

THE SECRET REPORT ON THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN

Roderic H. Davison

In 1919 a French writer, Bertrand Bareilles, published a small book entitled *Le Rapport secret sur le Congrès de Berlin adressé à la S. Porte par Karathéodory Pacha, premier plénipotentiaire ottoman* (Paris, Editions Bossard, 197 pages). The two introductory chapters by Bareilles are of no importance. But the rest of the book, from page 65 to page 195, is a description from the Ottoman viewpoint of the negotiations at the Congress of Berlin, which met between June 13 and July 13, 1878. If it is authentic, this description is of great value to historians of the Ottoman Empire, of European diplomacy, and of the Eastern Question. Although the *Rapport secret* has been used by historians, its authenticity has not, to the present time, been determined. Now, a combination of evidence, some of it only recently available, makes possible a reasonable judgment as to whether the *Rapport* is genuine or not*.

The value of the report, if it is genuine, lies in the fact that its author was himself one of the leading participants in this major international Congress. Aleksandr Karatodori Paşa (Alexandre Carathéodory) was head of the Ottoman delegation; the other Ottoman plenipotentiaries were Field Marshal (Macarlı) Mehmed Ali

* The author is grateful to the Government of Turkey for permission to do research in the Başbakanlık Arşivi and in the Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrak. His thanks are also due to the Social Science Research Council, to the American Research Institute in Turkey, to the George Washington University, and to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for much assistance.

Paşa and the Ottoman ambassador to Berlin, Rami Sadullah Bey. The value of the report is increased by the fact that it was written, apparently, soon after the close of the Congress, while the author's impressions were still fresh. The value is further enhanced by the fact that the report includes quotations from the telegraphic correspondence between the Foreign Minister at the Sublime Porte, Mehmed Esad Safvet Paşa, and the Ottoman plenipotentiaries in Berlin. Bareilles's book, therefore, if the report is genuine, is a source for original diplomatic documents of the Ottoman government. Few such documents are available to historians in published form.

Because this book is the only one in a western language that presents the views of the Ottoman diplomats at Berlin, and because it contains Ottoman documents, it has been used by a number of eminent scholars. For example, W.N. Medlicott, in his detailed work *The Congress of Berlin and After*, relies on the *Rapport secret* for many of his statements¹. R.W. Seton-Watson, in *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question*, also uses the *Rapport secret*². Alexander Novotny lists the *Rapport secret* in the bibliography of his documentary volume, *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Berliner Kongresses 1878*³. None of these authors raises a question about the authenticity of Bareilles's publication. B.H. Sumner, however, who also uses the *Rapport secret*, does raise questions about it in his masterful work on *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880*. He notes that Bareilles does not say how he got the report of Karatodori. Sumner asks, further, whether the report is published in its entirety

1 W.N. Medlicott, *The Congress of Berlin and After: A Diplomatic History of the Near Eastern Settlement, 1878-1880* (London, 1938), p. 44, note 23, and bibliography.

2 R.W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question: A Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics* (London, 1935; New York, 1972), p. 440, note 1, and following pages.

3 Alexander Novotny, *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Berliner Kongresses 1878*, Vol. 1, *Österreich, die Türkei und das Balkanproblem im Jahre des Berliner Kongresses* (Graz-Köln, 1957), p. 359. Novotny, Medlicott, Seton-Watson, and Sumner all spell the name «Carathéodory» as it appears on the paper cover of Bareilles's work. On the title page of Bareilles's book, the name is spelled «Karathéodory.»

or not; he points out that it deals with the problems at Berlin concerning European Turkey, but not with those concerning Anatolia⁴.

The question of whether Bareilles could have gotten Karatodori's report, or a copy it, is an important one. How, furthermore, did he get the report, if he actually did get it? Bareilles himself does not provide an answer. He says only, «Pure chance allowed me to make a copy of the original text of a secret report addressed to the Porte by Carathéodory Paşa.»⁵ In another book, published two years before the *Rapport secret*, and in which he quoted extensively from the report of Karatodori, Bareilles said much the same thing: «I had the original in my hands.»⁶ This is a most unsatisfactory explanation. It does not inspire confidence in Bareilles. Furthermore, Bareilles identifies Karatodori wrongly. He says that, at the time of the Berlin Congress, Karatodori was the Ottoman ambassador in London, and therefore was sent to the Berlin Congress to represent his government⁷. Bareilles has obviously confused Karatodori Paşa with another Ottoman Greek, Kostaki Musurus Paşa, who actually was the Ottoman ambassador in London in 1878 and who had been in that post since 1851⁸. But Musurus did not go to Berlin; he remained in London during the Congress. Karatodori had to travel from İstanbul, where he had been undersecretary (müsteşar) in the Foreign Ministry. He reached Berlin only after a difficult journey via Odessa.

