoman) state,

---

345. (Y) He is the grandfather of Messrs. Jawād and Farīd Būlus.

while the French Government was sorely displeased  
with his deeds.<sup>346</sup> He made a great name for himself,  
and the people were anxious to see his face. All the  
merchants and leading men of Beirut, Mount Lebanon,  
and Tripoli would send him gifts and money and all  
that he needed. Everyone prayed for his victory and  
aided him with all that they could, and they called  
this period of time the "war of Yūsuf Karam." As for  
the Ottoman troupes, whenever they heard mention of  
Karam, their hearts would quake in fear of him, because  
of what they had seen of him and his men, and of the  
fiery zeal that they displayed. In truth, no man in  
Lebanon has been seen or heard of equalling him in  
bravery, generosity, knowledge, and graciousness all  
found in the same person; and rarely is anyone like him  
found anywhere in the world, especially in the area of  
Syria. He struck fear in the hearts of everyone.  
(Then) because there was no one to help him, he hid in  
the wilderness, and his name was no longer heard. He  
remained in this way for a time, wandering from place to

---

346. cf. Scheltema's statement that  
the French Government "warmly  
espoused" Karam's cause, which  
was the cause of French interests  
in Syria. (Abkarius, op.cit.,  
p. 173.)

place secretly. The troops returned to their homes and for some time the country became quiet. His Excellency Dāwūd Pāshā returned to Bait al-Din. He stationed troops on behalf of the government in al-Zāwiyah, and of the local recruits he placed about 400 men around Indī, 'Irjis, Karam Saddī, and al-Kūrah in order to protect them from him (Yūsuf Karam) and in order to collect the collective (Mirī) taxes. The Governmental Authority in Zghartā he entrusted to Mikhayil Bey Karam, the brother of Yūsuf Bey, since he found him to be opposed to the deeds of his brother. He also installed a general Qā'im Maqām in the environs of al-Batrūn and established a judicial council there. He began to ask for the collective (Mirī) tax money with complete freedom and to pay a great amount of money for the capture of Yūsuf Bey, alive or dead. All this was in vain, for the news would reach the Bey immediately, without delay, his cause having a strong attraction to every Christian.

The Almighty was aiding him, for though he fell in great danger God saved him from it and from many evils. He was divinely favoured and enjoyed the respect of all men. No one would mention him without wishing him success, because of his good deeds, superior

nobility, and great bravery, the likes of which were unheard of in those parts and areas. For if I wished to disclose the place, circumstances, and number of all his battles, it would require a long time, and I am unable to complete it in detail, for he had already made considerable trouble by the time he surprised the State forces in their tents one night on the plain of Tannūrīn. Of his own men, Ibn 'Abū 'Īsa of 'Ashqūt was killed - for throughout all his battles he still had men with him from Kisrawān, numbering from 30 to three, according to the circumstances of the time, and similarly from the areas of Dair al-Qamar, the Shūf, and elsewhere. We left off mentioning everything for fear of prolonging (our account), so let us return to what we were discussing. After Yūsuf Bey hid himself at this time, the army had returned home, and conditions had become quiet, one day in November, 1867, Yūsuf Bey gathered about 150 of his men in the area of al-Zāwiyah, without any one knowing about it, and crept with them through the mountains near al-Batrūn and Jubāil till he came to Kisrawān. He came to Qarṭabā, passed through al-Futūḥ, and crossed through 'Ibārah Shawwān. Then he came to Ghūṣṭā, to the house of the gentleman (Khawājā) As'ad Ramyā. His arrival was a surprise without anyone knowing about his coming, for everyone had understood

that he had gone to Europe, and no one had any knowledge of him until he arrived in Ghūstā. There was great fear and the people were perplexed because of his coming, for no one knew how he had come. Fear fell on the people of Ghūstā and its environs on account of the government the people of Ghūstā received him and his men with all courtesy and cheerfulness, dividing them among the houses and giving them the necessary food. He himself stayed in the house of Khawājā As'ad, where the priests and chieftains of Ghūstā came to him to extend their full welcome. Then he wrote letters to His Beatitude (the Patriarch) in Bkirkī and to his friends in Beirut and elsewhere; then the next day he sent to Jūniyah for provisions for his men, both cereals and other kinds. He stayed the entire second day, and on the third day left Ghūstā and passed through 'Ashqūt. When he reached the spring of 'Ashqūt he was overtaken by the interpreter from the French Consulate in Beirut with another horseman, and they conferred for a moment. Then the interpreter from the Consulate returned to Beirut, while he (Yūsuf) left with his army. He slept in Dair al-Rūmiyyah, and his men either in Dārayyā or with him. At that time the Frenchman Altap with his National (Lebanese) army of about 400 men had arrived in Ghazīr, following in the

tracks of Yūsuf Bey. He asked about him and heard the news that he was in Dārayyā. Then the next day Yūsuf Bey left Dārayyā to go to Bikfayyā, and according to what was said, going (from there) to Bait al-Dīn to release the prisoners. Then Altap and his army left Ghazīr and slept in Dārayyā. The army of the State (Ottomans) of about 500 men was in Jūniyah and stayed there. Meanwhile Yūsuf Karam had reached Bait Shabāb . With him were several men from Kisrawān, besides those who had been with him earlier. That night Yūsuf Bey (and his men) slept in the monastery of Mār Anṭūnyūs al-Naba' and Mār Buṭrus, the fig orchards, and thereabouts. He placed scouts in the valley with Abū Fīrān. Then the next day Altap left Dārayyā to go after Yūsuf Bey. The latter received the news and replied, "It is all right," and when Altap reached the valley, he was met by some of Yūsuf Bey's men in the valley. There was fighting in the valley, and meanwhile Yūsuf Bey's men were up above. At the height of the battle Yūsuf came out, with a dog following him. They recognised him and fired at him. As for him, he knew who had fired at him; he reproached him and, taking a gun, fired at him and killed him. And while they were engaged in this battle, Shaikh Ṣalībī Kan'ān al-Khāzin arrived carrying

letters from the Consuls in Beirut. He presented them to Altap, and after the latter had read them he told the Shaikh to take them to Yūsuf Bey in case the battle was prolonged. He fastened a white flag on his rifle and went to Yūsuf Bey and presented him with the letters.<sup>347</sup> After he read them, he motioned to his men to cease fighting, and went away toward the bare mountains, passing by al-Ṭabshah and passing the night in the village of Bqā'tūtā while his men dispersed. The next day his men met together with him. He took them to al-Mazra'ah, and then went down with them to Bkirkī. With him was a great crowd from Kisrawān. He went to Bkirkī to see the (Consul) General of the French Government and, representing the English Government, the Vice Consul.<sup>348</sup> They remained that night

---

347. The letters were apparently summons to Karam and Altap to meet with Des Essarts, the French Consul, at the Patriarchal Monastery of Bkirkī. (See *Ibid.*, p. 15.)

348. The Meeting at Bkirkī had been preceeded by appeals from Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad to Karam to give himself up, although by a strange twist Dāwūd Pāshā at one time accused Mas'ad of encouraging the outlaw. Karam later asserted that the Patriarch had been bought by Dāwūd by means of pensions to his relatives and by nomination of his brother as a public official in Kisrawān. The Patriarch, in return, allegedly used his influence with the French Government to secure



and it was agreed that the next day Yūsūf Bey would go to Beirut. His men and the people of the country knew of that, and a very great number came down from the country, even including the women. (They thought it) impossible that they should abandon the Bey, or that they should wish him to go to Beirut. They began threatening and storming the monastery. Then Yūsūf Bey came out to them and exhorted them, saying that he wished to go of his own free will and that this was in conformity with his interests and the interests of the country. When they knew that he was not going for their sake (i.e. for the sake of the French and English) they left things as they were and returned home. Then on the third day Yūsūf Bey and the Consul went to the

---

Dāwūd's appointment to a second term of office.

Karam also complained that his offer to surrender and submit to a fair trial was dismissed by Mas'ad as an attempt to prejudge himself in his own favor.

The agreement finally struck between Karam and Des Essarts, approved by Dāwūd Pāshā and the Patriarch, provided that Karam would be exiled for the time being to Algeria, under French protection, Dāwūd thus being enabled to re-establish his full authority in Mt. Lebanon. (In return Dāwūd was to pledge just rule: the safety of Karam's followers and his property would be guaranteed by France.) Karam charged that the latter condition was later violated; his followers were arrested and his property sequestered. (Ibid., pp. 15-19)

monastery at 'Ainṭūrah of the Lazarites and from there to Beirut. On his arrival at Nahr al-Kalb (Dog River) those accompanying him returned home, while about eight men from Zghartā and eight men from elsewhere remained with him. When he arrived at the Beirut River he found carriages ready to take him, supplied by the Consuls and chief men and notables of Beirut. He entered the carriage of the French Consul, then was changed to another one. During his passage along the road one could see bands playing, women singing, and orange-blossom water being scattered. Everyone was crowding together, and the celebrating women were a thing unheard of, until the town was in commotion. Most of the people only wanted to see him because they had seen his picture on paper, with him holding his blood-smearred sword, and these were so many pictures of him (like this) that he was known as the Blood-Shedder. Then after he had arrived in Beirut and stayed there four or five days, he went one day to attend Mass at the Maronite Church. While he was present in the church all eyes were staring at him, and on his exit from the church he could not pass through the street because of the congestion of people trying to see him. So he rode on horseback, which everyone saw, while his

attendants walked in front of him carrying arms. He had the privilege of kissing the fingertips of His Grace Bishop Tūbiyyā 'Aun, the much respected Bishop of Beirut. He (the Bishop) showed him hospitality, as did Khawājā As'ad al-Mulhimah who was one of his dearest friends. He visited the principal men of the town, and wherever he went, the people came running to see him. Then after this time, he traveled to Marseilles.<sup>349</sup> It was said that he received great honors there. He then proceeded to Paris, where he was honored by some, not including the King of France, Napoleon, who was not willing to meet him, nor some of the ministers either. Then he came to Egypt, where he was also honored, and returned to France. There were some causes of discord between him and the Prime Minister,<sup>350</sup> such as his request for honors and other things.

- 
349. Actually, Algeria.  
Karam on the evening of Jan. 31, 1867 boarded a French ship which had been prepared to carry Empress Eugénie to Rome but sent to Beirut for Karam when the Empress cancelled her voyage. It sailed from Beirut February 1, carrying Karam, his secretary Rizq-Allah Khadrā, and eight companions. (Saj'an al-Khāzin, *op.cit.*, p. 3.)
350. Saj'an al-Khāzin states that Karam met both the Emperor and his Cabinet and received their sympathy (*Ibid.*, p. 55.), but had a falling out with the Foreign Minister. (p. 71)

He had a strong party (of supporters) there and he wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. Then he went from there to Rome, for he could no longer stay in France, on account of the presence of his opponents. Then he wrote a letter, addressed to His Excellency Dāwūd Pāshā in Lebanon, in which he gave evidence to show that justice was against His Excellency and to clear himself;(copies of) it are in the possession of most moneyed people.<sup>351</sup> Then after he had arrived in Rome and had been honored by the places where trod the feet of the Supreme Pontiff, Pope Pius IX, and received the blessing, he remained in Rome for a time. Letters concerning him went to the Sublime State (in Istambul), concerning permission for him to return to his country. He did not receive that, although it was permitted to him to go wherever he wished except Lebanon and the lands surrounding it. Then he went to Athens, in the land of the Greeks, and then elsewhere. Efforts have continued to be made concerning his return until the present time. As for Dāwūd Pāshā, after Yūsuf Bey had gone, he ruled with

---

351. "وهي موجودة عند الاكثرين من ذوى المتمولين"

Presumably he sent copies of the letter to a large number of influential persons.

justice in Lebanon and conducted a general land survey throughout his reign. He levied the collective tax (Mīrī) on property and number of inhabitants and collected it on the basis of 7,000 bags, over and above taxes levied by other bureaus.<sup>352</sup> He organised affairs well throughout the land. He established eight deputies (Qā'im Maqāms) in the districts (Muqāṭa'ahs) with a director (Mudīr) under each of them. He was exceedingly zealous in the building up of the country and its expansion everywhere. He took a part of the Biqā' under a sort of guarantee at first, as a step towards its later becoming part of Lebanon. He also asked that Beirut, Tripoli, Sidon, and a part of al-Dinniyyah belong to the country and that Lebanon be free like other areas. In this he was supported by France. The country became completely quiet and at rest for a time; then, after the quieting of the situation, he went to Istambul in this concern in order to request what has been mentioned.

In his place he organised an administrative council whose president was Na'ūm Effendi Qīqānū. After his arrival in Istambul, several men in the government

---

352. "ماعد الاقلام الخارجة"

arranged a plot (by telling him to) ask for the above mentioned areas and to request that there be no Pāshā other than himself in Lebanon. If this were not granted to him, he would resign in protest and the government would be obliged to grant him his request and not relieve him (from office). After his request was made, it was not granted him, so he presented his resignation in protest to the Sublime Porte. Immediately his resignation was accepted, for he had been deceived by Fu'ād Pāshā whom we mentioned earlier. <sup>353</sup> Because of the fact that earlier, when His Beatitude Patriarch Būlus had come to Istambul, Franco Effendi had been appointed by the government to attend to him,

- 
353. Saj'ān al-Khāzin explains Dāwūd's expressed desire to add the above-mentioned areas to Lebanon as a bid on his part to regain his rapidly disappearing popularity. His proposal reached the ears of Fu'ād Pāshā, the Grand Vizier, who ordered Dāwūd to return to Constantinople and then to resign. There is no mention of a plot; Dāwūd had simply served his purpose and was discarded. (Saj'ān al-Khāzin, op.cit., pp. 66-7. Cf. also M. Jouplain, La Question du Liban, p. 506.) Some time afterward he was returned to Fu'ād's good graces and was sent to Europe on a loan-raising mission. While there he was accused in Constantinople of financial dishonesty and disloyalty to the Government. Not daring to return, he died abroad in 1869. (Saj'ān al-Khāzin, op.cit., p. 87.)

had given him the necessary servants, had liked him very much, and had hoped for his (Būlus's) appointment (to the Patriarchate), - because of this, when Dāwūd Pāshā resigned, Franco Effendi was appointed to be Mutaṣarrif of Lebanon, after being made a Pāshā.<sup>354</sup> He came to Lebanon in the year 1868 and ruled over Mount Lebanon, with everything continuing to be organised in the way it had been previously (under Dāwūd). Friendly relations grew between him and His Beatitude the Patriarch and all the Bishops, and clergy. He was a man appropriate for the period and suited to the times. He established new offices for which the orders had previously been issued by the government, but which Dāwūd Pāshā had not considered good for the inhabitants of Lebanon. His Excellency (Franco) ordered their execution (the orders), such as a tax on petitions, promissory notes, deeds of sale, and other such things. He dismissed some of the troops, journalists, and postal officials; he lowered some salaries and renewed others. He removed people living near the clergy. He collected funds that previous-

---

354. Naṣrī Franco Pāshā had been on friendly terms with Yūsuf Karam ever since he had served as secretary to Fu'ād Pāshā's mission to Lebanon in 1860-1. (Ibid., p. 68).

ly had been neglected for years. He continued as governor for a period of five years, and then contracted an incurable disease, which lasted about four months until his death in Beirut. Before his death he had ordered that he be buried in the cemetery of al-Durūb in al-Hāzmiyyah, above Beirut. They buried him there as he had asked, and his tomb is still there. The direction of the government had been provisionally delegated to the administrative council under the presidency of Shaikh 'Īd Ḥātīm. After his (Franco's) death the matter was referred to the Sublime Porte, which confirmed the said provisional government, and the reins of government remained provisional about four or five months. Then afterwards Rustum Pāshā Īṭālyānī ("the Italian") arrived as Mutaṣarrif of Lebanon, to whom were delegated greater powers than those of his predecessors. Conditions remained unchanged except for the fact that he dismissed some officials from the administration - such as the Daftar Khāné, the military council, and other officials - and transferred the collection of debts to the Treasury, and issued other orders which it would be difficult to enumerate. Then he favored the people by opening schools of learning in most inhabited regions. He raised money for the teachers' wages from the pockets of all government officials, from



His Excellency (himself) down to the policeman, taking two and a half piastres out of every hundred, from each according to his ability. These schools were established by government order for all its subjects, according to location (in the most suitable places). They would learn simple reading, grammar, arithmetic, and handwriting. The "Azīziyyah" school was in Dair al-Qamar. It was the largest in Lebanon, having six teachers of the subjects mentioned and other subjects, except for the Dāwūdiyyah school in Bait al-Dīn and the one like it in 'Abbaih for the Druse sect. He favored the teachers with wages according to what was required of them.

Page 155

Among the schools was one opened in Kafar Dabyān on December 8 of the year '73 which had two teachers: the priest Ilyās al-'Aqīqī for simple reading, with permanent status at a wage of 100 piastres monthly, and the priest Yūhannā Salām, for grammar and arithmetic on a temporary basis, at a wage of 150 piastres.

CHAPTER V.

UNDISCLOSED LETTERS

Commentary by the Editor

Some Considerations on these "Memoirs".

ge. 156

The Memoirs of the late Anṭūn Ḍāhir al-'Aqīqī are ended - would that they had not ended! - and from their pages we have drawn some fearful considerations which should restore to us the courage to <sup>look</sup> look at realities with an eye clear of all prejudice:

1. The Turks deceived the Lebanese and incited them to slaughter one another in order to annihilate both the Christians and the Druses and clear the air for the Ottoman Sultanate in this beautiful corner of the Arab lands.

2. The English and French (and then the Russians) split the Lebanese into religious sects and armed them to slaughter one another.

3. The feudal landholders in Lebanon tyrannised and oppressed the people by various means; and when the human conscience of those oppressed was awakened and they sprang to lift the yoke from their necks and recover their violated rights, the feudalists incited all the Powers against them, changing the course of their revolt to a religious civil war which was destructive and fruitless.

4. All these events offer clear proof of two things:

First, none of the foreign powers smiled on us once except to make us weep a thousand times. We have seen how they twisted and turned as they wooed our sects to their

side, and swore their friendship for them one day only to betray them the next.

ge 157 The second thing is the absence among the Lebanese feudalists of wise men who would think clearly, or possess patriotic feelings. We have seen **how** the feudalists, pushed on by their personal petty feelings and hatreds, ignited the religious civil war, after certain ~~elements~~ among them had diverted it from its course as a class rebellion. We have seen how some of them imposed their "divine" haughtiness in a base and shameful way. The absence among the feudalists of wise persons to prevent the masses from mutual slaughter is an indication of the fact that private interest in the class system does not understand the meaning of national security or national unity, and will give up no part of its "divine" rights except to exchange them for a thousand new rights!

