

Negotiations and Agreements for Population Transfers in the Balkans from the Beginning of the 19th Century until the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913

Mehmet Hacısalihoglu*

Abstract:

The history of population transfers on the basis of decisions by ruling authorities dates back to ancient times. In modern times, however, the establishment of nation-states played a decisive role in forcible population transfers in the Balkans. Balkan historiographies tend to date back bilaterally agreed population transfers and population exchanges to the Balkan Wars in 1912/13. However, the process of establishing autonomous and independent states in the Ottoman Balkans saw multiple cases of forcible population transfer based on agreements and treaties. Some of them are well-known cases, for example, the forcible emigration of Muslims from the newly independent Greek state in 1830, the forcible emigration of Muslims from Serbian principality in 1862 and several cases of negotiations on the emigration of Muslims from different regions, such as Crete or newly established Bulgaria. This paper deals with these processes in the Balkans beginning already as early as in the 19th century.

Keywords: population transfer in the Balkans, population exchange, Greek Independence, Russo-Ottoman treaties, Muslim Minorities, ethnic cleansing, the Ottoman Empire, Russia, Greece, Serbia

Introduction

At the end of the eighteenth century, a new era of population transfers began in the Balkans.¹ Almost all the Ottoman-Russian wars

• Prof., Yıldız Technical University, Center for Balkan and Black Sea Studies, email: mehmethacisalihoglu@gmail.com

caused mass migrations in occupied territories, and the creation of the Balkan states in the nineteenth century was accompanied by migrations and population transfers also, for different reasons. But many historians view the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 as the starting point for population transfers imposed by government decisions or bilateral agreements, that is, for the forcible expulsion of population groups on the basis of nation-state policies. Sundhaussen, for example, treats forced ethnic migrations as a development of the twentieth century.² Similarly, most historians of the Balkans do not take into consideration the forced migrations and other forms of population transfers prior to the Balkan Wars. The field of Ottoman studies provides more information about the resettlements, but such events have a peripheral place within these studies.

This essay seeks to modify the present-day opinion that population transfers resulting from negotiations and ethnic purification policies began during the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913. I offer an overview of the population transfer processes by analyzing political decisions and agreements made during the long nineteenth century, before the Balkan Wars. I do not attempt to describe the migrations themselves,³ but rather the diplomatic negotiations and

¹ For earlier population transfer policies in the Balkans see Peter Charanis, "The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3, no. 2 (1961): 140-154; for the Ottoman policy of *sürgün* see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler" [Exile as a Method of Settlement and Colonization in the Ottoman Empire], *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11 (1949): 524-569 and 13, no. 1-4 (1952): 56-78; Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. 1, *The Central Lands*, (New York, London: Holmes & Maier Publishers, 1982), 11-12.

² Holm Sundhaussen, "Forced Ethnic Migration," *Europäische Geschichte Online (EGO)*, Mainz European History Online (EGO), published by the Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz 2010-12-03. URL: <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/europe-on-the-road/forced-ethnic-migration/holm-sundhaussen-forced-ethnic-migration>

³ On the migration of Muslims from the Balkans and other migration processes to the Ottoman Empire and Turkey see Justin McCarthy, *Death and Exile. The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*, 2d ed. (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1996); Nedim İpek, *Rumeli'den Anadolu'ya Türk Göçleri* [Emigration of Turks from the Balkans to Anatolia] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994); idem, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler* [Migrations from Empire to Republic] (Trabzon: Serander, 2006); Ahmet Halaçoğlu, *Balkan Harbi Sırasında Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri, 1912-1913* [Turkish Migrations from the Balkans during the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995); Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler* [Ethnic Formation and Migrations from the Ottomans to the Present], translated by Bahar Tırnakçı (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010); Nurcan Özgür Baklacioğlu, *Dış Politika ve Göç. Yugoslavya'dan Türkiye'ye Göçlerde Arnavutlar, 1920-1990* [Foreign Policy and Migration.

political decisions that led to them. Further, I try to classify the processes as the traditional imperial population policy or as a modern nation-state policy of homogenization. Finally, I discuss whether these processes served as examples for population transfers during the Balkan Wars and afterwards.

1. Russo-Ottoman wars and population transfers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

Most of the Russo-Ottoman conflicts during the second half of the eighteenth century ended with a loss of Ottoman territory on the northern coasts of the Black Sea, in the Balkans, and in the Caucasus. These areas were in large part inhabited by Muslims of various ethnic origins. The Russian expansion into the Ottoman lands usually caused mass migrations of Muslims from these areas. Almost all the peace treaties that concluded these wars included an article concerning population transfers by both sides, as described below:

Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, 1774

During the Russo-Ottoman war of 1768–1774, Russian troops occupied the northern Black Sea region, including the Danubian Principalities. But under the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, signed in 1774, only a small part of the occupied territories remained in Russian hands. Bessarabia, the fortresses of Bucak, Kili, Akkerman, and İsmail, the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, and the Mediterranean islands occupied by the Russians were given back to the Ottomans.