There is also another reason to question the reliability of Bareilles, in addition to this and other factual errors. Bareilles seems not

4 B.H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880* (Oxford, 1937), p. 676.

5 Bareilles, *Rapport secret*, p. 5.

6 Bertrand Bareilles, *Les Turcs; Ce que fut leur empire; leurs comédies politiques* (Paris, 1917), p. 149. Chapter 6, pp. 148-73, is largely based on the Karatodori report. Curiously, Bareilles makes a bad error here, on p. 156, saying that Mehmed Ali was the first plenipotentiary of the Ottoman delegation at the Berlin Congress. This error is not repeated in the *Rapport secret*.

7 Bareilles, *Rapport secret*, p. 6.

8 Devlet-i alîye-i osmani, *Hariciye Nezareti celilesinin sânamesi*, 2nd edition, (İstanbul, 1306), p. 96. Karatodori was once sent on a special diplomatic mission to London, but that was much later, in 1901, at the time of the death of Queen Victoria and the accession to the throne of Edward VII: Faik Reşat Unat, *Osmanlı sefirleri ve sefaretnameleri* (Ankara, 1968), p. 238.

to be objective. His introductory chapters to the *Rapport secret* indicate that he may be publishing the report for anti-German reasons. Bareilles appears to be very anti-German. The *Rapport secret* is very critical of Bismarck, the German chancellor who presided at the Congress of Berlin. Bareilles uses this fact to offer remarks very critical of Germany. He speaks of 1878 and the Berlin Congress as the time when the Hohenzollern foreign policy became centered on the move to the East. He speaks further of the German policy of expansion into the oriental world, and of the «forging of the first link in the chain of German ambitions» at the Congress of Berlin⁹. Of course, Bareilles is writing under the influence of his feelings at the time of the first World War, when France and Germany were bitter enemies. His first introductory chapter is dated 20 October 1918, and the second one is dated 10 November 1918, just one day before the signing of the armistice. Bareilles's feeling is natural, but his approach raises doubts as to his objectivity.

Who was Bertrand Bareilles? His identity may shed some light on the authenticity of the *Rapport secret*. Bareilles evidently knew the Ottoman Empire, and certainly İstanbul, first hand. He wrote several books on aspects of the Empire. Casual references in one of his books indicate that he lived in or near İstanbul from approximately the middle 1890s to about 1914¹⁰. For a time, at least, he dwelt in a rented konak in Bebek, on the Bosphorus. He probably was a teacher of French in the military medical school about 1900, and probably also a teacher of French to the man who became the last caliph, Abdülmecid. He was possibly also correspondent in İstanbul for the *Journal des Débats*¹¹. Bareilles apparently was close to some of the Christian minorities in İstanbul, as well as to the European community there. This is demonstrated by a detailed work that he

9 Bareilles, *Rapport secret*, pp. 55, 58, 59. Bareilles had started to use this theme in his earlier work, *Les Turcs*, p. 149, where he says that, at the Berlin Congress, Germany laid the basis for an expansionist policy.

10 Bertrand Bareilles, *Constantinople, ses cités franques et levantines (Péra-Galata-banlieue)* (Paris, 1918). Some of Bareilles' remarks in *Les Turcs*, especially pp. 216-17, imply that he may have come to İstanbul some time in the 1880s.

11 These probabilities are mentioned by Falk Reşat Unat, *Osmanlı sefirleri*, p. 6, note 1. Unat cites three references, none of which is available to me:

wrote on *Constantinople, ses cités franques et levantines*, which contains much information on Greeks and Armenians. Bareilles also wrote a preface to the book of Malachia Ormanian on the Armenian church and its history¹². Ormanian was the Armenian patriarch in İstanbul from 1896 to 1908. Bareilles evidently became anti-Turkish as well as anti-German. During the first World War he published a derogatory book on the Turks and their history¹³. These pieces of information indicate that Bareilles was not always objective and scholarly. They also indicate, however, that he was in İstanbul a long time and must have known many people there. Therefore some official or ex-official whom he knew, or possibly some relative or friend of Karatodori or even Karatodori himself (who died in 1906), might have shown Bareilles a copy of the report on the Congress of Berlin.