Perhaps one of our most sacred duties is to point out on this occasion that the political feudalism which has died as a system in Lebanon and Syria is still alive, working under a new guise and a new name, and that the amīrs, shaikhs and prominent men who lie hidden with their sins and their shameful record in the grave, have left us many grandsons who live in the spirit, feelings, and thoughts of their grandfathers. The people must warn them to ensure the abolition of the spirit of evil in them, for their intrigues are congenital!...

age 157

When I presented these "Memoirs" for printing, I hesitated over whether to leave them as they were or to omit from them the profuse description of the infortunate events that took place in the year '60. I was anxious and disturbed by this hesitation, since I saw some use in printing the manuscript in its entirety, and some other use in omitting some of its pages. So I consulted my friends in my "crisis"; and most of them advised me to print the source completely, as a service to history and learning.

age 158

Then I saw that the curtailing of those accursed events would not negate their having happened. An attempt on my part to soften their description here would not prevent the appearance of many biased books recounting them with lies and shameful insinuations. So to print them, then, as set down by their well-intentioned author, even if he erred at times, was more truthful and right; and so this was done!

I have seen fit to follow these "Memoirs" with historic letters having a direct connection with the revolution of the proud people of Kisrawān and their heroic leader Ṭānyūs Shāhīn. They are undisclosed letters, scattered everywhere, that hitherto have not been published. Some of them I copied from the collections of the office of the Maronite Patriarch in Bkirkī. My good friend Najīb Salīm al-Daḥdāḥ and one of his relatives were kind enough to accompany me there and help me with the copying. Some of the others I came across in the possession of my brothers and

friends who have looked deeply into that blessed revolution and its heroic noble leader. They were kind enough to give them to me, sharing in unveiling an aspect of those glorious days of which alone the Lebanese deserve to be proud. In them the readers will see a true pattern of the life of the revolution and its heroes, and an authentic presentation of its events and the nobility of its aims. Perhaps we shall facilitate our effort to collect everything connected with it and to publish it at an early date; we might render our beautiful country, Lebanon, and the cause of its people a service incumbent on all who believe that Lebanon is dear because of its people, and not because of the executioners who have ruled it.

And so to the readers I present the aforementioned letters :

Undisclosed Letters

Related to the revolution of the Adventurous leader Tānyūs Shāhīn.

I. The reason for writing it:

"Whereas the well-known prevailing conditions, which are known to all, require that we be united in outlook and deed in all that is related to our interests in the removal of oppression, whether against us or by us against anyone, and that we all behave in accordance with what law and justice require; and whereas our people are so numerous: we have established as our representatives (wakīls) to arrange these interests our brothers Ḥuṣn and Qa'dān, and to expend all that is required for that, whether in expenditures or favors, with all that is necessary, be it little or much, entrusting that to their judgment, wisdom, and conscience; whatever they spend, we are bound as a group to repay it to them. It shall be distributed on us equally according to our income, without question, but according to their statement and their conscience. For their part, they are obliged to deal with these interests earnestly and perseveringly, in all that is required, and to be mindful of these interests. We have made a compact with them and have called as our witnesses the Creator - may He be exalted over us, and may His names

be glorious! - The Holy Eucharist, and the Mother of God, whose purity is universal, to witness that we shall be obedient to them (the two wakīls) and follow what they tell us regarding our interests and what concerns our joining together in, and preparation for, conduct satisfactory to the Almighty, - may He be exalted! - to the head of our religious denomination, the reverend Patriarch whose beatitude is universal, to those in authority, and to the rights of mankind. Similarly they (the representatives) have called as their witnesses the Creator - may He be exalted! - the Holy Eucharist, and the Mother of God, that on their post there will be no neglect of what these interests require, nor any deceit as to expenditures, whether by excess or deficiency, and that they will do all that is required. Whoever leaves us in disagreement, the mass of us shall be against him and deal with him as he deserves; and on this our satisfaction and agreement are complete.

Recorded on the 13th of December, 1858.

"Concurring,

The family of Abū Naufal al-Khāzin."

II. Letter from certain villages to Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad.

"To the most holy Father, may God prolong his reign!

"After kissing the places where your sacred feet have trod, and seeking your Apostolic blessing forever, we submit to you:



"The disturbances that have taken place in this district are no secret to your Beatitude. Because of them we have been robbed of our peace, on account of the presence of ignorant people. In view of the fact that on this date your son our brother Shaikh Saj'ān al-'Uḍaimī came to us on behalf of the people living in the region of al-Zūq, asking of us the union which would bring peace to all of us, we, your children the people of the villages whose names are recorded at the end of this petition, therefore met in the village of Dlibtā on the 12th of this month. After deliberation with the representatives (wakīls) of all our people, we came to an agreement. Since your Beatitude is considered to be a spiritual father to us, we present to your Beatitude this petition, which we beg you to examine with a generous eye, with an explanation of the headings listed above, so that by force of your superior wisdom you will be obliged in conscience to return our rights to us, not only for the present but for always everlastingly. Since your children who are presenting this are unable to secure for themselves the foregoing and your Beatitude will feel obliged to inquire about that, we therefore repeat our plea, knocking at the gates of your paternal justice and compassion, saying : Look at our weakness and save us from our oppressor. As for the question of the office of "ma'mūr" this we entrust to the command and the wish of your Beatitude. Whomever you consider suitable to deal with our situation and able to restore the

general peace, we shall recognize his orders. Whereas not everything is explained in our petition, at this time the bearers of this petition, who were appointed to present it to you will lay the matter before you more adequately. All depends on what your commands call for. May God prolong your reign!

Again we kiss the places where your feet have trod.

December 17, 1859.

"Your Beatitude's children,

The people of

Al-Judaidah, Shnan'ir, Dlibtā, 'Aramūn, Ghūsta, Baḥḥā.

III. The demands of the people, referred to in the preceding letter, Number II.

"Statement of the items requested by which peace may be secured for us and for their Excellencies the Shaikhs.

"First: that the distribution of the collection (Mīrī) tax money be in accordance with principles, as the head tax, on the great and the small according to the register instituted by His Grace Shakīb Pāshā, so that even the Shaikhs shall be obliged to pay what is apportioned to them in the collective and head taxes, without the people having to bear an excessive head tax.

"Second: Oppressions, wrongdoings, exaction of extras from travelers and servants, and the money transfers<sup>355</sup> taken from the people through their Excellencies the various Shaikhs, this being contrary to the laws of the Sublime State and the beneficial arrangements<sup>356</sup> - when these deeds are verified at the place designated, whether the present council or elsewhere, the doer of these offenses and of violations of the law, after confirmation, must return and repay what he has taken in its entirety.

"Third: the presents and marriage taxes currently paid to their Excellencies the Shaikhs in certain places, or the presents to the Shaikhs attached to the sale of their goods to the people, must be discontinued and removed in their entirety.

"Fourth: As for the question of the office of "ma'mūr", which is of the greatest importance, having to do with governing the people and removing grievances and violations, the political ma'mūr must act in accordance with justice and law so that there shall be no further disputes between us and their Excellencies the Shaikhs. Whoever is appointed to deal with our affairs, we pray that he will be deserving of this position and worthy of it, and possessing all the conditions suited to the authority and

---

355. "حوالات"  
356. "الترتيبات الخيرية" possibly a reference to the Hatti Humayun of 1856.

and activities of ma'mūrs. Similarly it is incumbent on all the people to render their due obedience and consideration to the ma'mūr, he being distinct from the mass of the people, and there must be great efforts made to keep his commands. For every village one or two representatives (wakīls) should be instituted, according to the large or small size of the village, so as to achieve peace and facilitate the ma'mūr's orders and to facilitate his work and interests without hindrance.

"Fifth: Whereas the Sublime State - may the Lord of Creation preserve it! - favored us with universal equality and complete freedom, so that there should be no distinctions or degradations in addressing persons, and so that all the old principles should be changed in what concerns the registers,<sup>357</sup> and whereas new taxes have been levied on all, we pray that all this may be kept in mind by your Beatitude.

"Sixth: The submission of the question of ma'mūrs in Kisrawān to the orders of your Beatitude is done on condition that the order of the ma'mūr be effective on everyone without exception in accordance with the reform measures taken, so that from now on no one will be set apart and distinguished from the general public except for the ma'mūr himself. As for those remaining of their Excellencies the Shaikhs, if any offenses on their part occur against the

---

357. "الكتابات" Presumably, the registers of tax assessment.

people, they shall be punished in accordance with the laws upon confirmation by the council, as<sup>it</sup> shall be done to offenders from among the people.

IV. (To Patriarch Mas'ad.)

"Previously a petition was laid before you from us in particular and from the family in general, concerning the prevailing conditions and the excitement, in simple form. We all agreed on complete quiet and forbearance from the least possible cause (for trouble), so much so that we were willing to bear all insults, expecting that in that way the situation would become quiet. For the complaint of those who were excited was against the overlordship of the family, and we thought that if we gave up the overlordship, the excitement would cease. We were all expecting your Beatitude to honour us (with a visit) to prescribe the treatment (to cure this situation). At this time there arose a new various aims to further this excitement. A council was formed in al-Zūq exceedingly well situated to spread these aims because of the connection of this council to Beirut. There was in this council a strange diabolic policy to impregnate everyone in Beirut, from the high-ranking to the humble, with those of the aims that was appropriate to him: to the governor what was agreeable to him, to the Qā'im Maqām the same; the Muslim would be indoctrinated with what he desired, the foreigner the

the same, and similarly the Christians of various sects. By this indoctrination you see that the excitement was agreeable to all; and in the same way the policy was used with the common people. The wise persons among the people tried to persuade the council that the (proper) aim was solely to improve and reform the overlordship, not to destroy it, and that should the excitement reach the highest degree, the reform would not be achieved. The ignorant people have been fully indoctrinated, each according to his interests. The agitators among the people are persuaded that since they have openly become involved in hostility (to the Khāzin family), they no longer have security in the continuance of the family or its authority, for whenever the situation becomes quiet, the family will certainly destroy them. There now prevails a hellish situation, so much that they cannot imagine that the pillars of hell could support more. And what has newly happened in stimulating the excitement would take a long time to describe. The day before yesterday there was a plot to gather the people together and send them to Beirut. The agitators arranged that Ṭānyūs Shāhīn of Raifūn, the wakīl of the villages, would get up at night, fire shots in his house, and call for help saying that the Shaikhs had ambushed him. This was done; a large crowd gathered and went down to al-Zūq, from whence they were sent to Beirut. A petition was formed for every village, containing the enumeration of

all sorts of outrages and composed according to the inclinations of all (the types of people) we have mentioned. With them (the crowd from Zūq) went members of the polygot council of al-Zūq and other people from al-Zūq. And the next night, which was the day before yesterday, there was another trick, by which Ṣāliḥ Jirjis Maṣṣūr was also "attacked", and shots were fired in the night, until the excitement reached the highest degree. The people of 'Ajaltūn brandished their weapons at our cousins, insulted them with unbearable insolent words, and threatened them with destruction. Our cousins stood by their weapons and wrote to our cousins in Ghūṣṭā to come and defend them. They remained in this situation and kept their patience till morning. In brief, the shedding of blood has become closer than the eyelid is to the eye.<sup>358</sup> May the Creator be gracious by blessing your prayers and preventing ruin. It will now have become apparent to your wisdom and zeal how necessary it is that you should hasten to honour us (with a visit), even if you are in poor health - may God forbid such a thing. This petition of ours is presented in the spirit of our belonging to your Beatitude, and for this reason we take courage and submit that the prevailing opinion among the common people is that the delay in your honouring us (by coming) results from indifference, while most of the reasonable people explain that the delay is made in order that the matter be dealt with in the proper way. But actually the

---

358. i.e., imminent.

situation is otherwise, for with your delay the excitement is increasing hour by hour, and the danger of ruin is imminent, as we submitted. This is all that could be presented briefly. The matter rests with you. May your life be long.

'Abbās Shaibān al Khāzin

Page 165 V. (The people of al-Zūq, who were the heroes of the revolution and had taken the lead in starting it, had written at the onset of the action to the Patriarch as follows):

"O most holy Father, universal in blessedness,

Page 166 "Our petition, after kissing your sacred footsteps and seeking the goodness of your apostolic prayers, concerns the fact that discord has arisen between us and their respected Excellencies Shaikh Yūsuf Radwān and Shaikh 'Abbās Shaibān al-Khāzin. We now understand that all their Excellencies the Shaikhs of the Khāzin family are meeting in one of the villages of Kisrawān and are gathering together with the intention of besieging us in our places and robbing us of our possessions. We do not know whether they will actually do that or not, but for fear that they might carry out their intentions we are presenting this petition to your Beatitude's sacred hands, seeking your paternal compassion, that you may consider our



protection in accordance with the wisdom of your Blessedness. At the same time we have presented petitions to His Grace the Consul-General of the great French Government, for the sake of our safety and in consideration of the matter of our protection. Everything depends on the command of your Beatitude, May God perpetuate the days of your Blessedness, our Master.

December 10, 1858.

"Your servants,

The people of Zūq Mīkāyil"

VI. (One week later (December 18) the people of Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān, fellow-villagers of Anṭūn Ḍāhir al-'Aqīqī, author of these "Memoirs" sent a petition to the Patriarch in which they complained against certain members of the Khāzin family. Here is its text):

"Most Holy Father,

"After stooping to kiss the ground where your most sacred feet have trod, praying for the continuation of your noble Beatitude, and seeking blessing from your most holy mouth forever, our plea is to disclose to your Beatitude's hearing what concerns Ilyās Ibn Yūsuf al-Zukh and how he was lost for a period of a month and a half, and was searched for by means of sanctions<sup>359</sup> emanating

---

359. "حرومات"

from your Beatitude. And now 'Abdullah Jarbū' has come from Bqa'tūtā and concluded after talking to our priests and prominent men of the village that their respected Excellencies Shaikh Haikal Tūmā and Shaikh Sarkīs Jād al-Khāzin seized him (i.e. Ilyās) in a place called Sāqiyah al-Ḥarīqah at the outskirts of the village and sealed his mouth with a handkerchief. This was on Tuesday evening. After they had tied him, and the aforesaid 'Abdallah and this prisoner went with them to Sāqiyah Bqā'tuta, the aforesaid 'Abdullah left them and went home, while their Excellencies took the prisoner on the road and went toward the Monastery of Our Lady; and it is not known what else happened. This is what was contained in the transcribed report.

We have laid it before your Beatitude so that all may be known to you. We prostrate ourselves at the feet of your Beatitude in supplication that you shall command us to do whatever is right, hopeful that we shall continue to be included in your prayers. May Almighty God prolong the noble presence of your Beatitude forever. Amen.

"The people of Mazra'ah

December 18, 1858

Kafar Dābyān"

VII. (While we were copying these letters in the library at Bkirki, we came across another petition with the same content, written by the people of some of the rebelling villages, with the date omitted, to Būlus Mas'ad also. Here is its text):

"Most Holy Father, may God prolong his life, Amen.

Page 168 "After kissing the places where your most sacred feet have trod, with all humility and respect, and seeking the Apostolic Blessing from your most holy Mouth forever, we plead: that the news is known to have reached your noble ears of the dispute existing among the family of their Excellencies the Khāzin Shaikhs because of their devious plans about which they have their secret thoughts. This dispute has done obvious harm to us. Although one group among them desire us to support them in order to complete their plans that they have laid and the other does not want our support, both are employing insults and blows on us to fulfill their aims. Because of this we are caught in a (painful) dilemma, so much so that from the start of this dispute we have had no security, peace, or quiet. For if we obey the one side, the other will set a trap for us to upset our peace; and matters have already progressed in that way more than we could bear, by the outright killing, which is well known to your Beatitude, of some of the prominent among us, by robbing our property, and by outrages.

At the same time we kept quiet, hoping that that was a temporary incident and would pass away and cease, and desiring to keep the peace and taking into consideration the nobility of their forefathers. Now, upon thorough consideration and deliberations upon that matter by all of us, we have found that the past, as compared to the present and the future, is to be reckoned as nothing. For this reason we can no longer bear the unbearable, and in protection to the lives of all of us and in order to preserve our honour and status, we, the people of the villages listed below, have met together, and after thorough consideration of our existing means of protection against what we have enumerated, we have found no sure way to ward off the said evils from us as a group and individually, except to bind ourselves together in the spirit of love free from deceit, and to stand aside from all disturbing causes.

Upon the occurrence of oppression in any village, a petition shall be presented to whoever is in authority on behalf of all of us as a group. This bond has been entered into by all of us, and we have confirmed it by grave oaths. We have drawn up a list of our grievances by which to clarify our compact. And because the peace of your children is a special concern of your Beatitude, it was necessary to present the petition of this to your blessed person, so that it might reach the honoured ears of your Beatitude. Consequently, if now you command anything conducive to the

welfare of your oppressed children concerning what we asked of Him (God), whose station is illustrious, He will guard for us the honour of your presence, coupled with glory and power. We repeat the kissing of the earth under your sanctified feet with great reverence and humility. May God, be He exalted, prolong your presence forever. Amen.

"The people of Ghādīr, J'aitā, Ballūnah, Dārayyā, 'Ajaltūn, Raifūn, 'Ashqūt, Biq'ātā, 'Ashqūt, al-Qlai'āt, Mazra'ah, Kafar Dabyān."

VIII. "Most Holy Father,

After kissing the ground under your Beatitude's pure feet, seeking your Apostolic blessing, and offering prayer to God for the continuance of your life forever: We submit to your noble personage that it is not hidden from your Beatitude at this time that there prevails a great uneasiness over the presence of the Shaikhs in the seat of the Maronite faith, on the part of all the people. We beg your Beatitude most earnestly to remove them from the said place, for the chief reason (for the trouble) is their presence there, as is known. It is not possible to put off and delay the people except by their (the Shaikhs') removal, by bringing a large band of men. In any case, your Beatitude does not wish this cause (of trouble), for far be it from your wishes that it should happen. In addition to this, we beg that peace may be made general and the trouble

ensuing from this business be averted. With all honour and respect we repeat the kissing of your feet, and may God - be He exalted! - prolong your stay (on earth) forever.

"Your children  
January 3, 1859.  
The people of the villages of Kisrawān."