Albanians in the Migrations from Yugoslavia to Turkey, 1919–1990] (İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2011); Bayram Nazır, *Macar ve Polonyalı Mülteciler. Osmanlı'ya Sığınanlar* [Hungarian and Polish Refugees. Refugees in the Ottoman Empire] (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2006); Fahriye Emgili, *Yeniden Kurulan Hayatlar. Boşnakların Türkiye'ye Göçleri, 1878–1934* [Re-established Lives. Migration of Bosniaks to Turkey, 1878–1934] (İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2012); Süleyman Erkan, *Kırım ve Kafkasya Göçler, 1878–1908* [Crimean and Caucasian Migrations, 1878–1908] (Trabzon: KATÜ Kafkasya ve Orta Asya Ülkeleri Araştırma Merkezi, 1996; Abdullah Saydam, *Kırım ve Kafkasya Göçleri, 1856–1876* [Crimean and Caucasian Migrations, 1856–1876] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997); Yıldırım Ağanoglu, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Balkanların Makus Talihi: Göç* [III Fate of the Balkans from Empire to Republic: Migration], 7th ed. (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012); Neriman Ersoy-Hacısalihoglu and Mehmet Hacısalihoglu, eds., *89 Göçü. Bulgaristan'da 1984–89 Azınlık Politikaları ve Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç* [Forced Migration of 1989. Minority Policy in Bulgaria between 1984 and 1989 and Forced Migration to Turkey] (İstanbul: BALKAR and BALMED, 2012); Mehmet Hacısalihoglu, *Doğu Rumeli'de Kayıp Köyler. İslimye Sancağı'nda 1878'den Günümüze Göçler, İsim Değişiklikleri ve Harabeler* [Lost Villages in Eastern Rumelia. Migrations, Name Changes and Ruins in the Province of İslimye/Sliven from 1878 to the Present] (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2008).

The treaty accorded to the population in these regions the right to sell or take their possessions with them and to migrate elsewhere. According to Point 5 of Article 16, families wishing to emigrate were allowed to do so within the term of one year.⁴ Article 17 of the treaty awarded to the Ottoman Empire all the Mediterranean islands that had been occupied by Russia during the war. Under Point 4 of Article 17, the Sublime Porte would allow those persons who wanted to leave their homes to settle elsewhere.⁵

These provisions concerned the Orthodox Christian population primarily. The imperial Russian policy was directed toward the establishment and consolidation of the Russian rule in the newly gained territories, and for that reason, the Russian government began to invite the Ottoman Orthodox population to emigrate from the Ottoman Empire to Russia. At the same time, the Muslim community of the occupied regions began to emigrate to the Ottoman Empire. The Orthodox emigrants from the Ottoman Empire were to be settled in the places left by Muslims. In this way, the Russian government sought to strengthen the new Russian borders against the Ottoman

⁴ "D'accorder aux familles qui voudront abandonner leur patrie et se transporter dans d'autres pays, la faculté de le faire librement et d'emporter leurs biens avec elles; et pour que ces familles puissent avoir le temps nécessaire pour arranger leurs affaires, il leur sera accordé le terme d'un an pour émigrer librement de leur pays, lequel terme devra se compter du jour de l'échange du présent Traité" (Gabriel Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. 1 [Paris: F. Pichon, 1897], 327); İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi* [Ottoman History], vol. 4, part 1, 5th ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), 424. For the Turkish text of Article 16: "Cümle Bucak memleketi Akkerman, ve Kili ve İsmail kaleleriyle sair kasabat ve kurâ derunlarında mevcut bulunan amme-i eşyalarile Rusya Devleti tarafından der-i aliyeme red olunub ve Bender kalesini dahi Devlet-i Aliye'ye red ider ve kezalik Eflâk ve Buğdan memleketlerini cümle kulâ ve şehirler ve kasabat ve kuraları derunlarında mevcut bulunan cümle eşyalarile kezalik Devlet-i Aliye'ye red ider. Devlet-i Aliye'm dahi atilbeyan şerait ile memalik-i merkumeyi kabul idüb işbu şeraiti tamamen ve kâmilin zabt ve hüraset eylesini va'd-i mamülünbih ile teahhüd eyleye [...] (Hamisen) Terk-i vatan idub ahar mahallere varmak gagbetinde olan hanedanlar eşyalarile nakl itmeye serbestiyet üzere me'zun olalar ve işbu hanedanlar kendu mesalihinin tanzimi için vakt-i kâfleri olmak için serbestiyet üzere vatanlarından nakl itmelerine bir sene müddeti imhal olunub işbu müddet mühlet-i ahidname-i mübarekenin mübadelesi tarihinden mâdud ve mehsul oluna" (Nihat Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku ve Siyasi Tarih Metinleri* [Texts of International Law and Political History], vol. 1, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Andlaşmaları* [Treaties of the Ottoman Empire] [Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953], 127-128).