Perhaps Bareilles had an opportunity to see one or both of the volumes said to contain manuscript copies of the correspondence of Karatodori and Safvet. One of these volumes is said to have been in the possession of Said Paşa (Mehmed Said Paşa, nine times grand vezir), who had borrowed it from Safvet Paşa's son, Refet Bey. The other volume is said to have been purchased from the estate of Refet Bey by Gabriel Hanotaux, who was chargé d'affaires for France in İstanbul¹⁴. But it is pure speculation that the report on the Congress of Berlin was in either of these volumes. It is also speculation

Mirat-ı mekteb-i tıbbiye, p. 107; *Nevsal-ı osmani*, I, p. 82; and Marcelle Tinayre, *Notes d'une voyageuse en Turquie* (Paris, 1910). A list of foreign correspondents of the *Journal des Débats* does give the name of a correspondent for Turkey, but spells it «Bareiller.» *Le Journal des Débats Politiques et Littéraires, 1814-1914* (Paris, 1914), p. 205. Perhaps it should be «Bareilles?»

12 Malachia Ormanian, *L'Eglise arménienne; son histoire, sa doctrine... son présent* (Paris, 1910).

13 Paris, 1917. (See note 6, above.) This book had a preface by Jacques de Morgan, who was a strong partisan of Armenians. At the end of the war Bareilles also wrote a chapter entitled «Coup d'oeil sur l'Albanie» for Démètre Beratti, ed., *La Question albanaise* (Paris, 1919). This book is meant to influence the Paris peace conference, and is also rather anti-Turkish.

14 This information is in İbnülemin Mahmut Kemal İnal, *Osmanlı devrinde son sadrazamlar*, 4th printing (İstanbul, 1969), cüz 6, p. 883, note 1. Gabriel Hanotaux was counselor of embassy for France in İstanbul in 1885 and 1886, but on April 18, 1886, he was elected a deputy in the French Chambre: *La*

that Bareilles could have seen the volumes, or one of them. The documents in the volumes were, in any case, not the originals, but copies.

Bareilles says, however, that he copied the «original text» of the report by Karatodori to the Sublime Porte. Presumably, then, the original report would have been in the archives of the Sublime Porte when Bareilles was living in İstanbul; or it might have been in the archives of the Yıldız palace, where Sultan Abdülhamid II collected many documents on state affairs. It is not clear how Bareilles would have had access to the original text, but perhaps officials he knew in the Ottoman government, who had access to the archives, could have shown it to him. Possibly Abdülmecid procured the report for him. If the original report is still in the Ottoman archives today, it could easily be compared with the one that Bareilles published. These archives have, fortunately, been opened for historical research in recent years. The *Rapport secret* does not, however, seem to be there. I have been unable to find it, among those documents that are catalogued and available for examination. In the Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrak there are many documents pertaining to the Berlin Congress, including telegrams by Karatodori Paşa; but no long report on the Congress seems to be in the files¹⁵. In the Başbakanlık Arşivi there is a large category of Yıldız papers. Among them are some papers by Karatodori, including a notebook, bound in red leather, on the Congress of Berlin¹⁶. But this is not the *Rapport secret*. Instead, it is a collection of telegrams sent from Berlin by Karatodori, and translated from French into Turkish, probably for Sultan Abdülhamid to read.

The documents in the Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrak do, however, provide a means for testing the genuineness of important parts of the *Rapport secret*. In this archive, scattered among many dossiers in two different cartons in the Political (Siyasi) category,

Grande Encyclopédie, vol. 19, p. 823. Refet Bey died only in 1887: İ.A. Gövsa, *Türk meşhurları ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul, 1946), p. 319. So perhaps Hanotaux was not in İstanbul when Refet Bey's estate was sold.

¹⁵ The report might be in Kartons 127, 182, 185, or 527 of the Siyasi tasnifi, but is not.