IX. "Most Holy Father,

"After kissing the ground where your feet have trod, with all honour and respect, seeking the Apostolic blessing from your most holy mouth forever, and praying for the continuance of the honour of your Beatitude's presence: We submit to you that yesterday morning, Tuesday, two men came to us from al-Qlai'āt asking that wakīls be sent from the district of Dlibtā, 'Arāmūn, and al-Judaidah to attend a meeting in the village of Raifūn. There was general debate; and this, by request of Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, was verbal, without written record. After the two men went away from us, our brother Shaikh Saj'ān al-'Uḍaimī came with about 40 men, carrying in his hand a written statement signed by the wakīls, the portent of which, according to its literal text, was, "Kindly give consideration (to what we requested of you)"<sup>360</sup> We your children have consulted among ourselves (and agreed) to go tomorrow, Thursday, to Dlibtā and ask the people of Ghūṣṭā and Shnanṭr. After deliberation among

---

360. "و مضمونه حسب صورته حرفيا طيه تشرفونا بالنظر

ourselves, we shall give him a reply. What we have noticed in regard to Saj'ān is that he has never taken from us any written commitment to unite with him or with the wakīls, so he feels free to mistreat any of us going toward Jūniyah and elsewhere.

Since the meeting is tomorrow, we shall give him the reply in Dlibtā. We must present our case to the ears of your Beatitude so that everything may continue to be known to you. We ask God - be He exalted! - to support your leadership and inspire you with whatever may lead to the welfare of our people. We repeat the kissing of your footsteps with all humility forever.

January 12, 1859. "Your children,  
The people of 'Arāmūn and Judaidah"

X. The "Statement from the Wakīls" mentioned in Letter No. 9.

"To their Excellencies our esteemed and respected brothers.

"After offering our respects and asking about your wishes: a number of persons are coming from your villages to make it clear that all of your people are united in deed and word, and that your inclinations are the same as ours. Inasmuch as successive reports are reaching us of actions by certain people among you in conflict with

our actions and the good of the populace, it is necessary for our brother Saj'ān al-'Uḍaimī to visit each of your villages to learn the truth from all of the population that wish to unite with us; their union (with us) will be in accordance with what they are told by our brother Saj'ān, whom we have mentioned. Whoever is in opposition, - God forbid! - he will inform us so that we may be on our guard; and this is sufficient.

"Your brothers,

The people of the allied villages."

(signed): Anṭūn Bishārah Qaṭṭān (seal)

Ilyās Khaḍrā (seal)

Ṣāliḥ Jirjis (seal)

Page 172 XI. "Most holy Father, may God - be exalted! - prolong your life.

"After respectfully kissing the ground where your Beatitude's pure feet have trod, seeking your Apostolic blessing, and praying to the Almighty - may He be exalted! - to grant perpetuation of your life: In accordance with your command, we sent your Beatitude's letter to the Fathers the priests of al-Mazra'ah, with the muleteer Naṣr As'ad of Biq'ātā. No sooner had he arrived at Nahr al-Ṣalīb than he was met by a group from the organization of al-Mazra'ah. They beat him and struck him even more than they had used to do, although he made them understand



that he had the honour of bringing a letter from your Beatitude to their priests. At that, they snatched the letter and opened it, increasing their boisterousness and speaking characteristically. After much discussion they released him upon certain conditions, particularly that if one of us killed any of your children, he should be brought to justice. To date we have not received a reply to forward to you, nor the flour.(?) It was necessary to lay this before you so that you may command what your Grace wills. The purpose of our plea is that we should continue to enjoy your satisfaction. We repeat the kissing of the ground under your feet and direct our prayers to the Almighty - may He be exalted! - to preserve your presence for the support and pleasure of everyone forever.

January 18, 1859. "Your son,  
Amīn Kisrawān al-Khāzin."

XII. March 1859.

"Most holy Father,

"After kissing the ground under the pure feet of your Beatitude, seeking your Apostolic blessing and praying to the Almighty to prolong your life forever: we submit to you that news has reached us that you convened some of the wakīls and talked to them concerning three ma'mūrs, (officials), one for each district ('uhdah). Formerly

they used to receive their authority from the government, since they were government officials. It is not we who sanction their authority, and we shall not make any written acknowledgment of their authority over us. We beg your Beatitude, in as much as you are seeking (their appointment, to wait till) after they go with us before the court of law, and in accordance with its decision, we shall accept whatever you command. For when they do go to Beirut (to the court) it will be only by your issuing of an order to them. It is not expected that you will destroy the rights of your poor children. We wish you had proceeded with this action, before impositions and losses befell us, by doing what would have been more suitable. For now some of them have returned to their places and are full of insults and derision. From the beginning, had we employed their methods, we would have secured peace rather than respecting your Beatitude, your prosperous council (Dīwan), and the commands of his Grace (the Qā'im Maqām), may God support him. For it appears that our obedience to him (the Qā'im Maqām) has led to the destruction of our houses, as signs indicate to all our people. We have presented to your Beatitude and to the Government a general wakīl who will present what we request from the Khāzin family and will consult us on anything new that arises. When we heard this news we went to him because he was sick, and these things were unknown to him. Because of this reply of his we have dared to submit this

petition, And if your reply is issued to our general wakīl in Raifūn (Ṭānyūs Shāhīn) we shall do what you command. With all deference and respect we again kiss your feet. May God prolong your life forever.

Yours servants, the people of the villages."

XIII. Enjoying the attention of his Excellency the esteemed Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, may his life be long,

"Our esteemed, beloved, dear, most exalted, and respected son, may his life be long.

"After presenting you with the appropriate greetings and inquiring after your previous health and your well-being:

"We inform your reverence that on the last Feast of Our Lady, which fell on the 15th of August, we sent the mule-driver of the monastery to buy cheese from Sha'rah in the Ba'albak country. The said mule-driver placed in the hands of one called Jirjis Jibrān, from Mrāḥ al-Mīr, the cost of 40 raṭls<sup>361</sup> of cheese, the price per roṭl being 8½ gold and 2 silver pieces.<sup>362</sup> The cheese was to be brought here and weighed on our scales. The said Jirjis brought us 20 of the original 40 raṭls at that time, but the remainder of the requested amount he has delayed in bringing

---

361. A raṭl equals 2½ kilograms.

362. "سعر الرطل ع ٨، وقضية ٢"

till the present time. Some time ago we sent the monastery mule-driver to him with a paper stating our request for what belongs to us, at which time he left his house and the muleteer returned having accomplished nothing. And now, since we understand that you have authority and that you restore lost rights, we beg of your celebrated zeal to restore the rights of your monastery. For on account of the procrastination of this person we have been compelled to buy cheese at a price of 15 per raṭl, and for this he must reimburse us for the difference.

Page 175 That is what we have to say; because of your zeal there is no need for further clarification. May the Lord ... to us your presence perpetually. February, 1859 ...

"Appealing to you

The priest

(signature illegible)<sup>363</sup>

The servant of the Monastery of Bishārah."

XIV. "Enjoying the attention of their Excellencies our great and illustrious brothers, the respected Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, general wakīl, and Ḥabīb Jāmāṭī, may their lives be prolonged.

"To their Excellencies our respected brother, may their lives be prolonged.

"After our respects and bearing witness to you our

brothers' goodness and generosity, we inform you our brothers that Qa'dān Bey (al-Khāzin) arrived tonight in al-Mazra'ah. We did not know where he was heading, for sunset had come. Eight men were with him. For our part, we are still hindered up to today from finishing the matter of which you know. We pray you to inform us frankly of what has happened newly and what was decided with his Beatitude. If it is necessary for us to come now, we shall come with all possible speed, even if our interests demand otherwise, for they are private, while your interests are general. We beg a reply with all possible speed, for we are in great anxiety because we know nothing of what has been happening. It appears that we shall complete our business soon. May your life be prolonged.  
February 20, 1859.

Written by your brother,

Ḥabīb al-Khūrī 'Aqīqī"

age 176 (And in the margin:)

"After we wrote this it occurred to us to send some people to him. A great crowd went to him, and immediately he left the village in the middle of the night to go to Biq'ātā. We shall send after him to discover what he is up to and we shall inform you of it. We beg you not to accept from the Shaikhs that you should take up the case with them in the presence of his Beatitude, until you see the seals of the entire Khāzin family from the

young to the old, and they (the seals) are affixed to their papers of authorisation. You are more clear sighted than we, and perhaps you will not accept from them, but ... we (should like to) remind you about that."

XV. "Most Holy Father,

"After kissing the earth upon which your Beatitude's pure feet have trod, seeking your Apostolic blessing, and offering prayers to God to prolong your life forever: We submit that we were honoured to receive your Beatitude's letter and praised the Creator that you are pleased. You wrote for us to come to kiss your footprints in order to deal with the matter. What we understand from the wakīls is that you spoke to them of three ma'mūrs, that is, ma'mūrs for each district ('uhdah). But after the debate in the council concerning the previous dispute, and since Shaikh 'Abdullah Khaṭṭār arranged in Beirut that on Monday, the fast day, they will come to the council, for that reason we refused to deal with matters until they came to the council. This is what we must lay before you. We repeat the kissing of your fingertips, and may God perpetrate the pleasure of your life forever.

March 6, 1859.

"Your son

Tānyus Shāhin"<sup>364</sup>

---

364. Yazbak has told the translator that

"Your sons the wakīls of 'Ashqūt: Kan'ān Shiblī, Bākhūs Abu Ghālib, Sarkīs Mas'ad, 'Abdullah Mūsā, Hannā Dāhir al Ḥajj, Yūsuf Anṭūn Naṣr, Sarkīs Tābit.

"The wakīls of Biq'ātā: Fāris Maṣṣūr, Janādyūs al-Khūrī, Jirjis Na'mān, Yūsuf Khalwān.

"The wakīls of Raifūn: Mārūn Barjīs, Makhūl Ṣfair, Fāris al-Ḥawāṭ, Fāris Anṭūn, 'Abdullah Sim'ān, Maṣṣūr Daryān,

"The wakīls of Qlai'āt; Ḥassān Ṣfair, Jirjis Ṭannūs Ṣfair, Buṭrus Kan'ān Kassāb, Wākīm al-Qā'ī, Ya'qūb Mufarrij.

"The wakīls of Ballūnah: Khalīl al-Mazzūq.

"The wakīls of al-Suhāillah: Yuḥannā al Shamālī, Ṣalībā al-Qā'ī, Sulaimān al-Shamālī.

"The wakīls of J'ītah: Naṣr Niqūlā, Mārūn al-Qīm.

The people of 'Ajaltūn."

age 178 XVI. "The items demanded by us from the Khāzins.

"Article 1. General claims shall be settled by two elected individuals, one elected to represent us and the second elected to represent the shaikhs. Whatever amount it is decided that they owe shall be paid immediately.

"Article 2. The shaikhs shall pay the expenses that we have incurred because of them, our payment of money exacted from us and the fees of the wakīls.

"Article 3. The rank of the shaikhs shall be the same as ours in all things without any exception whatever.

"Article 4. None of the shaikhs shall be appoint-

ed as a ma'mūr over us.

"Article 5. The donation taxes which they are imposing upon us on the basis of receipts given at the time of their sale to us of places belonging to them, whereas they have been exacted by force, shall be null and void for the past, the present, and the future."

(Without date)

XVII. (This letter, also without date, is written in the same handwriting as the "articles" (No. XVI) and on the same paper, and is connected with it.)

Page 179 "After kissing the ground upon which your Beatitude's sacred feet have trod, with all honour and respect, seeking the abundance of the Apostolic blessing, and praying for the honour of your Beatitude's presence forever, we submit: that on Thursday, the 30th of last month, the respected Fathers Buṭrus Manassā and 'Abdullah al-Mu'annaq came with several priests, by your orders, and a number of notables well known in all five villages. There was a meeting of all our wakīls in the village of Raifūn, and after the meeting there were speeches by the priests and the others addressed to all our wakīls concerning your Beatitude's orders for improvement and pacification of our relations with their Excellencies the Khāzin Shaikhs - a thing which we desire with all our hearts, in obedience to your command. From the beginning of the disturbances



we have not rejected the idea of a reconciliation, which would bring peace to all of us. But it is no secret to you that their Excellencies up to now have not abated in presenting petitions to the Government in which they make false complaints, while on the other hand they send petitions to your Beatitude about a reconciliation, which throws doubt upon their good intentions. Besides that, they are finding ways to harm us by means of their oppressions. It has been confirmed to your Beatitude by Shaikhs Ḥaidar and Rāmiḥ and the priest Ighnāṭiyūs al-Khāzin, together with Buṭrus Ṭannūs of 'Ajaltūn and Mansūr Buṭrus of Raifūn, how in the village of Liḥfid they were insulted and painfully beaten, so that as a result they were wounded and confined to their beds, and are (still) not free of danger. Nevertheless the fact is, in truth, despite their disreputable deeds and intentions they do evil things and attribute them to us. And now after our meeting, in accordance with your command, we have made up our minds that we shall all be satisfied with laying our wishes and our obedience in all humility under your command, hoping from the nobility and graciousness of your character that you will accept our petition here presented, and that it will receive consideration, in accordance with your wisdom, for what peace and tranquility it may promote for all of us. We, presenting it, offer our obedience to you in the words of our own tongues, for the sake of our tranquility. We

pray that it may be accepted, and in all respects authority is yours. The object of our plea is that we may continue to enjoy your pure and noble consideration. May God prolong the honour of your presence forever. Amen.

"Your children,

The people of Kisrawān in a body."

XVIII. "Most holy Father, may your life be perpetuated.

"After kissing your pure footprints with all respect and seeking your Apostolic blessing forever, we submit; that we understood the letter that came from his Excellency Shaikh Yūsuf 'Īd al-Khāzin to their Excellencies his cousins, and the earnestness of the message of the wakīls to his Excellency. Because of this it seemed good to us to send the son of your Beatitude, our son Yūsuf, in hopes that he might facilitate the handling of the matter with them. They replied only that it was impossible for them to accept a ma'mūr from among their Excellencies the Shaikhs, and that they had certain rights that they wanted to regain without anyone else's mediation. Our son (Yūsuf) understood from them that they remained determined and in a state of complete excitement that would pave the way to ruin, so that even if the office of Ma'mur were abolished, their aim would continue to be the taking of their rights which they are determined to have, without due process of law. For with conditions such as they are, we have become afraid that a cause of

trouble may occur at any moment, and this time the situation is not safe as it used to be.<sup>365</sup> We are ashamed to have to call upon the paternal zeal of your Beatitude to prevent this excitement. Whatever you see fit to do and whatever God inspires you to do, we ask Him who is most high to keep your Beatitude, and we repeat the kissing of your footprints. May your presence be prolonged forever.

May 8, 1859. "Your son,  
Ya'qūb al-Biṭār.

XIX. "Most holy Father,

"After kissing the ground upon which your pure feet have trod, seeking the Apostolic blessing from your holy mouth, and praying for the continuance of your leadership perpetually, we submit to your generous attention: A man from one of our villages, Shnan'Īr, a lime-seller by trade, was asked by the most respectful Bishop Aghābiyūs to work for him. When he arrived in Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān he encountered some people of that village who beat him painfully and stripped him. Then two men from al-Judaidah were found in another place by the trouble-makers and were treated in the same way as the man from Shnan'Īr.

Then, following the foregoing petition: An official letter came from Tānyūs Shāhīn in which he mentioned that he plans to come with an army of 800 men to Mi'rāb and ask from each of our villages 200 uqqās (500 lb.) of bread, plus one

---

365. "وهذه المرة لا تسلم كالسابق" This appears to be a reference to the colloquial proverb, "مشر كل مرة تسلم الجيرة"

piastre from each man.

If we delay, he will send to the coastal towns for trouble makers to come and assault us in order to procure the amount now demanded. Whereas we your children from the start have entrusted our situation to your Beatitude, body and soul, and whereas from our part there has been no excitement or disorder, we must submit the matter to your compassion. Our complaint is that first of all, most of our villagers left their homes this year, some going to Beirut and some to other places. Because of the prevailing hardships, they could not grow silk because of the high prices of silkworms' eggs, and consequently were unable to earn their daily bread. Remaining thus in their houses, unable to buy their daily bread, how could they pay anything to Ṭānyūs? Nevertheless, we have found a way to fulfill his demand. Perhaps he might place himself in the hands of your Beatitude as we have done, put an end to the agitation, and bring peace and quiet to everyone. If the matter is dealt with in this way, then we shall exert ourselves to fulfill Ṭānyūs' request, even if it costs us two piastres to give one. And if - God forbid - they (Ṭānyūs and his men) continue to act as they now do, this demand of theirs will bring them no return. On the contrary, ruin will doubtless come down upon them, soul and body. We advised them (of this) many times, but they did not accept our advice. May the Creator be generous to us and to them. This is what we

must lay before you. We pray that we shall continue to enjoy your noble consideration. May God keep you with us for many years. Amen.

May 19, 1859.

"Your children:	"Your children	"Your children
The people of	The people of	The people of
al-Judaidah.	Shnan'ir.	Dlibtā

"Your children	"Your children
The people of	The people of
'Arāmūn.	Ghūstā."

XX. <sup>366</sup>The Apostolic blessing is extended over our children the most honorable wakiīs of the village of Kisrawān.

After sending our good wishes: We desire that you come to us in Bkirkī on this day, Wednesday, even if it be after sunset, so that we may explain to you what is necessary concerning the current incidents. Do not delay in coming after these lines reach you. Once again the Apostolic blessing is extended over you.

June 15, 1859.

The poor Būlus	Būlus.
Buṭrus, the Patriarch	The seal of Buṭrus
of Antioch."	The Patriarch of Antioch.

---

366. This letter from the Patriarch is the only one of this entire collection written in clear and correct classical Arabic.

XXI. "Most holy Father,

"After kissing the places where the pure feet of your Beatitude have trod, and seeking the Apostolic blessing from your most holy mouth forever, we submit: that this evening, Monday, Farj Qalāwis of 'Ashqūt came to us from you and explained to us verbally that it was your Beatitude's idea that some men from the villages should go to his Excellency the illustrious Amīr Ḥasan.<sup>367</sup> We did not know the reason necessitating that, for we were not at fault and had done nothing against him. And if there have been persons pursuing their own aims who have made petitions to his Excellency which are at variance with realities, that is something to which we have done nothing similar. On the contrary, at all times we are obedient to your orders and the orders of the Sublime State - may the Lord of Creation preserve it! This is what we must lay before you, and whatever seems best to you, tell us of it. For all our people are obedient to whatever you command, and we continue to offer many prayers for your welfare. May God perpetuate your life.

June 22, 1859.

"Your children,  
The wakīls of the villages  
of Kisrawān."