¹⁶ Başbakanlık Arşivi, Yıldız tasnifi, Kısım 28, evrak 2077.

there are approximately 130 telegrams, in French, sent by Karatodori in Berlin to Safvet in İstanbul between June 14 and July 16, 1878. In addition, there are approximately 90 telegrams, also in French, sent by Safvet to Karatodori in the same period. Among these 220 telegrams are about 30 which are quoted directly, or whose contents are summarized, in the *Rapport secret* published by Bareilles. Many of the quotations are only portions of documents, but they are sufficient to allow identification and comparison. When one looks at these telegrams in the Foreign Ministry archive, it is immediately clear that they are the same telegrams as are quoted in the *Rapport secret*. Thus the telegrams in the *Rapport secret* are authentic and, with occasional minor variations in wording, are completely accurate.

Below is given a list of telegrams quoted or summarized in Bareilles's *Rapport secret*, together with identification of the same telegrams in the archives. Occasionally I have identified a passage in the *Rapport secret* as coming from a telegram, even when this is not mentioned in the *Rapport* itself; the archives telegrams make clear the origin of the information.

In the table below, the page reference in Bareilles's book is given in the left-hand column. An asterisk* after the page indicates that the *Rapport secret* gives a direct quotation from the telegram; in other cases, the telegram is summarized. In the columns to the right are given the Karton number in the Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrak, the dosya number, the name of the sender of the telegram, the serial number given to each telegram in 1878, and the date on which the telegram was sent. Both Kartons are in the Siyasi category in the archive. I have not indicated the varying security classifications placed on the telegrams by the sender - some are marked «confidential,» some are «secret and confidential,» some simply «secret,» and some are «very secret and confidential.» A few are marked «personal.» Some, of course, have no security classification at all.

Table One

Page in Bareilles, Rapport secret	Karton	Dosya	Sender	Telegram Number	Date
75-76*	185	S	Karatodori	4	14 June
77	185	S	Karatodori	7	16 June
85-86	185	O	Karatodori	9 and 11 (?)	16 June (both?)
89	185	O	Karatodori	8	16 June
134 *	185	S	Karatodori	14	18 June
135-36*	527	38	Safvet	51526/19	20 June
138	527	38	Safvet	51590/39	25 June
138-39	527	38	Safvet	51608/43	26 June
139-40	527	38	Karatodori	55	27 June
141	527	38	Safvet	51640/47	28 June
141 *	527	38	Safvet	51641/48	27 June
141-48	527	38	Karatodori	57	28 June
148-49	185	S	Karatodori	59	28 June
150-51*	527	38	Karatodori	69	29 June
153-54*	527	38	Karatodori	76	1 July
154 *	527	38	Safvet	51665/68	3 July
155 *	527	38	Safvet	51669/69	4 July
156 *	185	G	Karatodori	91	4 July
156-57*	527	38	Safvet	51690/70	6 July
157 *	527	38	Karatodori	111	8 July
158-59*	527	38	Safvet	51699/74	9 July
159 *	527	38	Safvet	51723/82	10 July
162	185	N	Safvet	51666/66	23 July (sic)
(the date is an error — probably it should be 2/3 July)					
167-68	527	38	Karatodori	121	11 July
169	527	38	Safvet	51725/84	10 July
169	527	38	Safvet	51726/85	10 June (sic)
(the date is an error — it should be 10 July)					
174 *	185	G	Karatodori	122	11 July
181-83*	527	38	Safvet	51761/92	12 July
184-86	185	D	Karatodori	131	13 July
189-90*	185	G	Austrian statement		13 July
191	185	G	Ottoman statement		13 July
194-95*	527	38	Safvet	51771/95	14 July

The comparison of the telegrams preserved in the archives of the Foreign Ministry, as listed above, with those telegrams quoted or summarized in the *Rapport secret* demonstrates, therefore, that historians may rely on the *Rapport* for Ottoman records concerning the Berlin Congress.

It is obvious, also, from reading the Safvet-Karatodori correspondence in the archives, that additional information in the *Rapport secret* is also drawn from the telegrams that have not been quoted or summarized. So far as one can judge from the records in the archives, the whole report as published by Bareilles seems to be reliable. There is a confirmation of this in the British archives, as well. The British ambassador to Istanbul, Austan Henry Layard, sent back to his government in London a copy of an Ottoman telegram which he had been given in the strictest confidence in July 1878¹⁷. Probably it was given to him by an official in the Sublime Porte or in the Yıldız palace. This telegram conforms closely to Safvet's telegram no. 51725/84 of July 10, and to the same one as cited by Bareilles at p. 169 (see Table One, above). When the two archival sources agree, it can hardly be doubted that Bareilles is referring to an authentic document.

The *Rapport secret* unquestionably puts the actions of the Ottoman delegates to the Berlin Congress in the best light possible. It is, in a way, a defense of their conduct. In this sense, it is not entirely objective. This does not, however, mean that the *Rapport* is fraudulent or untrustworthy. It is soundly based on the documents, and is of great use to historians. At the same time, it must be recognized that the *Rapport secret* is a very incomplete account of the negotiations at the Congress. It emphasizes the role of Bismarck, the question of Bulgaria, and the question of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Many other matters are omitted. The documents in the *Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrak* and, to a less extent, in the *Başbakanlık Arşivi*, give a more complete picture.

Occasionally, however, the *Rapport* gives information that does not seem to be in the archives. The *Rapport* also has one advantage over the diplomatic correspondence — it is more informal, and con-

¹⁷ Public Record Office (London), FO 78/2793, Layard to Salisbury no. 898, very confidential, 13 July 1878.

veys somewhat better at times the impressions of the Ottoman plenipotentiaries. It also adds some color that is not contained in the telegraphic correspondence. For example, the *Rapport secret* (pp. 85-86) describes at length a significant visit to the Ottoman plenipotentiaries by Prince Bismarck, who emphasized the official character of his visit by wearing his military helmet. The situation as of that moment is then analyzed in the *Rapport*, with the benefit of hindsight, by Karatodori. Not all of that is in the archival documents. Similarly, the *Rapport* offers a dramatic account of how, on the very last day of the Congress, the Ottoman delegates extracted from the Austrians a declaration of the Sultan's sovereign rights over Bosnia-Herzegovina (pp. 183-93). Most of this action and color is missing from the telegraphic reports.

Is it, however, certain that the author of the *Rapport secret* was, in fact, Aleksandr Karatodori? Unless the original report or some other documentary proof is found, there can be no absolute certainty. Whoever the author was, he was familiar with the inner workings of the Ottoman delegation at the Congress of Berlin; he was familiar also with the secret telegrams of the Sublime Porte and of the Ottoman delegation. Karatodori is the most obvious individual who possessed those qualifications. The *Rapport secret* is, furthermore, written in excellent French. Karatodori had the ability to do that. He had been educated, at least in part, in France. He had written two law theses in Paris¹⁸.

Better evidence that Karatodori was the author of the *Rapport secret* comes, however, from a Turkish official of that period who later turned historian. This is Mahmud Celeleddin Paşa. His work, *Mirat-ı hakikat*, is an extended account of the Balkan crisis of 1875-76, of the Turco-Russian war of 1877-78, and of the peace. At the end of his history Mahmud Celeleddin includes the report of Aleksandr Karatodori Paşa on the Berlin Congress. Although it was written, probably, well before his death in 1899, Mahmud Celeleddin's history evidently could not be published during the reign of

18 Alexandre Carathéodory, *Jus Romanum: De pignatoribus et hypothecis: de separationibus. Code Napoléon, Privilèges sur les immeubles* (Paris, 1858), Faculté de Droit de Paris, thèse pour la licence; and *De l'Erreur en matière civile d'après le droit romain et le code Napoléon* (Paris, 1860), Faculté de Droit de Paris, thèse.

Abdülhamid, until after the Young Turk revolution of 1908¹⁹. Then *Mirat-ı hakikat* was published, in three volumes, in 1908-1909 in İstanbul²⁰. This was, ironically, ten years before Bareilles published the *Rapport secret*. Bareilles, since he lived in İstanbul, should have known about Mahmud Celeleddin's work, but he does not mention it. The report was, therefore, public after 1909. When Bareilles published it again in 1919, it had not been secret, at least to Turks, for ten years.