---

367. Amīr Ḥasan Abū al-Lama', the acting Qā'im Maqām.

XXII. (To Ṭānyūs Bey Shāhīn.)

"To his most illustrious and glorious Excellency:

"After our respects and asking after your precious health - may God, be He exalted, grant that you are in perfect health - we submit: what has happened on the part of the army is that their intention is to go up and distribute munitions. We hope that you will understand your business and make the necessary arrangements and be on your guard. For the number of soldiers includes 250 men, plus 90 irregulars and Albanians, not more. Do not expect them to be more. What I understood from the soldiers themselves is that at the beginning of the battle they will surrender to you.<sup>368</sup> The shaikhs have gone to Kākhī Pāshā, so, God willing, they will go up before the soldiers; enlist your men for service, and prepare for war, because if there is a surrender or running away in secret, the country would be ruined. For the Qawwās (kevass) of his Grace the French Consul told us that. Take care that none of the enemies cheat you, for they are deceitful and confirmed cheaters. We have from Ghādīr about 50 men standing ready by their arms. So if it is necessary, let us know so that we may come. We hope there will be no fear; all the villages in our vicinity have come to us,

---

368. "والذي فهمت من نفس العسكرانه من فتوح الحرب

ويسلم" - اي في بدأ القتال يسلم .

having been informed by your Excellency to come. Strengthen yourself for war. May God give you victory over your foes, and may God prolong your life.

July 17, 1859.

"Your brother,

'Abdullāh al-Khūrī."

Page 185 XXIII. (To Shaikh Tānyūs Shāhīn)

"To his illustrious, glorious, respected Excellency, may his life be prolonged.

"After tendering our profuse respects and ardent good wishes, desiring your kind attention with all goodness and bountry:

We begin by saying that a debt is owed to us by Shaikh Sim'ān Ibn Niqūlā Haidar Hūbaish, of Ghazīr, in accordance with the written statement here enclosed, in the amount of 160 piastres, from last year. We have asked for it repeatedly, but he continues to procrastinate. We beg you to sign the enclosed letter for us with your seal at this time, for perhaps he will pay us. If he does not pay and yet does not contest our right, we know of no way to get the money except through your efforts, for you have the means of obtaining it, and your words are heeded by the said shaikh. He will accept what you say and desist from his procrastination and excuses. We ask the Almighty - may He be exalted - to prolong your life.

September 8, 1859.

"Your brothers,  
Mikhāyil 'Aṣāf' (?)<sup>369</sup>



XXIV. "To his Excellency, the most illustrious, glorious, respected, and esteemed Ṭānyūs Bey, may his life be prolonged.

"After expressing our hope that you are well and asking after your health = we were honoured to receive your letter dealing with the matter of the trouble that has arisen between their Excellencies our brothers, Messrs. Ḥannā Nahrā al-Haddād and his nephews Ḥabīb and Ḥaidar. One of them, Ḥannā, came to inform us of the aggressions of his nephews against him. In connection with him you directed us to send our brother Sim'ān 'Aṭāllāh to investigate, and afterwards to give your Excellency a description of the situation by means of a written report, so that justice might be done by punishing the aggressor by order of the Government. All that has been understood. But since we were quite certain of your constant desire for love and friendship with everyone, and that you absolutely did not want there to be any causes for the cessation of the general peace, in accordance with your upright inclinations we have resolved the issue between the two parties by sending the Fathers, the priests of the locality, and we have removed all issues between them to their satisfaction. As we said, since the existence of peace is pleasing to you, we have lost no time in submitting it (the petition). We seek Divine favor for your support, and may God prolong your life.

"Your brothers,

The wakīls of 'Arāmūn."

XXV. (To Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn)

"To his most illustrious, glorious, and respected Excellency, may his life be prolonged!

"After tendering our respects and asking after your well-being, we submit; that on this date Sim'ān and Jirjis Rīḥān were carrying several raṭls of vegetables to sell them, when Fāris al-Ard and some people from Nahr al-Ṣalīb appeared, shouted to them that they were the tenants<sup>370</sup> of Shaikh Yūsuf 'Īd (al-Khāzin). They took two Majīdī riyāls from them to keep until they (Sim'ān and Jirjis) could produce an order from your Excellency to give back the two riyāls. We therefore beg you to give them (Sim'ān and Jirjis) a letter from your Excellency to carry with them so that no one may obstruct them on the road, for we authorised them to take to Shaikh Yūsuf his provisions, vegetables, and all that he desires. Without a written statement from you they can bring nothing. This is what we must say; and may your life be prolonged.

September 18, 1859.

"Your brothers,  
Buṭrus al-Ḥājj."(?)<sup>371</sup>

---

370. "شركات"

371. The question mark is Yazbak's.

And in the margin:

"Also, concerning the uncultivated lands<sup>372</sup> of Yūsuf 'Īd (i.e. Shaikh Yūsuf al-Khāzin) there are complaints about them.

"We beg you to give them (the owners) a letter to warn them so that this aggression shall not take place, because the cattle .. (rest of the phrase cut off)."

XXVI. (From the "priest" Yuḥannā al-Ḥabīb to Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad).

"Most holy father, may God perpetuate his noble presence.

"After kissing the ground where your pure feet have trod, with all humility and respect and seeking the issue of the Apostolic blessing from your most pure mouth forever.

"I was most honored to receive your Beatitude's generous letter, of this month.<sup>373</sup> I praised Him - may He be exalted! - for your well-being and peace of mind, seeking from Him - may He be praised! - to preserve for us your presence from all evils and troubles perpetually. What you commanded your son to do I have carried out; but no result

---

372. "حراش": forests or uncultivated land used for grazing or wood-cutting. Evidently Shaikh Yūsuf's cattle grazing on this land are trespassing on other persons' property.

373. "زمن الجارى": literally "the current," or "instant." It could here mean "the current day", but more probably there is a number missing; a date of the current month.

has been obtained except that I have endured fatigue and have been consoled by my thoughts. This is what must be laid before you, hoping from ... universal ... that I may continue to enjoy your blessed favor and have the honor of serving you. I repeat the kissing of the places where your pure feet have trod with respect.

October 17, 1859.

"Your Beatitude's son

(the one who is known to you.)"

(And in the margin:)

"Since you previously ordered me to remain here, I submit to you the fee of the messenger. I submit that it was 29 piastres, of which one Majīdī Riyāl was to here and the remainder to a messenger whom I sent to Brummānā to deliver the reply to Shaikh 'Īd in connection with what I had brought to his attention. Were it not for the large amount I spent for benefits neglected by everyone else, such as the cost of riding animals for journeys, messengers, and bearing the expenses of food and drink, excluding the hardships of fatigue, I would not have brought this matter before you. I am at your orders."

XXVII. "Having the honour to kiss the hands of the greatly respected Father, the respected priest Yuḥannā Ḥabīb, may God - be He exalted! - prolong his goodness and his life.

"Most respected Father, may God - be He exalted! - prolong his goodness and his life.

"After kissing your unblemished hands and seeking the benefit of your pure prayers of intercession forever: The matter submitted to your Fatherliness is that we were honoured by a visit from the representative of the great state of France, who looked forward to seeing you in order to confer with you. This being the case, I, your Fatherliness's son, fervently hope that you will do the honour of visiting us. I am sending our mule-dirver Jibrā'īl so that he may be at your service. Since, as I have said, your presence is fervently hoped for, we pray you to come, even though ... as you desire. We shall not accept from your Fatherliness any excuse for failing to come to us. We repeat the kissing of your hands, and may God - be He exalted! - prolong your life.

October 18, 1859.

"Your son,  
Ṭānyūs Shāhīn.

(And in the margin:)

"P.S. The writer kisses your hands and asks after the health of your Fatherliness, may his life be prolonged. We repeat our wish that your Fatherliness come to honour us in the morning, and that in the interests of your comfort, arrangements have been completed to fulfill your desires. His Excellency the most illustrious gentelman Yūsuf Ḥabbālīn kisses your kands and asks after the health of your Fatherliness.

(The seal) Ṭānyūs Shāhīn."

XXVIII. "By the Grace of God.

"Being favored with the attention of the gracious--  
Father, the priest Yuḥannā Ḥabīb, who is greatly respected,  
may his life be long.

"Most respected and gracious Father,

"After a brotherly kiss and heartfelt wishes to behold  
your countenance content with every bounty: We were most  
fortunate to receive your Fatherliness's letter which ref-  
lected the perfection of your qualities and in which you  
displayed your treasured graciousness which has become known  
to us. May we not lose the bonds of your affection, and  
whatever good wishes you hold toward us, we reciprocate  
them many times over. We ask Him who is most high that by  
His Grace we may meet at the earliest possible time.

Page 190 "Then, concerning what you mentioned in connection  
with meeting his Excellency your son, Mr. Ṭānyūs Shāhīn:  
You and he did not come to an agreement, for your Father-  
liness wants first of all a letter from us so that the  
people can be informed of what the decision is. Above all  
your Fatherliness knows that we have no object except solely  
the general good, which we love from the bottom of our hearts;  
for we see what harm is about to visit the people of Kisrawān  
should no measures be taken to deal with this injury which  
is ready to bring death to its friend. Because of this,  
in view of our past and present love for the people of  
Kisrawān, we must exert ourselves in dealing with this matter

which has been handled in a disorganised way,<sup>374</sup> and which those with evil motives desire to spread. For what can be done, if the people do not agree on a single course, and our effort goes in vain? Therefore it is necessary that first the people agree, whether to elect two ma'mūrs from the peasants plus a third outsider such as Yūsuf Karam, or something else: and after this agreement they should present petitions concerning the matter to the (Turkish) mushīr and to His Grace the esteemed General, our<sup>375</sup> dean. God willing, with His help, we shall not fail to take notice of all that would help in solving this problem and in furthering the immediate and general good. The whole purpose is that the opinion of the masses may be resolutely invited. We met with His Grace the General, and the necessary negotiations in this particular took place; God willing, the outcome of this matter will be favorable. Later another matter will be laid before you. If it is suitable, hasten to present the petitions in accordance with what was agreed when we parted, signed by the populace, so that an effort may be made to carry out the order as desired. Your Fatherliness is aware that the more there is neglect in finishing this action, the more its completion will be difficult, and the more difficult it will be to heal this wound without amputation.

191 Because of your wisdom

---

374. "اللاعبة بها ايدي سبأ" The writer in an attempt at erudition has misused a classic idion which is said to stem from the breaking of the great Ma'rib Dam in Yemen. The Saba' (Sabaean) tribe fled in confusion; hence the phrase "تفرق القوم ايدي سبأ" or "تشدتوا ايدي سبأ". The idion properly connotes disorderly movement or dispersion.

375. Probably a reference to the French Consul General.

it is not necessary to elaborate excessively on this matter. Always send us news of what happens. We repeat the kissing of your hands a second and a third time, and may your bounty continue.

October 20, 1859.                    "Hoping for your prayers,  
F. Leroy.                            Father François the Lazarite.  
General Father in Syria."<sup>376</sup>

XXIX. "Most holy Father,

"After most respectfully kissing the ground under your pure feet, seeking the grant of the Apostolic blessing and offering of prayers of benevolence to preserve the honour of your presence forever, I submit: I was honoured to receive two letters, one a reply and one informative. All that you commanded meets with the acknowledgement of your son. Praise be to Him who is most high for your well-being and comfort and the health of your most noble personage, who is the protection of peace and stability throughout the centuries. Enclosed in my petition is something I would be honoured to have you look at. I seek the favor of being eternally included within the fold of happiness, and I repeat the kissing of the ground under your pure feet with the utmost respect.

October 27, 1859.                    "Your Beatitude's son,  
The Priest Yuḥannā Ḥabīb

---

376. Père Leroy was Father Superior of the 'Anṭūrā monastery and chief of the Lazarite mission in Syria. Presumably this letter was written for him by a Lebanese colleague.



page 192 XXX. (As for Father Yuḥannā Ḥabīb's statement in the above letter, "Enclosed in my petition is something I would be honoured to have you look at," it is a "shuqqah" ( a secret letter) on two sheets of paper, in four filled pages. Here is its text):

"What you wrote on the three pages meets with my obedience: First of all I ask you to overlook my anger that I displayed previously. What caused it was fear of destruction, and I believe that your doing justice would meet with no obstruction from me because of my clear conscience. The 29 piastres that were paid to the messenger are still with the messenger. He was greedy and wanted to take all of them, even though I had bargained with him for one Majīdī riyāl, the remainder being the wage of a messenger to Brummānā. It has not been necessary to send him, for by chance someone was going that way, with whom I sent a short message to 'I. ('Īd Ḥātīm) as you ordered.

What happened newly is that I received a letter from the Amīgo (i.e. Ṭānyūs Shāhīn) which I am sending you. I went to him, but did not find the government representative (i.e. the French Consul). He told me that that was a device on his part to prevent me from excusing myself from coming, for he knew of my anger at his actions. He told me that the Padre François Leroy, the Lazarite had come from the country to 'Ainṭūrā. (The Padre) asked for (Ṭānyūs) so (Ṭānyūs) went to see him. (The Padre) inquired

of him what was happening. (Ṭānyūs) told him that the people would only be satisfied with a ma'mūr from among the people themselves. The Father pledged himself to (Ṭānyūs) on that, that they would agree on an individual and present a petition to the government of the Mushīr and that of the (Consul) General. The Father advised him not to accept the office because it would be troublesome to him, and said that he (the Father) would arrange a fitting means of protection. He replied, "I do not seek it (the office), but if they were to agree on me, what could I do?" I was surprised at his words, and told him that I would not believe it till I had written to the Padre. I sent him (the Padre) a letter containing an inquiry as to the substance of what the Amigo had told me, and saying that if it were true, the people ought to be informed of that. He sent me the enclosed reply; if it is convenient, have it returned to me. As for the Padre's enclosed comment, that he shares my opinion and the opinion of His Excellency etc., he was imagining that I wrote to him that my belief was that (the ma'mūr) should be from the people themselves, while actually his Excellency and I simply agreed that he (the Padre) should be asked for information. Both before the arrival of the Padre's reply and after it, the Amigo sent asking for his agents and clients and urged them to elect him as ma'mūr over Kisrawān within two or three days, for the Padre was trying to thwart

him. They answered his request and toured the villages fulfilling his wishes. After the arrival of the Padre's reply to me, which was well known here, many people sent inquiries to me which I answered. I considered above all that we should agree on his election, because disagreement would only lead him to insist on his goal. He promised me that if this matter did not turn out in his interest, he would return and compromise, and would be satisfied to accept a ma'mūr chosen by the Qā'im Maqām, on condition that he be informed of him in advance so that he could see whether it was agreeable to accept him. He would also make the condition that the man's subordinates must be from Kisrawān. This promise won my agreement, and the villages of the valley supported my opinion. As for the wakīls of Zūq, the ignorant (i.e. common people) rose against them and cried in a loud voice that their ma'mūr was the Amīgo (i.e. Tanyūs Shāhīn). I stayed with the Amīgo three days, constantly repeating (my views) to him. It appeared he was determined to have the office, and that if he did not get it because he was disqualified, he thought to transfer it to his nephew. Then the Padre promised me in his reply that he would write to me again, but to this date no information has come to me from him. So far no objectives have been forthcoming and I do not know what has happened to the Amigo since I returned from him three days ago. For he was concerned with the petitions and in a hurry to

collect and present them. Today I received news that he was no longer hurried and that he said that I had the petitions for office (i.e. for his election), so there was no hurry. This led me to suppose that he had received word from the Padre that his request had not been fulfilled; and it is probable that it was not fulfilled, for the consuls do not agree to it because he has incurred the anger of the government.

My belief is that the situation in Kisrawān will not improve, except either by compelling force to check the present growing rebellion, - for even if they were to accept a ma'mūr chosen by the government and asked for him they would not obey him - or by the Amīgo compromising and solving the excitement, or by giving the office to him; and this is the quickest way to quiet the situation. It is also best for the shaikhs (the Khāzins), for if the ma'mūr was someone other than he, they would be worried about their possessions, whereas if he were the ma'mūr, they would be able to return and regain their stolen possessions and provisions. For the Amīgo when he became the ma'mūr would exploit his position (beneficially), do justice and dissolve extremism;<sup>377</sup> for he would not longer cook in large pots<sup>378</sup> nor heed the ignorant. Wisemen would

---

التفكيك  
377. "يترسل وينصف ويحصل"  
378. "يطبخ الخلايق" i.e., entertain lavishly to solicit the support of large numbers of people.

surround him, and he would listen to them. This course would be more successful than others. All the courses have their dangers except for this one. But everyone will oppose this idea with heresy and unbelief and because the idea is sound, evil-doers and those with selfish aims will not allow it to be fulfilled. I wrote to Shaikh 'Īd about it and also to the priest Ḥannā, even though I might be considered ignorant or an unbeliever by other persons.

There is no response now from Beirut and the matter of the petitions of election has become a passing amusement to the Government.

There continues to be speculation over the outbreak of fighting between the Christians and the Druses.

age 195 The Mutasallim of Zahlah<sup>379</sup> continues in his usual situation.

The school continues to be in the situation described.

When the Amīgo asked for me, he delegated me to submit to you what he had told me from the Padre, about the need to delay that<sup>380</sup> until the reply arrived from the Padre. After the reply came, I made him understand the necessity to wait for the letter that the Padre had promised us in his reply. I came from him in these circum-

---

379. The Muslim Turkish official who had been placed over the town at the request of the inhabitants.

380. i.e., selection of the ma'mūr.

"We submit to your Beatitude:

Page 196 "On October 25 a letter reached us from his Grace the (Consul) General of the French Government, just as letters were sent to others than us, totalling seven in all: to his Reverence Bishop Niqūlā Murād; the clergyman J̄onādiyūs, general director of the Aleppine monks; to Father Francis Zwain; to Father Ḥannā Ḥabīb; to Father 'Abdullah 'Aqīqī; and to Father Buṭrus Ṣfair. All of them carried a single theme - that the rumor spread by Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, on behalf of the Padre François the Lazarite, that the said (Consul) General had voiced his wish that the said Ṭānyūs be ma'mūr over Kisrawān - that all this troubled him (the Consul) greatly, because there was no truth to it as regards either the (Consul) General or the aforementioned Padre. The only element of truth was that Ṭānyūs went to the said Padre expecting sympathy for the sake of his personal status and the status of Kisrawān in general saying that the people desired a ma'mūr from among themselves. The afore-mentioned (Padre) replied that he would intercede with the (Consul) General for the protection of Ṭānyūs' person, and in the interests of Kisrawān, if it were possible, to have three ma'mūrs, one from outside and two from Kisrawān under his (the outsider's) orders. All this he made clear to him and submitted it to His Grace the Mushīr, but it brought no result except that he (the Mushīr) showed his anger and

strong displeasure. This was the essence of the letter. He desires us to show his letter to the people in our district. For our part, since at the time the letter arrived we were in Ghazīr in order to deal with a claim in connection with our judicial functions, and it had to be finished, we were unable to attend at the time. We thought that the Fathers referred to, representing every district of Kisrawān, could make that (letter) public and seek to do what was written in the said letter. When we departed from Ghazīr, on the road we met Fathers Yuḥannā and François, and asked them what had taken place. They replied that the people of the valley were behaving as the (Consul) General asked, and that they had encountered us opposition. Therefore they are only awaiting the (reply of) the others; perhaps the reply will be unanimous. We in our district have publicised the letter, but the reply has not been complete. On this date a meeting is taking place in Raifūn, and there is still no agreement on a single reply. We ask the Creator - may he be exalted - through your prayers to grant what is beneficial for your children the people of Kisrawān as a body. We beg you, and beg again, to extend to your children the hand of your concern for them with what the Creator inspires you with for their welfare. Your wisdom is abundant. There is no need to send any reply, but rather that matter is dependent on your wisdom.