Mahmud Celeleddin explains, in *Mirat-ı hakikat*, that he publishes a translation into Turkish of the memorandum (lâyihâ) written in French which Karatodori Paşa gave to Safvet Paşa²¹. This statement by Mahmud Celeleddin is fairly reliable proof of Karatodori's authorship, because Mahmud was in a position to know the truth. His career had been in the offices of the Sublime Porte, and in the period he writes about in *Mirat-ı hakikat*, 1875-1878, he was amedci. This meant that he headed a central secretariat which dealt with communications between the Porte and the Palace, which kept minutes of the Council of Ministers meetings, and which performed other vital functions. Mahmud Celeleddin makes it clear in his preface that he had access to important government documents and to records of discussions in the Council of Ministers, and he says that what he did not know personally he could learn by informal conversations with those who did know²². He may have exaggerated his omniscience somewhat²³. Nevertheless, he was in a very strategic

19 The manuscript of Mahmud Celeleddin's work is in the Başbakanlık Arşivi, listed in the catalogue of the Yıldız tasnifi as Kısım 33, evrak 2026, «the drafts in his own handwriting of Mahmud Paşa's history called *Mirat-ı hakikat*» I have not seen the manuscript.

20 *Mirat-ı hakikat: Tarih-i Mahmud Celeleddin Paşa* (İstanbul, Matbaa-ı Osmaniye, 1326-1327 (1908-1909). Karatodori's report is on pp. 171-229 of volume 3.

21 *Mirat-ı hakikat*, III, p. 170.

22 *Mirat-ı hakikat*, I, pp. 4-5. On Mahmud Celeleddin, see further: Burşalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı müellifleri* (İstanbul, 1334-1343; Westmead, England, 1971), II, 426; Gövsa, *Türk meşhurları*, p. 79; and especially İbnül-emîn Mahmud Kemal İnal, *Son asır Türk şairleri* (İstanbul, 1930-1942), cüz 3, pp. 205-208.

23 He has also been accused of error and of lack of objectivity. Yuluğ Tekin Kurat, *Henry Layard'ın İstanbul elçiliği, 1877-1880* (Ankara, 1968), p.

position and may have known personally that Karatodori gave a report on the Berlin Congress to Safvet. He would also probably have had access to that report, either at the time it was presented or afterward.

The information that Mahmud Celeleddin gives also allows us to determine that Karatodori's report was written in the late summer or fall of 1878. Mahmud Paşa says that Karatodori gave the report to Safvet when the latter was both grand vezir and foreign minister. Safvet held these two offices at once between June 4 and December 4, 1878. Karatodori had left Berlin on July 16, 1878, three days after the close of the Congress. He had gone immediately to Vienna for further negotiations on Bosnia-Herzegovina with the Austrian government, and had stayed there until early October. After that, he was briefly governor of Crete. Then, on December 4, 1878, Aleksandr Karatodori became Ottoman foreign minister, at the time when Hayreddin Paşa replaced Safvet Paşa as grand vezir²⁴. Therefore, Karatodori must have written the report at some time before December 4, 1878 — while he was in Vienna, or in Crete, or during a stop in Istanbul. The date 1879, which Bareilles attaches to the report, must be erroneous²⁵.

The text of the report by Karatodori, as Mahmud Celeleddin gives it, is not precisely the same as that in the book by Bareilles. Bareilles's version is a little longer. It has more exact dates, especially dates of telegrams. It has sentences and phrases that are not included in the parallel passages of the report as published in *Mirat-ı hakikat*. It gives some telegrams in direct quotation which *Mirat-ı hakikat* gives only indirectly, in summary form. The paragraphing of the two versions is sometimes different, also. The question naturally arises, therefore, as to which version conforms to the origi-

226. notes that Mahmud Celeleddin falls into error concerning British policy when he writes what he has heard, without having seen British documents. Ali Haydar Midhat, *Hatıralarım, 1872-1946* (Istanbul, 1946), p. 65, note 1, charges Mahmud Celeleddin with bias against his father, Midhat Paşa.

24 *Hariciye Nezaret-i celilesinin salnamesi*, p. 74. See further, on Karatodori, *Larousse du XX Siècle*, I, p. 1026, «Carathéodory, Prince Alexandre.»

25 Bareilles, *Rapport secret*, p. 61. Maybe Bareilles has given 1879, mistakenly, as the date for the Congress of Berlin! This is not clear.

nal²⁶. The answer cannot yet be definite. Possibly neither version is exactly like the original — each one may be a variation. It may be that Karatodori himself revised an original version he had written, thus creating two «originals.» Possibly Bareilles added some phrases to the report himself, and so made it longer than Mahmud Celeleddin's version.