XXXII. From the priest Yuhannā Ḥabīb (later a Bishop) to Patriarch Būlus Mas'ad.

December 19, 1859.

"I am submitting this secretly to your person, in view of my identity.

"After I was honoured with your Beatitude's letter and the secret sheet enclosed, and after I asked His Excellency Shaikh 'Id (Ḥātīm) about matters related to it and about the state of conditions that he had noticed in the general and local government, I went specially to my friend (Ṭānyūs) with his Excellency and spoke to him, first privately and then in company (with 'Id Ḥātīm). We explained to him the consequences of the business and all the risks and dangers that might occur. To some extent he appeared to be convinced in accordance with your opinion: That is, to present the above-mentioned thing in the presence of the Qā'im Maqām and the council, and a sworn statement showing his faithful dependence on the advice of the populace with which he is associated. In order to convince him (Ṭānyūs) of this I used the argument that both his alliance with them (the populace) and his position as general wakīl required him to obtain their consent before making a decision.<sup>382</sup> For this reason

---

"أى بتقديم المشار به بحضور القاي مقام والمجلس وسند 382  
صحة الاعتماد على مشورة الجمهور المرتبط معه لكي  
يقنعه بذلك معتذرا ان الحلف الجارى بينهم ووكالته  
العامة يقتضيان اخذ رضاهم قبل القرار . . ."



it was deemed desirable to hold a public meeting, and a request went out to all the villages that their wakīls should appear on Saturday in Raifūn. On the same day Shaikh 'Īd went to them and found that in most (villages) people were coming (to Raifūn) with the exception of 'Ajaltun and its farms at Mazra'ah and its surroundings, Ghādīr, Juniyah, and Shnan'īr; from these places no one came. On the arrival of his Excellency ('Īd) he met first with Ḥabīb al-Jāmātī, and told him of what had happened on his trip, and of his recent observations of opposition from the other faction in al-Zūq, etc. After that his Excellency entered the meeting place, proclaimed the decrees of his Grace (the Qā'im Maqām) and their Eminences (?)<sup>383</sup> plus an account of the decrees of the Mushīr, together with the necessary explanation of them, officially and unofficially. He described the situation, contradicting what was agreed on in the special meeting between us. But by his thorough insinuation he was even able to convince those present who were best known for their opposition - the wakīls of 'Ashqūt and Raifūn and Bishārah Ghānim and a man from Ḥārah Sakhr - to write replies to his Grace (the Qā'im Maqām) and their Eminences containing a summary of the content of the decrees and showing this obedience, (and to agree) that the cases raised against them, and

---

383. The question mark is the translator's.

claims laid by them and against them should be submitted to a special council under the chairmanship and surveillance of the Qā'im Maqām. Whatever was asked of them legally, they would deliver it without appealing to the Qā'im Maqām on asking him to come to the district. His Excellency ('Id Ḥātim) left them in this condition, leaving them to re-draft the petitions and sign them. On his return to them today, Sunday, he found that most of the wakīls had gone, and none remained except the wakīls of Raifūn and 'Ashqūt, Yūsuf Ḥabālīn of al-Zūq, Bishārah Ghānim, and Mikhāyil Aṣṣāf, the latter being present with the others though not sharing in their opinion. When he asked about the petition that had been written, he was answered by Tānyūs in the presence of the populace, that they had decided to change the petition into its present form and that it would be written in no other way. He asked them for the reasons. They replied that the Mushīr had not addressed them, so there was no call for a reply to him. As for the Qā'im Maqām, they did not consider him to be the confirmed ruler, so his presence need not be sought. They said that since the beginning of their movement they had not strayed outside the bounds of his (the Qā'im Maqām's) opinion and guidance in what they had done. When necessary they had petitioned him, in writing and verbally, about certain pressing matters, asking that they be set right, and he would answer "I am

~~detained~~ before the court; you can see that I have been summoned, together with a woman from Zaḥlah.<sup>384</sup> And he would refer them to the Mushīr. What they are now asking is that if he (the Qā'im Maqām) is confirmed in office, they want to become acquainted with the high decrees issued in this connection; and then, once they knew him to be a Christian Qā'im Maqām of conduct befitting his position in the consideration of his co-religionists, they would put their trust in him and seek his judgment of their claims. They consider that this threatening and menacing conduct of his was a result of the general agreement made among the landholders; that the issue of the Mushīr's orders was at his behest; and that if the Mushīr had wanted them to do that,<sup>385</sup> he would have written them special orders which they would have obeyed without opposing whomever was empowered to govern them, be it the Mushīr or the Qā'im Maqām. Then secondly he asked them about their answer to their Eminences and about informing his Beatitude (the Patriarch) of the opinion they would present to them. They replied that when they received decrees of confidence in

---

384. Amīr Bashīr Ahmad, the Qā'im Maqām, was found in court to be indebted to a woman from Zaḥlah for a piece of land he had unlawfully seized from her. Count Bentivoglio, the French Consul, made representations to the Turkish authorities asking reduction of the Amīr's debt. (British Consular Files, Beirut. Moore to Bulwer, No. 1, January 10, 1860.)

385. i.e., if the Mushīr really wanted the people to obey the orders.

the confirmation of the Qā'im Maqām and assurances of his just behavior toward them, they would not hesitate to accept him.

Then he asked them thirdly about answering the council and the judge of the (Maronite) sect,<sup>386</sup> and how it would be, since they had been asked to give an opinion about their decision to deal with the case of Kisrawān. They answered that when the council was free, and could conduct its work freely, then they would give their reply. Previously they had asked for a "Majlis Commission,"<sup>387</sup> but their opponents had not accepted it while conditions were thus. They were not seeking anything, but would reply to whatever was put before them. If the Mushīr came with troops to Kisrawān, they would meet him at the river-crossing obediently, according to his wishes, etc. These thoughts and contradictions were expressed only by those who were already mentioned. The wakīls of 'Ashqūt, al-Qlai'āt, Raifūn and 'Ajaltūn only.

And written on a small clipping attached to this letter:

"Since I must expect to inform 'Īd of your reply concerning what I have written concerning him, tell me how I should write to him. Then because your letter was secret,

---

386. Each sect was represented on the Majlis of the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah by two members one of whom was a judge.

387. A council designated to supervise affairs of the religious community, serving as liaison between the clergy and people.

I was unable to help 'Īd. Nevertheless I informed my friend of its meaning in hopes that the request would be fulfilled. He answered me (agreeing), but afterward changed (his mind). I destroyed the letter, though there was nothing worth noting in it."<sup>388</sup>

XXXIII. ( A petition to the Qā'im Maqām, Amīr Aḥmad Abū al-Lama' ).

"After the introductory greetings = We were honored to receive your Grace's decree brought by your servant, Shaikh 'Īd Ḥātīm, and all that you decreed in writing and verbally transmitted by the said Shaikh. We have also had the honour to receive an account of the general content of the noble decrees issuing from the Mushīr by order of your Grace. All that was easily understood and meets with our obedience; it should be followed and obeyed. The situation in reality, Effendi, is that conditions with us were not what they were observed to be. For at all times we have been bound by the chain of obedience and acceptance of leadership, in all concerning your noble constitutional wishes. And since we are the slaves of our master the Great Sultan, and under the wing of the noble

---

388. "حيث لازم ان ابقى اعرف عيد عن جوابكم لي عما حررته بشانه امر وا كيف ابقى احرر له . ثم ان ظرفكم من حيث انه سرى قصر يدي عن مساعدة عيد ومع ذلك افهمت صاحبي عن معناه املا بنفوذ الطلب فاجابني لكن بعده غير والظروف عدته وان لم يكن فيه ملحوظ ما ."

royal sympathy, we have not the least fears of vicious rumours, nor of the issue of your Grace's decree to us, nor the sympathies shown to us. We praise Him who is most high for keeping your Grace as a refuge and source of mercy to all of us. Whenever we have the honour to receive special decrees from the Mushīr, or protective arrangements, then we will be obedient as before to execute the orders. By God's grace we shall not allow the least disturbance from among us to the Sublime State, may the Lord of the Land protect it! May God prolong your life."

(Most probably this petition is connected to the contents of the letter written by Father Yuḥannā al-Ḥabīb to Patriarch Mas'ad on December 19, 1859.)

XXXIV. (Probably to Ṭānyūs Shāhīn.)

"Containing news.

"We submit to you that your letter reached us carrying an enclosure which we read and whose contents we understood. First you mention the reason for the meeting of Tuesday as being in order to hear the reading of commands issued by his Grace the Count, the Consul of the Great French Government.<sup>389</sup> Actually this meeting was not for this but rather for other things ... We understand, and your Excellency likewise, etc..

---

389. Count de Bentivoglio.

Page 202 "Then you also mention that at the time of the meeting an individual came to the people and assured them that there would be a ma'mūr from among the people of Kisrawān, if they would pay all (the taxes) that were asked from the country.<sup>390</sup> This brother of ours has connections with yourself and with the people, and since you see that such an arrangement is suitable and beneficial both to you and to the people, and since your orders were issued to all the people in connection with that, our advice is no longer of any use. Similarly you mention that we should propose to the Father Superior<sup>391</sup> the thing that you mention. But we have observed and made very sure that he would not consider such things. This has been our opinion from the beginning, for what is done is done, and nothing can be done about it. And thus it is with such governments: so far nothing has been effective. This should have been made clear earlier. In view of your statement that perhaps the people will follow a government other than that of our brother, we beg you to note ... Do not embark on untimely writing (to anyone)<sup>392</sup> because you think that the French Government would concern itself with the people of

---

390. "وهم يدفع جميع المطالب عن البلاد"

391. Père François Leroy.

392. "لا ترموا كتابتكم بغير وقتها"

Kisrawān if they left their religion. This is something that would be beneficial to their welfare and to themselves as well. Do not even think that other states have the opportunity and power without the consent of the aforesaid state (i.e. France).<sup>393</sup> For both you and others understand the strength and power of the great French State. If the foregoing is sound, you will consider these matters and leave such actions which do not seem reasonable to us or to anyone else; indeed, if your friendship for us is real, and you understand that we wish your welfare and the welfare of the masses as much as our own welfare, you would tell us truly what is going on in your mind, so that we could know well what we wish to do. We tell you that this action coming from you and from the people ... the very same destruction. It will not be suitable for long, because you are becoming like a ruler, giving orders and not obeying. ... As for your statement that we believed thus, we do not entertain this idea at all, because the first deed ... to this extent. You got what you were thinking of, and more, and now, if you wish ... what suits you and suits people will endure.

---

393. Poujoulat states (op. cit., p. 71) that in 1860 Colonel Churchill attempted to persuade Ṭānyūs to join the British cause by pressing for the selection of Amir 'Abdullah Shihāb (Churchill's son-in-law) as Christian Qā'im Maqām, but Ṭānyūs refused.



Continue to obey the ruling authorities, and also the great French State. Do not think that this idea can be realised without efforts, for from the start you have rejected the ideas that have been put to your Excellency, and you did not accept them. So now you will have to work extremely hard at being appropriately diplomatic, and abandon your present ideas. Understand that the authorities are not incapable of disciplining the people of Kisrawān, and you do not realise what an army they have ... We have information that you are not lacking in wisdom and reasonableness in such matters, as the proverb says that ... will happen soon and all the effort will be in vain. Therefore we shall shorten our explanation. If it is possible for you to come secretly to whatever place you wish, let us know so that we can meet you and explain to you orally. For as you said, not everything can be written that is on the mind of the writer.<sup>394</sup> Your conscience will tell you to whom you wrote thus, and will also inform you that we are always alert to whatever leads to your welfare and that of the people; but far be it from anyone to appreciate that<sup>395</sup> what was completed and will be completed in the council of his Grace the Consul and elsewhere. Send us a reply ... immediately in writing and inform us of your wishes."

---

394. "ليس كل شيء يكتب في السان (لسان) القلب"

395. "ولكن يا ويلاه على من يبين معه ذلك"

(Without signature or date. The dots replace the words that were torn from the letter.)

Page 204 XXXV. "Hoping for the attention of his illustrious Excellency Ṭānyūs Bey, the most noble and venerable, may his life be perpetuated.

"We submit: that we are being besieged in Faiṣal's mansion. For God's sake - may He be exalted! - send troops to help us. God keep you.

"Beseeching your Excellency,  
"Ḥabīb 'Abdullah al-Khūrī."  
(without date)

XXXVI. "Favored with the attention of the respected Ṭānyūs Bey Shāhīn.

"To his Excellency, our respected spiritual son.

"After bestowing upon you our blessing and expressing our hope to find you well and happy, we must first ask how you are and whether you are in good spirits. May God grant that your Excellency is happy in fact and in name.

"Previously we were honoured to receive a letter from your Excellency in which you asked about us, and we wished your Excellency victory and success. Furthermore, a letter was brought to your Excellency previously, on our behalf, by our son Ilyās, concerning the recovery of certain rights; and we do not know whether or not he reached you,

for your Excellency was visiting his Beatitude, Now our son passed through Shwātā to try to collect some money owed to him by one named Ḥusain. Ḥaidar of Shwātā and by 'Ali Ḥasan 'Abbas. They maltreated him and beat him painfully. Since your Excellency asked after us when we had no complaints, now that we do have complaints you must ask after us (again) and restrain the Mutawālīs from us. For the Creator gave you a vivid voice with which to defend the rights of all Christians and set our minds at rest. As for the Mutawālīs, they are disrespectful of you. We hope to recover our rights (and indemnity of) the beating, May the Grace of our Lord keep your Excellency, and may God prolong your life.

"Praying that your life may be long,<sup>396</sup>

"Father Mīkhayil al-Shāmī,

Servant of Sir'ayyā."

And in the margin:

"Those who assaulted our son were five men, namely Ḥamūd Ḥaidar, Ḥamūd Ḥusain, Ḥusain 'Alī Shadīd, 'Alī Ḥasan, and Ḥusain Ḥaidar."

(Without date)

XXXVII. (To Ṭanyūs Shāhin)

"Containing news.

"Ṣāliḥ and Shāwūl are in great difficulties of every

sort and suffering losses and stoppage of work. They believe that whoever is your follower, you will obtain for him his rights and honor. They put their hope in your great zeal, that whoever joins with your Excellency, no one will be able any longer to take advantage of him. Swearing by God and their women-folk (their honour) they cried that if the Amīr or the notables of the country that does not belong to his Excellency Tānyūs Bey offered us an indemnity (for our losses) and the property of the country, we would not accept, nor would we make a reconciliation except by order of his Excellency (Tānyūs). We hope that the appeals of those who act in such a way (as Ṣāliḥ and Shāwūl) will not be neglected - especially when they say that they have goods and children which they sacrifice for your disposal for the sake of your honour, so that the enemy will not say to them, "What has he done for you as a result of your joining him?"

We know no more than that, for the hardship we experienced in al-'Āqūrah had never happened to us before. For the sake of the Virgin Mary, take us home once and for all. Were we to go broken with shame, we would rather kill ourselves. For had we actually done anything wrong, (that would be one thing); but (they) did it intentionally.<sup>397</sup>

---

397. دخل العدره مريم خدونا لملنا باء (بقى) وان رحنا  
مكسورين بالخجل نقتل حالنا ولو كان صار منا غلط في  
الواقع فلاكن هذه صارت تحت الحرص . . . .

There is no disgrace in defeating those who are partial or fickle. Should you wish to order us to take men from Afqā, let us know, for when we came to 'Āqūrah ten men came with us. We felt obliged to support the people of 'Āqūrah; and at the time we did support them."

(Without date or signature).

XXXVIII. "Favored with the attention of his most illustrious and generous Excellency Ṭānyūs Bey, may his life be prolonged.

"Illustrious and glorious Excellency,

"After our most abundant respects and our desire to have the privilege of seeing you in the best of spirits and well-being, we are writing to ask after your precious health. It was a most blessed occasion when we were fortunate enough to receive your letter announcing the good news of your good health; we praised Him who is most high for that. We understood its contents; and in regard to the debt owed by our brother Ḥannā Naṣṣār to our brother Buṭrus al-Khūrī of 'Ashqūt, upon the arrival (of the letter) we summoned the aforesaid Ḥannā and settled the claim by awarding an oxload valued at 470 piastres to the said Buṭrus. As for the remainder of the debt, it was decided that he (Ḥannā) should produce a statement of income from the priest, Father Ni'mat-Allah al-Daḥdāḥ, to repay the rest and give it to him (Buṭrus). As for the claim raised by Ziyādah

Mas'ad against Anṭūn Sarkīs: previously we contacted the said Anṭūn, and he put us off, saying that he would look to see what (money) was available to him. Then when we summoned him, he replied that he wanted Ziyādah to go with him to the judge, to see what should be done in view of his difficulties, and that he would then write out an acknowledgment of what he owed him, if the validity of the debt in that amount were confirmed. Whatever the court decided, he would act in accordance with it. As for the appendage (to your letter), we understood it and are pleased with your goodness in dispatching replies that refute the speech makers. We thank you for your goodness in improving the welfare of the common people, and especially for your desire to deal with the question of Kisrawān, as soon as their Excellencies the Shaikhs of the Khāzin family choose a wakīl for themselves to deal with it in a just manner. This is what was agreed upon, and your Excellency is obliged to do so because of your position as general wakīl for the common people of Kisrawān. For our part we have nothing that we need explain: indeed we rely on the continuation of friendship and concord among all of us. We hope that whatever is new with you, you will explain it to us as it occurs. We ask Him who is most high to make things turn out well and to inspire you to every good work, and may he perpetuate your life.

January 4, 1860.

"Your brothers,

The wakīls of the village of 'Arāmūn."

Written on the back of this letter is the following:  
"I, Ya'qūb, have opened the letter." This Ya'qūb was the nephew of the chieftain.

page 208 XXXIX. "Having the honour to kiss the hands of the illustrious Fathers, the respected priests of 'Arāmūn, may their lives be prolonged!