But the most likely explanation is the simplest one: Mahmud Celeleddin, in making the translation from French to Turkish, could easily have shortened the report a little. Probably the *Rapport secret* as published by Bareilles is closer to the original report of Karatodori, if it is not the exact original.

In conclusion, it can now be said that *Le Rapport secret sur le Congrès de Berlin adressé à la S. Porte par Karathéodory Pacha* is a document on which historians can rely. Although Bareilles made errors in his introduction, and although his motives for publishing the document may be suspect, the report itself is probably authentic. It is likely that Karatodori was in fact the author, as Mahmud Celeleddin asserts. The report was probably written in 1878. The telegrams exchanged between Karatodori and Safvet that are included in the *Rapport secret* are trustworthy copies of the originals in the archives of the Dış-İşleri Bakanlığı. The version of Karatodori's report published in Turkish translation by Mahmud Celeleddin is essentially the same, but is a little shorter than the one published by Bareilles. This version is also, in general, a reliable document.

Two sets of unanswered questions remain. 1) Did Bareilles really see the «original text» of the report? If so, where did he see it? Who gave it to him? Or did he see only a copy? 2) Where is the original report today? Is it in one of the Istanbul archives, perhaps still uncatalogued, perhaps filed in an unusual place? Is it in private hands? Or does it no longer exist? Further research may provide an answer to some or all of these questions.

26 Perhaps the manuscript of *Mirat-ı hakikat* in the Başbakanlık Arşivi will, when it is examined, shed some light on this question. Inal uses the *lâyihâ* of Karatodori in *Mirat-ı hakikat* without raising any question about its reliability: *Son sadrazamlar*, cüz 6, pp. 842-43 and note.

BERLİN KONGRESİ HAKKINDA GİZLİ RAPOR

Hülâsa

Bir Fransız muharrir, Bertrand Bareilles, 1919 senesinde *Le Rapport secret sur le Congrès de Berlin adressé à la S. Porte par Karathéodory Pacha, premier plénipotentiaire ottoman* neşretti. Rapor kitabın 65 inci sahifesinden 195 e kadardır. Eğer rapor gerçekse, tarihçiler için kıymetlidir, çünkü Osmanlı nokta-i nazarından yazılmış ve sadriazam ve hariciye vekili olan Safvet Paşa'dan Karatodori Paşa'ya, Karatodori'den Safvet'e giden telgraflardan iktibasları ihtiva etmektedir. Bugüne kadar, rapor'un güvenilir olması kesin değildir. Bareilles «metin aşını» nasıl aldığını ve kopya ettiğini izah etmiyor. Bareilles tahminen yirmi sene İstanbul'da oturduğu için, belki de asıl metni görmek fırsatını buldu.

Ne Başbakanlık Arşivinde ve ne de Dışişleri Bakanlığı Hazine-i Evrakında raporun aslını ve ne de onun kopyasını bulamadım. Bununla beraber, Dışişleri Bakanlığı arşivinde, Siyasî tasnif'teki Karton 185 ve 257 numara içindeki bir kaç telgraf Bareilles'in eserinde neşrettiği telgrafların aynıdır. Rapor'da iktibas veya hülâsa şeklinde verilen otuz kadar telgrafın listesi, ve arşiv numaralarının listesi buradadır. Bareilles'in kitabındaki telgrafların hep-i hakikidir.

Karatodori gerçekten raporun müellifi mi idi? Bunun doğruluğu ispat edilmedi, fakat bu muhtemeldir. Mahmud Celaleddin Paşa Tarihi *Mir'at-i Hakikat*'te (3. cilt, sahife 171-229), aynı raporu Bareilles'den on sene evvel bastırdı. Mahmud Celaleddin, bu lâyihanın aslını fransızcadan türkçeye çevirdi ve biraz kısalttı. O, Karatodorinin lâyihayı Safvet Paşa'ya verdiğini söylüyor. Mahmud Celaleddin o zaman (1878) Bâb-ı âli'de âmedci olduğu için, onun malûmatının doğru olması lâzımdır.

Onun için *Rapport secret* güvenilir ve faydalı bir vesikadır.