"Respected Fathers,

"After kissing your noble hands and seeking the bounty of your intercessory prayers forever, we must ask after your previous health. May God who is most high grant you all his blessings. Then we inform your Reverences what must already be known to you, concerning the incidents that occur on festival days as a result of drinking 'Araq and wine. The Council agreed that it was necessary to announce in all places that whoever drinks 'araq or wine outside his house and there results from it any mischief, unseemly talk, cursing and quarrelling, etc., this is in itself a very vile thing. Then may God - be He exalted!, the faithful of the Church, and the leaders all proclaim this. We hope that your Reverences will announce this in church to all the populace. Whoever transgresses after the announcement is made, and does the slightest mischief, his punishment will be one month (imprisonment) or several times that much. We are sure that such things will not occur from among your congregation, but since the announcement was to be made in

all places, it was necessary to inform your Reverences and the populace of it. We hope we shall always be included in your prayers.

February 8, 1860. "Your son,  
Ṭānyūs Shāhīn." (The seal)

XL. (To Ṭānyūs Shāhīn)

"To his most illustrious, glorious, and respected Excellency.

Page 209 "After offering our due respects and inquiring about your previous health and proud and peaceful temperament, we ask Him, may he be glorified, to keep you in all ease. We submit: that an incident has occurred between Ibrāhīm Ghānim al-Buwayyiz and his sons, and Ḥannā al-Mulḥimah. The desire of the said Ḥannā al-Mulḥimah is to ruin what you have repaired in this land. For he is working to persuade certain people in Zūq to cause insurrection and disturbances. For the said individual has taken money from persons whom you know, and he goes on trips to Bait Mirī every day, in order to achieve his aim. He does not appear to have had any success, but he is laying his hand on cooper goods, provisions, ... in which are accounts belonging to the dead cousin of Jirjis Mir'ī al-Buwayyiz. If you ask why we do not drive him away and not leave this responsibility to you, the reason is that he has supporters among certain people in al-Zūq. Were it not for that, we would expel him and his



family and put him in the middle of the sea, with your approval. We laid these facts before his Beatitude (the Patriarch) and his Beatitude's order was that they be submitted to your Excellency. If convenient, send two men of yours to remove his violence from our land and hand over the properties, <sup>398</sup>one by one because what he deserves is to be burned, since he disturbed the peace by spreading the news every day that the army was coming. The messenger will submit this to you, he is the son of Ibrāhīm Ghānim al-al-Buwayyiz. This is what must be laid before you. Call upon us for whatever services you require; and may God prolong your life.

March 27, 1860.

"Your brother,  
"Ḥabīb al-Zind." (Seal)

And in the margin:

"Enclosed is a memorandum on which are names. If you approve, honour us by sealing it, and command whomever you send to fetch them. Some are with Saj'ān, and the others you knew about previously.

Page 210 XLI. (To Tānyūs Shāhīn, The first part of the letter is lost.)

..."explain to you concerning the people of Ḥarājil, and that some of our people assaulted them. We submit that

---

398. "برقع قاوشة (برقع قارشه ؟) عن الرزقة وتسليم  
الاعطى (الواعي) . . ."

such was not the case, for the one who performed this deed was a man from Ghazīr called Lawīs (Louis) Bairam. It is true that one of our people was with him, but when he first arrived he took us part in the dispute,<sup>399</sup> according to what we have heard. Since our brother-in-law has gone to see you at Raifūn, when he returns we shall give him your letter and ... go to you at Dair Bkirkī before he goes home. Concerning the question of some of our men going to Bishārah Ghānim, we have become concerned about that, as our son Yūsuf will inform you about sending the men and about the solution (of the problem). This is what must be said. Call upon us for whatever services we can render. May the grace of Jesus keep you for us.

March 26, 1860.

"Appealing to your Excellency,  
Father Francis Shuqair (or Saqar)"

XLII<sup>400</sup> "Having the good fortune and honour to gain the attention of his most illustrious, glorious, Excellency, the illus-

---

399. "اول بلوغه ما قارششي"

400. The following letter from Ṭānyūs Shāhīn to the people of Jubail is not included by Yazbak in this collection, although he quotes from it briefly on page 59 of his volume. It is printed in English in Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria, 1860-61, I, p. 679. (Enclosed in a dispatch from Lord Dufferin to Sir H. Bulwer, March 10, 1861.) Dated April 3, 1860, it belongs here in chronological sequence:

trious, glorious, Excellency, the illustrious, respected  
Tānyūs Bey, may be live forever.

---

"(After compliments):

"I have received your letter and understood all that you say with regard to the arrival of Amir Yousef and the Bimbashi, bearing a bouyourouldi for the administration of Jebail. Do not accept, for I have a bouyourouldi from the Seven Sovereigns for the emancipation of all the Christians, who are no longer to be in bondage to anyone; if you desire to be emancipated from your slavery no one can prevent you, neither the Mushir nor the Kaimakam. I endorse an order to the Emir Yousef to return to his place: deliver it to him without delay, and do not fear anything. If you require a body of men let me know, and I will come myself with all my men. Fear nothing, for this is a matter which no longer concerns you, it concerns me. Any village of Jebail that wishes to unite with you let it name Vakeels over it in the village, who will enter their names with the Vakeel, lest the assembly should break up entirely; he that wishes to do so let him come on the part of the village, or let him inscribe his name in the register which will be sufficient. I have charged the bearer with certain verbal communications which he will deliver to you. Your brother, Tanios Shaheen (signed and sealed.) P.S. I transmit herewith a letter to Emir Yousef; deliver it to him at once and immediately, for it is most important that it should be delivered; and let me know what his answer will be; for I have plainly told him that if he hesitates he will have my men upon him from every direction. I also enclose a letter to Yezbek Lahood; deliver it to him and intimate to him verbally that he is to desist from design; do not fear anything; and this is sufficient for your sagacity. (sealed)  
Tanios Shaheen.

"After asking what your wishes are, we submit:  
We went to Anṭūlyās (Anṭilyās), where there are a number  
of Druse houses. On our arrival they fled and we were  
unable to calm them down. As for their houses and be-  
longings, we did what was necessary. This which happened,  
we have put before you: But Oh excellent Bey, it has become  
very, very necessary for you to rise up ( in arms ), and  
Page 211 if you do not arise in a mass immediately, there will be  
shame for the people of Kisrawān, and cowardice ascribed  
to the people of Kisrawān. If you have not risen because  
of the scarcity of ammunition, go to Anṭūlyās and you will  
receive all the ammunition and other things that you need,  
and we ... If you are waiting to learn the wishes of his  
Beatitude, then there is no more need to wait. We are at  
Mār Ilyās and swear by Mār Ilyās that your presence has  
become necessary in this region. Oh excellent Bey, listen  
to our opinion this time. If anything is done contrary to  
your wishes, we will gladly be without religion. Oh Bey,  
Oh Bey, do not kick away this opportunity. The decision  
rests with you. The news has been confirmed to us that  
Biskintā, Shwair, al-Qāṭi', and all districts have risen,  
with the sole exception of Kisrawān and those taking refuge  
there. Tomorrow we shall be in Bait Mirī. May your life  
be long.

May 24, 1860.

Your brothers,  
Na'mān 'Id and  
Bākhūs Âbū Ghālib."

And in the margin =

"Just when we were writing, some gentlemen came to us from Beirut and spoke to us, asking, what would you like us to bring you? Our reply was that we would ask for what we needed to-morrow, for because of the fewness of our people we did not have the nerve to ask.<sup>401</sup>

XLIII. "His Excellency the most illustrious, glorious, respected Ṭānyūs Bey, may he live long.

"After our deference and respect and earnest good wishes, we submit that with all ... your Excellency's message. We understood it, praising the Creator for your good health ... that we meet with your Excellency in Anṭilyās, we and our brothers the Shaikhs ... the main thing being to talk over the prevailing conditions. For our part it was ... to come and meet with your Excellency, but we must excuse ourselves for many compelling reasons that prevent us from going to the designated place. Since our brother Yūsuf Rāshid is going to represent us, he can act as needed on our behalf. We beg you to accept our apologies. We hope always to hear good news of your well-being, and may your life be long.

May 27, 1860.

"Appealing to you,

"'Aql Shadīd."

---

401. "فكان جوابنا انه نهار بكره نطلب اللازم فحيس قلت  
جمهورنا لم لنا عين طلبنا ."

XLIV. "To the villages of al-Fatūḥ and al-Kafūr.

"To their Excellencies our respected brother.

"After offering our respects: since it has been agreed that we all rise with our people to aid of our brother Christians, to defend them and to protect our homes, it is necessary that you send men to carry supplies and also send with your people some clever women to carry water for your people. You must also choose two intelligent individuals to be members of the council in al-Zūq. There is no need further to urge your concern and zeal. May your lives be long.

June 1, 1860.

"Your brother, (seal)

"Tānyūs Shāhīn.

And in the margin:

"As regards ammunition, we have it, so do not give it a thought.

"It is necessary to have the priests come, since this is an undertaking of Christian zeal.

Page 213 XLV. "Enjoying the attention of his most noble Excellency, the most illustrious, glorious, respected Tānyūs Bey Shāhīn, may his life be long.

"To his most noble Excellency, the most illustrious, glorious, and respected, may his life be long.

"After most deferentially tendering our respects and seeking your wishes: The arrival of your Excellency's

message was a most pleasing occasion, and we praised Him who is most high for your good health. All that you informed us of, concerning the need for us to come to Dair Bkirkī to discuss what has been happening, is understood; and in accordance with your wishes, God willing, tomorrow morning, Saturday, if it please God we shall come and find you well. This is what must be explained, and may your life be long.

June 1, 1860. "Praying that your life may be long,  
"Ilyās Naṣr."

And in the margin:

"The reason for the delay of our arrival until tomorrow, Saturday, is that the messenger was late in reaching us."

XLVI. "His most honorable Excellency the most illustrious, glorious, and honoured Ṭānyūs Bey Shāhīn, may his life be long.

"After seeking your esteemed wishes, we submit: we have examined your Excellency's letter and understood all that you explained. You told us to meet with you, with the men who are with us, in order to go with your Excellency to Bikfayyā . The reply to that is that, in the first place, we have spent 5 days in al-Zūq, Jūniyah, Maṣbaḥ, and Hārah Sakhr, and to the present date we have been unable to obtain 100 men. At present we are in

age 214 al-Zūq and have been promised (only) 50 men from al-Zūq to go with us, although altogether there are over 100 men present here. We shall go today to Bikfayyā, and we wish your Excellency to meet us in Bikfayyā, and inform all the villages of Kisrawān that, since the distribution (of men) will take place from al-Zūq to all the villages, by all means every sixth man should come.<sup>402</sup> We beg you to make haste and proceed, and that your Excellency rise up on the wings of speed with a great multitude and go to Bikfayyā in order, trusting in God, to defeat our enemies and rescue our Christian brothers. If your Excellency is successful, we shall learn it from you. Do not ask us to return to your Excellency from Bikfayyā;<sup>403</sup> rather we desire your accustomed zeal in rising up immediately so that we may know your commands in all districts and they may be put into effect. Whoever do not obey your orders, let us know, so that we may return with our people to compel them by force. This is what we must submit to you. Everything rests with you. May your life be prolonged.

June 2, 1860.

"Praying that your life may be long,

"Bishārah Ghānim."

---

402. كما حصل التفريق من الزوق الي كامل القرايا  
ان يقوم من كل بد السدس . . .

403. i.e. by not coming yourself.



XLVII. "Agreement drawn up of the conditions for the return of the Shaikhs of the Khāzin family to the district of Kisrawān.

"Since as everyone knows there has been a disagreement between us, the people of the district of Kisrawān, and the Shaikhs of the Khāzin family, due to various reasons, and as time passed the disagreement grew and spread by the incitement of certain masters of corruption, so that the aforesaid Shaikhs left their homes and property and went to other places, - for this reason certain selfish<sup>ly</sup> motivated persons induced us into rebellion against the commands of the government. Therefore on this date there came on behalf of the high authorities his Reverence the eminent Bishop Ṭūbiyyā 'Aun, Bishop of Beirut, who is most honored and respected, to warn and advise us to submit our obedience and acknowledgement of the orders and laws of the gracious Sublime State, - may the Lord of the land protect and preserve the honour of its existence, - and to put an end to this disagreement prevailing between us and the aforesaid Shaikhs, so that they may return to their homes and regain their property and their sustenance and other produce, without opposition from us. Whereas since long ago we have been found to keep our full obedience and submission to the commands of our lawful government, respecting the laws of those in authority over us, without the slightest disorder, as is well known, thus we

now declare ourselves submissive and obedient to the commands and laws of the gracious Sublime State. We have accepted the previously mentioned advice and warning which came to us from the high authorities. On our part there is no one who will prevent or oppose the return of the aforesaid Shaikhs to their homes, and their recovery of all their sustenance and property and other produce. Therefore whenever they wish they can return and recover (this property) as was said, since on our part there is not the slightest objection that would keep them from doing that. If they have debts or properties<sup>404</sup> to collect from any of us, or if any of us has debts or overdue accounts to settle with any of them, then those in debt from both sides should make payment of what they owe to the others. Wherever there is delay, refusal, or protest, the signature of the delayer, refuser, or protestor shall be given in legal form. As for the remaining claims resulting from this disagreement, it is left to a meeting with the aforesaid Shaikhs to make amends and to exchange forgiveness and absolution from them. And now, in witness to our obedience, respects, and acceptance with full willingness of all that is written in this manifesto, it must be signed and sealed by us and submitted to the government, with a plea for

the putting into execution of what is necessary. Written on  
July 29, 1860.

Tānyūs Shāhīn, general wakīl of Kisrawān - (seal)

The people of Qustā and its farms

(Seals: Father Buṭrus Manassā,

Ilyās Khalīfah,

Ilyās Fāris,

Father Anṭūn Iṣṭafān,

Sim'an Iṣṭafān,

Ishāq Shahwān,

and three other illegible seals.)

The people of 'Arāmūn and its farms

(seals: Father Jibrā'il Sabāt,

'Abbās Aṣṣāf,

Ḥabīb Nahrā al-Haddad,

Mikhāyil Aṣṣāf,

Manṣūr Aṣṣāf,

Mikhāyil Jirmānūs, and

'Abdullah Fransīs.)

The people of 'Ashqūt and Baq'ātā

(Father Janādyūs,

Dāhir Najm,

Dūmīṭ 'Īsa,

Nādī Sā'd,

Yūsuf Anṭūn,

Abū Huṣn Abū Ghālib,

Ḥannā Abu Ḥabīb,  
Dīb Yūsuf Dīb.  
Buṭrus al-Khūri,  
Dāhir Shāhīn, and  
'Īsa Tābit.)

The people of al-Judaidah ,  
(seals: Fransīs Ziyādah,  
Jibrā'īl Fulaifil,  
'Abdullah Fulaifil,  
Manṣūr al-Turk, and  
Father Fransīs Farḥāt.)

The people of Shnan'īr:  
Father Fransīs Naṣr,  
Anṭūn and Ilyās Naṣr.

The people of Dlibtā:  
(seals: Yūsuf Bishārah al-Khūrī,  
Jibrā'īl al-Khūri,  
Ibrāhīm Bishārah,  
Rafāyil and Kan'ān Rumayyā,  
Father Ya'qūb Jumayyil.)

The people of Ḥarah Ṣakhr:  
'Abdullah Na'mān and  
Bishārah Ghānim.

The people of Sāhil 'Almā:  
Father Yūsuf Mārūn,  
Ayyūb Abū Zaid, and  
Fransīs Maṭar.

The people of Dar'ūn and environs:

Seals: Father Ya'qūb Jirjis,  
Fāris Isbahān,  
'Abduh Ḥannā Dīb,  
Manṣūr Shahwān, and  
Father Ilyās Surūr.)

The people of al-Qlai'āt:

Niqūlā Ḥantūsh and his family,  
Kan'ān Kassāb and his family,  
Ya'qūb Nauharā and his family  
Jirjis Ṭannūs and his family,  
Sim'ān Abu Ṣāliḥ and his family,  
Anṭūn Naṣṣūr and his family, and  
Anṭūn Abū Fiyād.

The people of Mairūba:

Ṭannūs Rāshid Sa'ādah and  
Anṭūn Arsāniyūs and their families,  
Yūsuf al-Jadd and his family,  
Nāṣīf al-Khūrī,  
Khalīl and his family.

The people of 'Ajaltūn and its farms:

Sāliḥ Jirjis (Ṣfair),  
Ya'qūb Luṭfallāh,  
Yūsuf al-Zughbī,  
Jabbūr al Khūrī Khalīfah,  
Manṣur al-Qāmū',

'Abdullah Ṭannūs Tābit,  
Makhlūf Barīdah,  
Nāṣīf Sa'd from Dārayyā, and  
Fāris Mar'ī from Dārayyā.

The people of Raifūn :

Jirjis Barjīs,  
Fāris al-Hawwāt, and  
Mārūn Barjīs.

The people of Faiṭarūn:

Naṣṣār al-Qassīs,  
Dāwūd al-Barīdī, and  
Mūsā al-Khūrī.

The people of Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān and its farms:

Ilyās Zghaib and his family,  
Ḥabīb Yazbak and his family, and  
Ḥabīb al-Khūrī 'Aqīqī and his family.

The people of Ḥarājil:

Sim'ān Abū 'Aun and  
Ṭannūs al-Ifranjī,

The people of Fārayyā:

Shallīṭā Abū Hammām and  
Ghālib Naffā'.

The people of Ṣarbā:

(Seals : the people of Ṣarbā.)

The people of Ghādīr:

(Seal: the people of Ghādīr)

The people of the village of 'Aintūrah al Zūq

(Seal: Ḥabīb al-Jāmātī.)

The people of Bandar Zūq Mikāyil  
(Seal: the people of Zūq Mikāyil.)

Page 218

THE NOBLE ADVERSARY

XLVIII. "For the attention of his Excellency the respected Shaikh Tānyūs Shāhīn, may he live long in prosperity.

"Your respected Excellency Our brother.

"After tendering our respects and great desire to find you well: We have written you many letters to set our minds at rest concerning your health and to ask you to inform us why our partner Jirmānūs does not present himself before the council with us, and also to ask the expulsion of his sons from our property in al-Qlai'āt. Now, since our hope is fastened on your taking an interest (in the matter), we hope that the said sons may be expelled from our house in al-Qlai'āt and their hand be lifted from our property, and that Jirmānūs be brought with us to the council. For we have been waiting for 20 days in Ghazīr. We hope for a reply so that we may understand (what has happened.) In our previous letters we have sufficiently explained the matter to you; and to ask to have one's case reviewed is to ask for justice. It was necessary to send you this communication to set our minds at rest concerning your health and to obtain an answer to what we have mentioned. God willing, we may always come (to you for help). May

your life be long.

September 10, 1863.

Your brother,

Sarḥān al-Khāzin.

Ten days (?)<sup>405</sup>

page 219 XLIX. "Favored with the attention of his most illustrious Excellency Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, the respected agent of the district of Jurd Kisrawān, may his life be long.

"To his Excellency our respected son:

"After bestowing upon you **the** divine blessing, expressing the desire to see you enjoying all benefit and well-being, and asking about your good health which we hope for; may God grant you every success. We inform you that 'Assāf Shahwān of Faiṭarūn owes us nine uqiyyahs<sup>406</sup> of silk belonging to the sons of Ṭannūs al-Qāmū' al-Quṣṣar. We asked him for them and he replied that Būlus Najm Murād had taken them. We do not know Būlus Najm, so we made our demand to the tenant,<sup>407</sup> as is not unknown to you. We hope that you will serve a writ on the aforesaid 'Assāf for him to deliver the silk to the persons mentioned, or its price, at a rate of 570 per raṭl. Do not delay in this, for the said sons no longer have any silk to trade. Set our minds

---

405. The question mark is the translator's.

406. An uqiyyah equals 200 grams.

407. "طلبنا على الشريك" i.e. we hold the tenant responsible.



at rest concerning your health. The divine blessing is once again extended over you.

September 20, 1863.

"Appealing to you,  
"Iṣṭafān al-Khāzin,  
Bishop of Damascus.

Page 220 L. "Favored with the attention of his Excellency our brother Shaikh Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, the respected agent for Jurd Kisrawān, may his life be long.

"To his Excellency our respected brother.

"After tendering our respects and great desire to see that you, our brother, are enjoying all benefits, and asking after your health - may God grant that you are in complete health: We wrote to you previously and repeated many times by way of Ḥannā Sulaiman and others ... the produce of our orchard which Sulaiman maliciously took ... from al-Qlai'āt. Four months have passed since then, so it was necessary to repeat it. What we hope for from you is the regaining of our rights from the person we have mentioned. We are entrusting Ḍāhir Najm with a message that will clarify the matter to you sufficiently. The most we hope for is to be reassured that you are in full health; and God keep you.

December 2, 1865 (seal)

Your brother,  
Qanṣūh al-Khāzin."

And in the margin:

"The writer, our son Dablīn, will give you what is required. He hopes that you will recover his rights from Yūsuf Ḥannā Manṣūr (or Naṣṣūr) of Mairūbā.

CONCLUSION

Postscript by the Editor

To the Spirit of Sha'yā al-'Aqīqī  
Martyr of the Popular Crusade in Kisrawān

Page 221      You left us, Sha'yā, at the beginning of the road when the crops had not yet grown. How fondly we remember you, and how choked we are with grief, as we recall the recent past and see you searching diligently for the seeds which we have been looking for to cast with the wind over the soil of the Mountain -- our Mountain, sweet in its perfumed greenery -- that they may nourish the spirits of our people and refresh their innermost thoughts.

You used to say: "That seed is good for that ground, and this seed will not be of any use in this soil. For there the people are alert, and a slight dose will stir them, whereas here the people are heedless and must be shaken violently."

I still hear the tap of your knock on the door; then you put your head in gently, with your woollen cap appearing just before you enter. Your eyes turn, searching to find me in the room, and then you smile in that sincere, strong way, and say:

"Good day, sir!"

How great was your joy when you brought me an unpublished letter having to do with Ṭānyūs Shāhīn (Pardon! What did I mean by breaking the agreement? Didn't we agree not to call the illustrious leader, Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, by his name, but to confer on him the name of "The Chief?").

Oh, yes, we were both happy, and greatly overjoyed, conversing, making plans, and saying: A book must be written about The Chief. His picture should be in every Lebanese home. Every Lebanese must read the story of Ṭānyūs Shāhīn. We must set up a memorial to him in Raifūn. But where? - At the entrance to the town. No, in front of the church. No, in the public square. Not this, not that; we shall buy land and build on it a reading center called "The Ṭānyūs Shāhīn Center." No, we shall build a school in his name to teach the children of the poor. There must be, and there must be ... The money? ...Where shall we get the money? Kisrawān is generous; the manliness of its people has been aroused, and their humanity has awakened. They have come to sense their honour, to demand their rights, and to say, I want...! Will they neglect their duty to the first popular hero who said: "I want to liberate Kisrawān from the yoke of tyranny and oppression"?

...You used to say to me: I guarantee to collect the expenses of the statue from the sale of the book about The Chief, through my relatives abroad: In America there are more than two hundred "lions"<sup>408</sup> of the 'Aqīqī family, and more than twenty thousand "lions" from Kisrawān, who hold sacred the idea proclaimed by Ṭānyūs Shāhīn, and glorify the noble goal toward which The Chief marched. These, and others like them, are the ones who would do what the Lebanese "government" is always unable to do in every noble field (of endeavor)...

---

408. (Y) The Lebanese say: "So-and-so is a "lion"; and use this word to denote manliness, courage, and good qualities.

I prepared for printing this manuscript which you brought  
me, your heart leaping with joy and happiness -- as if you were  
bringing me title to a part of Paradise! I would read to you  
part of my annotation of it, and you would sway with pleasure and  
satisfaction, and be unable to contain your uncontrollable spirits;  
and you would jump at me and kiss me, saying:

"Bravo! that's how it should be said!"

Certain "reasons..." prevented us from proceeding with  
the printing, and after the third folio,<sup>409</sup> as you came and went  
asking for explanations, and I was too ashamed to tell you what  
had delayed us in our work, I would soothe your worry by reading  
some of the Chief's letters to his agents or supporters in the  
sacred revolution, and once more you would sway with pleasure and  
satisfaction, and we would part, our hopes overflowing.

Those happy days passed, and then someone came and made  
my heart jump by saying:

"Sha'yā al-'Aqīqī is dead!"

The world stood still within me. Better for it to have  
torn out a part of my heart, and thrown it in some remote place  
which I could see but to which I would be unable to go, as I looked  
on helplessly, burning with the anguish of living on.

Your remembrance has appeared to me a thousand times  
above the sources of the Great Wrath,<sup>410</sup> whenever I heard mention  
of the affairs of Kisrawān. Your faithful appearance is there as  
a guest in my library, greeting me morning and evening whenever

---

409. i.e., the first 48 pages.

410. (✓) The "Great Wrath" is the popular revolution if Kisrawān  
against feudal rule. As for its sources, they are al-Zūq,  
Raifūn, Mazra'ah Kafar Dabyān, 'Ajaltun, and their allies.

224

I enter it and reach out my hand to a book having to do with the revolution and the Chief. I imagine it speaking with me, even reproving me, on quiet nights, repeating insistently: "What's wrong with you -- why don't you publish a book: 'Revolution and Civil War in The Lebanon'? What is delaying you from writing your history of the Chief?" So I found the courage to stir the generosity of some of my countrymen, and al-Talī'ah - it, too - played its part;<sup>411</sup> and so we fulfilled your wish and completed the printing of this manuscript, whose publication is thanks primarily to you, and which I dedicate to you to convey my veneration, esteem, and love.

And now that I have made known my "confession" to you, pure priest, I beg you to grant me absolution for my sin.

The first planting is in bloom, what we planted, Sha'yā. So tell the illustrious Chief to descend to us with his noble spirit, and may his supporters descend with him: al-'Udaimī and al-Munayyir, al-Jāmātī and Şfair, your ancestor al-'Aqīqī and Habālīn, and their brothers. You, too, come with them, for the harvest is abundant and the hungry are many.

I have remained true to the agreement, and I still say what we used to say together in our sessions, and wished everyone would say:

"God is in the Heavens, and Tanyūs Shāhīn is on Earth!"

Permit me to add: "The memory of Sha'yā al-'Aqīqī is in men's hearts!"

---

411. (Y) Among them I recall gratefully my two good friends, Messrs. Sa'dullah al-Jābīrī and Louis Ziqādah; and al-Talī'ah recalls with esteem its generous supporter, Dr. Fu'ād al-'Aql, in the United States.

God give you rest, thou bravest partisan of the people  
and most faithful of friends, and peace be upon you.

From your brother who kept his promise to you,

Yūsuf.



## Conclusion

Sweeping judgments on the misfortunes which befell Lebanon between 1840 and 1860 are easy to form and still easier to find in the writings of men of various allegiances. These generally show little more than the prejudice or indignation of French Catholic against Turkish or Druse "barbarianism;" Englishman against Maronite "bigotry," French "machinations," and Turkish cynicism; or a combination of these, as in the case of Colonel Churchill and Henry Harris Jessup, who echoes him.

Yazbak's own conclusions deserve more analysis. His principal finding is that the underlying social struggle of the 1860 period was that of the peasantry against their oppressive feudal chiefs, and that the latter, with the help of Turkish, French, and British imperialists, were able to subvert this movement into a purely sectarian conflict between Druse and Christian.

To support his argument Yazbak supplies each party with its motive, but adduces little direct evidence that such subversion took place. The Khāzin family exiled from Kisrawān by the peasant revolt, could hope to gain the chance to return to their homes if their subjects turned their wrath against the Druses, or if a major disorder took place in Lebanon and brought foreign intervention. The French and British, he says, each encouraged civil war as a means of combatting the other and of gaining control over the country. The Turks' intention was "that the two groups should destroy each other and be wiped out

together, so that Turkey might govern the Mountain directly."<sup>412</sup>

We shall examine the position of each of these parties in turn. There is no evidence that the Khāzāns incited Christian against Druse. There is the fact that landlords of both sects had a common interest to preserve against any threat to their feudal position. We have cited Chruchill's statement that many Maronite landholders took no active part in the 1860 war because they saw that "the triumph of the Druses was that of feudalism...The deadly enemies of the Druses were not the Maronite aristocracy, but the Maronite clergy."<sup>413</sup> Yazbak corroborates this by noting the effort of the Khāzin family to obtain help against their peasants from the Druse Janblāṭ and Talḥūq families.<sup>414</sup> These considerations do not imply that the Maronite peasants were incited against the Druses on a sectarian basis, or vice versa. Indeed they can as easily suggest that Maronite landholders had every reason to hope that the Christian tenants of their Druse colleagues would remain submissive, and that if anything they lacked sectarian consciousness.

If any group within the Lebanese population can be charged with incitement to religious hostility, it would seem to be the Maronite Church rather than the aristocracy. Examples of its inflammatory interest in the political fortunes of the Christians of the Mixed Districts date back to 1841, when the Patriarch had in effect attempted to dispossess the Druse

---

412. Yazbak, p. 131.

413. The Druses and the Maronites, p. 178.

414. Yazbak, p. 81.

feudalists of their authority.<sup>415</sup>

It is, however, difficult to disentangle the separate threads of the feudal and sectarian issues. The Patriarch's interest in the Mixed District Christians was a sectarian one, but it led to antagonism between tenant and landlord. The Kisrawān insurrection was a social class movement, but insofar as its repercussions were felt among Druse-governed Christian peasants, it contributed to sectarian tension. But if the cause of the Druses was that of feudalism, and that of the Christians in the Mixed Districts was anti-feudal, it was not only so by virtue of geographical coincidence. The Maronite Church in the nature of the case had its reasons to see in the authority of any shaikh over his subjects competition for the influence of the Church itself. The Maronite clergy customarily exercised great civil as well as moral sway over its flock, even to the extent of financial impositions.<sup>416</sup> In Kisrawān, where the Church begrudged the influence of the Khāzin family in ecclesiastical matters, it had a further reason to dislike the feudal institution.<sup>417</sup> Directly and indirectly, then, both for religious and political reasons, the aims of the Church made for increased sectarian friction. The role of the feudalists themselves was defensive, and any contribution by them to religious animosity, if there was any, came as a reaction and was therefore secondary in importance.

---

415. See above, p. 10.

416. See Perrier, *op. cit.*, pp. 298-9.

417. Poujoulat, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

What of the French and British? Yazbak may be overstating the case in saying that each sought to gain full political authority over Lebanon, particularly in the case of Britain, whose diplomacy by 1860 does not seem to have envisaged outright territorial colonialism in the Ottoman Empire. It is nevertheless quite clear that France through the Maronites and England through the Druses sought to enhance their prestige in the land, and their own rivalry could not but rub off to some degree on their protégés. The Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system of government gave each nation its sphere of influence, and when the system foundered for reasons of its own, the effects of their competition were all the more keenly felt. If, as we have maintained, the Maronite Church contributed to the sectarian conflict, the close ties of that church with France and the support it received from it provided added encouragement.

To Yazbak's mind the confidence of Druses and Maronites in their sponsors was badly misplaced. At least one prominent Maronite shared this view. Bishop Tūbiyyā 'Aun, much condemned for his own encouragement of sectarian intolerance, told an Englishman, "I wish you to know that we are not attached to France. France is to us an oppression, from which we would be most happy to escape; we have proved this by acts, but no account is taken of them. How France came to be considered our protector is an old story, into which it is needless to enter. The connection awakened against us the hatred of the Turks and of the Greeks, and to it may be attributed the past suffering of our people from both. Here and in the other parts of Syria, in Egypt and in Cyprus,

from the middle of the last century to the close of the campaign of Napoleon, we reckon that the blood of 40,000 Maronites has been shed by the Turks or the Greeks. This is the debt we owe to French protection. When, in 1840, the French government sent to us to require us to support Ibrahim Pasha and Emir Beshir, (our reply)...which had been decided by the Bishops and Chiefs, (was): 'The Maronites had heard much of, but had never seen, the fruit of the protection of France, and could not, in the hope of it, expose themselves to the risks they were now required to run.'..."The Maronite leaders, continued Tūbiyyā, had in 1840 urged Colonel Rose, the British Consul, to bring them under England's protection; Rose replied, "You are, soul and body, French; England has no alternative but to support the Druses."<sup>418</sup>

These words were briefly echoed even by a French writer who said of the French protectorate of the Maronites, "Le mot était très pompeux mais la chose était très petite."<sup>419</sup>

France and England took inevitably opposing sides on the feudal issue as well as the sectarian, both in the Mixed Districts question and in Kisrawān. The cause of the Christian tenants in the Mixed Districts and of Tānyūs Shāhīn's rebels received French support together with that of the Maronite Church, while the concern of Britain in both cases was for the protection of the traditional rights of the landed aristocracy.

But in what ways did France or England directly incite

---

<sup>418</sup>. Urquhart, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 261-5.

<sup>419</sup>. Xavier Raymond, quoted in Abkarius, op. cit., introduction by Scheltema, p. 31.

sectarian hostility as such? We recall that "upwards of 120,000 stand of arms and 20,000 pistols were imported into the Lebanon between January 1857 and the spring of 1860."<sup>420</sup> This is the kind of evidence that implicates but does not convict. It is perhaps most truthful to say only that France and England through their respective policies encouraged a partisanship that paved the way for open conflict.

Even the role of Turkey is not entirely clear. She has her critics and her apologists, and is entitled to both. There is no doubt of her willingness to precipitate disorder in the country from 1843 to 1845, by taking only half-measures to institute the Qā'im Maqāmiyyah system of government and by actively aiding the Druses in the 1845 bloodshed.<sup>421</sup> Again in 1858 she took half-measures in the dispute over Amīr Bashīr Ahmad, and in the Kisrawān in 1859 the rebels received her encouragement.<sup>422</sup> In 1860 Turkish complicity in the bloodshed at Ḥaṣbayyā, Zaḥlah, Dair al-Qamar, Damascus, and elsewhere was only too clear.

These facts do not establish Turkey's motives. There is evidence that she did not have the military strength to enforce an effective peace.<sup>423</sup> She was dissatisfied with the political

420. Syria Correspondence, I, p. 423. Dufferin to Russell, Dec. 19, 1860.

421. See above, pp. 29-33.

422. Cf. Moore's statement, quoted above: "If Khorsheed Pasha were sincere in his desire to restore order in the disturbed district, he has abundant means at his disposal..." (British Consular Files. Moore to Bulwer, No. 16, May 9, 1860.) Also Poujoulat, *op.cit.*, pp. 64-8, cited above, for instances of Khūrshīd's intrigues.

423. See Abkarius, *op. cit.*, Scheltema introduction, pp. 25-6, and Documents Diplomatiques, p. 201, both cited above.

system in the country but powerless to change it, except perhaps indirectly by creating anarchy. Whether she actually desired the annihilation of Druse and Christian, as Yazbak and others claim, or whether she was satisfied to have the existing system of government demonstrated a failure, or whether her misdeeds may be blamed only on individual officials, Turkey lacked the necessary responsibility, and therefore the will, to keep order in Lebanon.

But again, did the Ottomans subvert an anti-feudal struggle into an inter-religious one? Or did they simply encourage discord in whatever form it arose, sectarian or otherwise? If they incited the Druses against the Maronites, was it not because the opportunity presented itself -- that the animosity between the two groups already existed?

There were enough reasons for a Druse-Maronite conflict without conscious subversion by any party of the feudal issue. The two issues were already sufficiently entangled, as we have said, to subvert themselves. It would be significant were evidence to appear that the Druse subjects of the Druse Muqāṭa'jis were rebellious, and were persuaded by their Muqāṭa'jis to turn with them against the Christians instead -- or that the converse happened among the Christians in the north -- but such evidence is lacking. We do have evidence that the rights newly gained by the Christians under Ibrāhīm Pāshā, the latter's use of them against Druse rebels, the conversion to Christianity of Amīr Bashīr II, and support from Catholic Europe tended to make the Maronites, and particularly their clergy, overly conscious of the favored position to which they had been exalted.

We have further evidence that the feudal institution was progressively weakened from the reign of Bashīr II through the Mixed Districts arrangements of 1845 to the Kisrawān revolt, and that by the time of the latter event the interests of the Maronite Church and those of the landlord had broken apart. We should prefer to emphasize these facts than to lay Lebanon's misfortunes at the door of a handful of petty individuals, who could perhaps make use of historical circumstances but did not create them.

Yazbak's initial premise, that the primary fact of social change in Lebanon from 1840 to 1860 was the peasant's bid for emancipation, therefore seems incomplete. The cleavage between tenant and feudal lord must be placed alongside that between Christian and Druse (or better, Catholic and non-Catholic), Maronite civil governor and Maronite clergy, Maronite and Turk, French protégé and English protégé, and, in some cases, French Consul and Maronite. It was this abundant store of dissatisfactions and antagonisms that combined to produce nationwide anarchy and eventually civil war.



## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

Male population of the Muqata'ahs - (1879)\*

	<u>Christians</u>	<u>Druses</u>	<u>Muslim</u>
al-Zāwia	1731	--	60
al-Kūra	2500	--	126
al-Quwaiṭa'	1458	--	139
Jubbat Bisharri	10200	--	--
Bilād al-Batrūn	6803	--	188
Bilad Jubail	5000	--	1000
al-Fatūh	2099	--	--
Kisrawān	10044	--	19
al-Qāṭi'	4181	--	--
al-Matn	6699	2154	105
Sāhil Beirut	3000	--	300
al-Gharb al-Asfal	1451	1081	--
al-Gharb al-A'lā	1563	771	100
al-Shahār	1631	990	--
al-Jurd	2016	891	--
al-Manāṣif	3894	1138	10
al-'Arqūb	1305	1153	--
al-Shūf	1325	3517	--
Iqlim Jazzīn	3271	97	--
al-Shūf al-Biyadī	11473	--	1000
Iqlīm al-Tuffāh	1784	31	--
Iqlīm al-Kharūb	1502	200	815
Jabal al-Rihān	<u>327</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>686</u>
	87727	12023	6744

\* \_ Copied from al-Shidyāq, op.cit., p. 34.

APPENDIX B.

Convention of Peace Between the Christians and the Druses, 1860.\*

We, the undersigned Kaimakam, Onakils (Ouakils), Mokatadgis, Dwan (Diwan) and the principal people among the Christians, having gone, according to the orders of His Excellency the Mushir of Saida, to His Excellency the Kada and Kaimakam of His Excellency Onasfi (Ouasfi) Effendi, after having conferred with the Kaimakam, the Onakils, Mokatadgis, Dwan and principals of the Druses, endeavouring both one and the other to root out the causes of disunion which have taken place, and to secure public tranquillity for the future, conformably to the orders of His Excellency and for the love of the country.

We admit that since the commencement of these disturbances, the Government, the Chiefs of the country, the reasonable men and those who love the country and tranquillity, have never ceased to prevent their taking place. But whereas from the machinations of those who love disorder, and principally persons who have no pity on newborn babes, young boys and girls, and from the obstinacy of unreasonable men, they were not able to prevent war from breaking out, admitting also that in such a state of things there is no other means of putting an end to the effusion of blood, and producing a general peace than concluding a treaty between the belligerent parties, conformably to the condition of that which was made in the year 1261 of the Hegira (1845), which is "Oblivion of what has taken place."

It has consequently been agreed, with the help of God, to draw up this treaty of General Peace on the above-mentioned conditions, and that for all that has happened from the commencement of the general war to the present time none of the parties has the right of making any claims either for the present or the future; that after the signature of this treaty whoever shall seek to break the peace shall be immediately punished by the authorities, and whoever shall

---

\* - Copied from Abkarius, op.cit., Appendix.  
First published in the London Times, July  
30, 1860.

endeavour to protect him shall be also punished. All the chiefs must in such a case unite to prevent the recurrence of such a fact.

The orders of the authorities will be issued in conformity to the regulations of the Mountain. The Kaimakam and the Mokatadgis must also conform their actions to the administrative regulations of the Lebanon without any change, and must promptly execute all the orders of the authorities, and make the latter acquainted with the state of affairs whenever it may be necessary so to do. They must use all their efforts to promote union, friendship and concord between the two nations; to procure the tranquillity and welfare of all its inhabitants and particularly to endeavour to bring every individual back to his house, to live there in peace, and resume the possession of his property, without anyone throwing any obstacle or molesting him in so doing. They shall in case of need, lend their cooperation to the people, in conformity with the regulations of the Government and with the aid of His Excellency the Muschir.

Prompt means shall be adopted as soon as possible to put an end to any cause of disunion, and restore relations of friendship and general tranquillity, conformably to the will and the orders of the Sultan, whom God preserve, and to the intentions of His Excellency the Muschir. But, as it is admitted that the principal causes of disorder are to be found in the carelessness with which the orders and regulations of the administration are executed, the undersigned beseech His Excellency to take effective measures for the administration of justice with impartiality to every one.

All the Mokatadgis and officials must perform the duties confided to them with zeal and attention, in conformity with the regulations of the Mountain, without allowing anyone to be treated with the slightest injustice - duties which it is hoped they will fulfil with conscientious eagerness and impartiality.

Conformably with the above peace is concluded between us on the condition above named, and it has been considered proper to draw up four copies of it, signed by each nation, two of which will be exchanged between the parties, and two will be presented to His Excellency the Muschir, to be kept in the archives of the government, and served as the rule of conduct for the present and the future.

(Here follow the signatures)

## APPENDIX C.

Speeches in the House of Commons, August 17, 1860, on the massacres in Syria.\* (See above, pp 193-195)

### THE SYRIAN MASSACRES.-QUESTION.

Mr. Monsell said he wished to know what instructions had been given to Lord Dufferin on his appointment as Commissioner to Syria with reference to the atrocities recently perpetrated there, and whether those instructions would be laid on the table of the House? Within the last two or three days a new set of papers had been printed with regard to these lamentable occurrences, and among them a most remarkable letter from Mr. Cyril Graham, a gentleman of great ability, sent by the European Powers to Syria to ascertain what were the real facts with regard to these horrible massacres. The scenes which that gentleman described were, he (Mr. Monsell) ventured to say, such as it never could have entered into the mind of any man to conceive. The atrocities were utterly abominable. Mr. Graham stated in the most distinct manner that the Turkish authorities - many of them being of the highest grade in the district - were actually accomplices in the perpetration of the worst of these atrocities. Whether it would have been possible to prevent them if more attention had been paid to the circular letter written in April, he would not stop to inquire. He would not stop to inquire whether, if negotiations had been entered into with France in time, the evil might have been prevented. But it did certainly appear, considering the history of Syria for the last twenty years, that this country was deeply responsible for these atrocities. What did we do twenty years ago? We found Ibrahim Pasha governing these disturbed districts of Syria. Under his rule these horrible scenes did not take place. We, in opposition certainly to France, and he believed to some of the other Powers of Europe, recommended a change of Government. We recommended that there should be a chief of the Druses and a chief of the Maronites, and that there should be a Turkish Pasha over both. We were warned in the

---

\* - Text copied from Hansard, Parliamentary Debates, 3rd Series, 23 and 24 Victoriae, 1860, Vol. CLX, 23 July 1860 to 28 August 1860. Columns 1479 to 1486.

strongest manner possible by Monsieur Guizot, on several occasion, and by Monsieur Thiers, when Prime Minister of France, as to what the effect of this would be. We were told that we were handing over these provinces to unlimited sway on the part of the Sultan which never existed before - that we were changing his suzerainty into a sovereignty. The gallant Admiral the Member of Southwark (Sir Charles Napier), who took part in the transactions in Syria in 1840, mentioned at a meeting in Edinburgh in 1845 that he felt it a disgrace to have had anything to do with transactions which produced such lamentable results. In 1844 the Earl of Aberdeen distinctly recognized the position of responsibility in which we had placed ourselves. In 1845 and in 1847 scenes on a smaller scale than those that had just taken place - but still terrible scenes - took place in these districts, and the Turkish Pasha in those cases also was an accomplice, and took part in the horrible transactions. On one occasion 150 Turkish soldiers looked on whilst some terrible murders were perpetrated, and two convents sacked. What he wished to know from the noble Lord at the head of the Government was this - whether, it having been found that the system which was adopted twenty years ago - owing very much to the influence of this country - was a complete failure, the commissioners who had now been sent by the different Powers of Europe had received any instructions to reconsider that system; and whether the Lebanon district would be placed in a position in which it would be more free from the tyranny of the Pashas and replaced in that position with regard to the Ottoman Porte which it occupied in 1840.

Sir Charles Napier said, that what the right hon. Gentleman had stated was quite correct. He had stated at Edinburgh, and also in that House, that he felt ashamed of the part which he had taken in the affairs of Syria. He was sent under the orders of the Government, and he did his duty, though very unwillingly. When the country was held by Mehemet Ali it was peaceable and quiet. The roads were secure and the people comparatively happy. The Turks did everything they could to stir up rebellion in Mount Lebanon, and he was afraid that the allied Powers did a great deal which had the same effect. Lord Ponsonby sent an agent into Mount Lebanon to do everything which he could to stir up the inhabitants, and it was notorious that they were told they would be better used by the Turks as an inducement to take up arms. The inhabitants did take up arms, and if they had not joined us it would have been quite impossible with our small force to have turned 30,000 or 40,000 Egyptians out of Mount Lebanon, and finally out of Syria. But before the English left the mountain the tyranny of the Turks

began before their faces. Sir Robert Stopford and himself did everything in their power to get rid of the Governor sent there, as he was a regular tyrannical, cruel, old Turk. After Mehemet Ali was driven out of Syria, they left that wretch as Governor of Mount Lebanon. Before the ink was dry on the treaty, the Turkish troops or the Turkish Government broke faith with Mehemet Ali. They sent an army to disturb his retreat, and if hon. Members read the blue-book published in that day, they would see that the Turkish Government boasted of having destroyed 30,000 men in the retreat from Damascus. All that was done under the patronage of the allied Powers. They took no steps to leave Syria in a state of safety and good Government. He did as much as he could, and he advised Mehemet Ali not to receive the Pasha who was sent by the Porte. A very short time after the English left, the Turkish Government fomented all sorts of quarrels between the Druses and the Maronites. Colonel Rose, in his despatches, stated the manner in which the Turks behaved, and what little pains they took to prevent the Druses and Maronites coming to blows. They did come to blows, and almost the first thing which Colonel Rose saw was a number of Turkish troops looking on and not preventing the Druses marching past with Christian heads on their pikes. If it had not been for the gallant conduct of Colonel Rose, he believed that there would have been many more massacres than had since taken place. He never believed that the plan of a chief of the Druses and a chief of the Maronites, both under a Turk, was the way to pacify Syria. The French were now sending troops to Syria. It was a dangerous manœuvre for the French to be in possession of Syria. They knew what the French did when they took possession of Rome, and he thought they would do the same in Syria. Yet he confessed that he for one would sooner see the French establish themselves permanently in Syria, if they would give protection to the unfortunate inhabitants, than see them again left to the tender mercies of the Turks. He trusted that whatever arrangement the allied Powers made with the French Government as a condition for their quitting the mountain, some steps would be taken - he did not care what steps they were - to protect the people. As to leaving them in the hands of the Turks again, he hoped that was out of the question. Whatever promises the Turkish Government might make, or their Pashas might choose to make to the Turkish Government, Europe might depend upon it that no attention would be paid to them after European troops were out of the country. It was not in the nature of the Turks to govern properly. They bought their places, and they ground the people down as much as they could in order to re-

pay the money which they had had to borrow at Constantinople to purchase their places. As to expecting anything like common humanity, it was totally out of the question. There was never anything like humanity in Mount Lebanon. There was no humanity for the Christians in any part of Syria. They were the last remnant of Christians in the East. The allied Powers, when they drove out Mehemet Ali, promised them a better Government. They had forfeited their word. Almost the first thing which the Turkish Government did at that time was to arrest the chief of the Maronites, and take him to Constantinople, where he was kept a prisoner for ten years. He well remembered the noble Lord at the head of the present Government making a speech of two hours the night before Parliament was prorogued, in 1841 or 1842, and calling on the Government to interfere. The chief was kept a prisoner for ten years. He was sent back without any power, and the Druses had completed the catastrophe by cutting his throat.

Viscount Palmerston: ... My hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaid) has asked whether any instructions have been given for the purpose of endeavouring to rescue from the harems in the interior those unhappy women who were carried off in great numbers from Damascus. Lord Dufferin has instructions, when he visits Syria, to take steps with this end in view, and communications will also be made to the Ambassadors at Constantinople to induce the Turkish authorities to co-operate with Lord Dufferin in endeavouring to accomplish this object. The two chiefs, Kurschid Pasha and Osman Bey, have, it is true, been sent to Constantinople for the purpose of being tried. Whether one of them, being a military officer, was received with the military honours attaching to his rank I do not know, and cannot consequently inform the House; but it is also true that they have been sent back to Syria, to be there tried for their crimes. Evidence will, of course, be more easily obtained on the spot, and I hope and trust that when they are arraigned they may receive the reward due to their atrocities. My right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) has entered into the general question of the state of Syria. He seems to imagine that these recent events were the result of the tyranny of the Turks. So far from that being the case, they have in a great degree resulted from the absence of direct authority on the part of the Turkish empire.



Mr. Monsell explained that he had referred, not to the tyranny of the Turks, but to their policy of fomenting civil war among the tribes by setting the Druses and Maronites one against the other.

Viscount Palmerston: My right hon. Friend, at all events, held the English Government responsible for these events. I beg in the most direct and positive manner to repudiate on our part any share of the responsibility. It is not for me, sitting here, to say on whom that responsibility rests; it is not with us - that is all I will say. There are very strange reports as to the party that was the aggressor. In fact, there is little doubt that the Maronites commenced the disturbances, though to what extent they are responsible for the lamentable outbreak I am unable to say. There is a report that the first acts of violence are to be attributed to them; but it is impossible to attach importance to rumours of so vague a character. This subject has elicited the remarks of the gallant Admiral the Member for Southwark. My hon. and gallant Friend distinguished himself, he will allow me to say, in the Syrian war, not only as a naval but as a military commander, and also as a negotiator, and performed great services in each of the three capacities. First of all, he gallantly conducted the attack on Acre; he then defeated the forces of Ibrahim Pasha on land, and finally he went to Alexandria, and extorted a very good treaty from Mehemit Ali. An arrangement was, however, made after the period to which he refers, by which the government of that district, instead of being carried on by the direct authority of the Sultan, was to be placed in the hands of two native chiefs - a Maronite chieftain to govern the Maronites, and a Druse chieftain to control the Druses - both being to a certain extent subservient to the representative of the Turkish Government. *Primâ facie* one would imagine this to be a good arrangement, and that these tribes would be better governed under their own chieftains than by the direct authority of a Turkish officer. Of late I have not had official knowledge of the facts, but as long as I remained at the Foreign Office and the papers passed under my observation it was the constant endeavour of the Government at Constantinople to overthrow this system of administration, and to place Syria on the same footing as all the other provinces under the control of the Porte. Therefore, so far from the arrangement being favourable to Turkish tyranny, it was one, on the contrary, which was specially directed to the withdrawal of the two tribes from the direct dominion of the Porte. And that it has to a great extent been successful is evident, because, though you cannot expect that, in an uncivilized country, where there are two races which have

been from time immemorial at war with each other, conflicts will not be liable to arise, there has been nothing at all to be compared since 1841 with the atrocious outrages which have now taken place. I am not at present prepared to lay the instructions to Lord Dufferin on the table of the House; it is not usual to do so when instructions are in course of execution. But I may state that one of the duties with which Lord Dufferin has been intrusted is to inquire, in conjunction with his colleagues, into the state of the country, and to suggest the system of government that would be most conducive to the good and welfare of the people, and most likely to prevent a recurrence of the unfortunate collision which has taken place.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Western Language Sources

- Abkarius, Iskandar Ya'qub. The Lebanon in Turmoil. Syria and the Powers in 1860. (Book of the Marvels of the Time Concerning the Massacres in the Arab Country. Translated and annotated and provided with an introduction and conclusion by J.F. Scheltema. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1920.
- Bliss, Daniel. The Reminiscences of Daniel Bliss. Edited and supplemented by his eldest son. New York, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1920.
- British Consular Files. Records preserved in the archives of the British Consulate in Beirut, including the complete dispatches sent by H.M. Consul General to the Foreign Office and to the Embassy in Constantinople, as well as copies of petitions and letters received and other minutiae. 1841-1860.
- Churchill, Colonel Charles. The Druses and the Maronites under Turkish Rule, 1840-1860. London, Quaritch, 1862.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Mount Lebanon: a Ten Years' Residence from 1842 to 1852. Three volumes. London, Saunders and Otley, 1853.
- Enciclopedia Italiana, article "Maroniti." Volume XXII. Milan, 1934.
- France: Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. Documents Diplomatiques. 1860. Paris, Imprimerie Impériale, 1861.
- Great Britain: Foreign Office. Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria, 1860-61. London, 1861.
- Hansard, Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, 23 and 24 Victoriae, 1860, Vol. CLX, 23 July 1860 to 28 August 1860. London, 1860. Columns 1479-1486.
- Hitti, Philip K. The Origins of the Druze People and Religion. New York, Columbia University Press, 1928.

- Jessup, Henry Harris. Fifty-Three Years in Syria.  
Volume I. New York, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1910.
- Jouplain, M. La question du Liban. Paris, Librairie  
Nouvelle de droit et de jurisprudence, 1908.
- Lenormant, Francois. Histoire des Massacres de Syrie en  
1860. Paris, L. Hachette, 1861.
- The London Times, September 6 and October 14, 1907.  
"The Lebanon Experiment."
- Les Maronites et la France. (anonymous). Paris,  
Tinterlin, 1860.
- Napier, Commodore Sir Charles. The War in Syria. Two  
volumes. London, John Parker, 1842.
- Perrier, Ferdinand. La Syrie sous le gouvernement de  
Méhémet-Ali jusqu'en 1840. Paris, Arthus  
Bertrand, 1842.
- Poujade, Eugene. Le Liban et La Syrie, 1845-1860.  
Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1867.
- Poujoulat, Baptistin. La Vérité sur La Syrie et  
l'Expédition Française. Paris, Gaume et  
Duprey, 1861.
- Souvenirs de Syrie. Expédition Française de 1860.  
("Par un témoin oculaire.") Paris, Plon, 1903.
- La Syrie en 1860 et 1860. Lettres et documents  
formant une histoire complète et suivie des  
massacres du Liban et de Damas, des secours  
envoyés aux chrétiens et de l'expédition  
Française. Recueillis et coordonnés par M.  
l'Abbé Jobin. Lille, J. Lefort, 1880.
- Urquhart, David. The Lebanon. (Mount Souria.) A  
History and a Diary. Two volumes. London,  
Thomas Cautley Newby, 1860.
- Vogüé, Comte Melchior de. Les Evénements de Syrie.  
Paris, Charles Douniol, 1860.

المصادر العربية . Bibliography : Arabic Sources .

• سجعان الخازن : يوسف بك كرم في المنفى • مطبعة الانشاء • طرابلس في سنة ١٩٥٠ .

• الشيخ طنوس بن يوسف الشدياق : كتاب اخبار الاعيان في جبل لبنان • بيروت •

بطرس البستاني • في سنة ١٨٥٩ •

• عبد الرحمان عدده : بروتوكول لبنان • ملحق رقم ٢ :

رسالة من يوسف كرم الى حكومة الجمهورية الفرنسية

والى البابا • باللغة الفرنسية •

دائرة التاريخ للجامعة الاميركية في بيروت • (غير مطبوع •)

مجموعة المحررات السياسية والمفاوضات الدولية من سوريا ولبنان من سنة ١٨٤٠

الى سنة ١٩١٠ • تعريب فيليب وفريد الخازن • مطبعة "الصبر" - جونية

في سنة ١٩١٠ • (٣ ج •)