⁵ "A l'égard des familles qui désireront s'expatrier et se transporter ailleurs, il leur sera permis de s'en aller avec tous leurs biens; et afin qu'elles aient le temps d'arranger leurs affaires, il leur sera donné pour cela le terme d'une année, à compter du jour de l'échange du présent Traité" (Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux*, vol. 1, p. 328); A. Schopoff, *Les Réformes et la Protection des Chrétiens en Turquie 1673-1904* (Paris: Plon Nourrit et Cie, 1904), p. 11. For the Turkish text, see: Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 129.

Empire.

In 1774, Crimea, which had been under Ottoman rule since the 1480s, became autonomous. In 1783, the territory of Crimea was annexed by Russia. During the annexation, General Potemkin issued a declaration under which the Muslim population was allowed to leave the Crimea; Muslims who wanted to stay were required to take an oath of allegiance to the Russian Tsar. When Potemkin noticed, however, that nearly 30,000 Muslims began to emigrate after this declaration, he realised that it could cause a mass migration of Muslims and the depopulation of the region. According to Uzunçarşılı, he then halted the migration by force.⁶ This clearly shows that Russia was not seeking a total depopulation of the newly gained territories.

Treaty of Iași, 1792

The next Russo-Ottoman war, which began in 1787, ended with the Treaty of Iași (Jassy; Turkish: Yaş) in 1792. The Ottoman government hoped to recover the lost territories, above all the Crimea, but without success. Russia occupied new territories and, pursuant to the Treaty of Iași, its new borders stretched to the Dniester River (Turkish: Turla). Russia returned to the Ottoman Empire the Bender, Akkerman, Kili, and İsmail fortresses and the Principality of Moldavia, which had been occupied during the war. Article 4 of the treaty set forth conditions that the Ottoman Empire had to accept, one of which was, in Point 5, that the Ottoman Empire would allow in the places left to it under the treaty the free emigration of families who wanted to leave the country and go elsewhere.⁷ This provision again concerned primarily Ottoman Orthodox Christians, who were encouraged by the Russian army to migrate to Russian territory. Consequently, thousands of Orthodox Christians migrated to Russia at that time, among them the Turkish-speaking Orthodox population

⁶ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 490-491. According to Turkish historian Uzunçarşılı, Potemkin ordered a massacre of these emigrants to prevent a mass migration.

⁷ "De permettre aux familles qui voudraient quitter leur pays et s'établir ailleurs, de sortir librement et d'emporter avec elles leurs biens; et, afin qu'elles aient le temps de prévenir leurs parents, sujets de l'Empire Ottoman, de vendre leurs biens meubles ou immeubles, selon les lois du pays, à d'autres sujets de l'Empire Ottoman et de mettre enfin ordre à leurs affaires, il leur sera accordé un délai de 14 mois, à dater du jour de l'échange de la ratification du présent Traité" (Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux*, vol. 1, 18). For Turkish text, see Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 189-190.

of Gagauz.⁸

Not only the treaties with Russia but also those with Austria-Hungary contained provisions regarding the emigration of the population, but there was a significant difference between the two. The 1791 Treaty of Svishtov (Ziştovi) between the Ottoman and Austrian Empires provided in Article 8 that all subjects of both empires who had emigrated from one to the other before or during the war would be accepted as subjects and would not be forced to return to their home country.⁹ But this article did not allow the emigration of the population after the war, nor did it encourage the population to emigrate. The right of free emigration can thus be viewed as a Russian policy toward Orthodox Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

Treaty of Bucharest, 1812

The next Russo-Ottoman war, between 1806 and 1812, ended with a peace treaty signed in Bucharest. Russia was again the winner and occupied new territories. The Prut River became the new border. During the war, the Russian military had actively promoted the migration of the Orthodox Christian population in the Ottoman territories, in an effort to encourage or force this population group to resettle in Russia. Consequently, a large number of Christian emigrants were leaving their homes for Russia. For example, the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Gagauz people and many Bulgarians were forcibly transferred to Bucak (Bessarabia), mainly during the course of the war. In 1827, there were 48 villages of Bulgarian migrants in Bucak.¹⁰

⁸ Olga K. Radova, "Pereselencheskoe Dvizhenie v XVIII - Pervoi Polovine XIX vv. Osnovnye Etapy i ikh Osobennosti" [Migrations in the Eighteenth and First Half of the Nineteenth Centuries. The Principal Stages and Their Distinguishing Characteristics], in *Istoriia i Kultura Gagauzov*, edited by S. Bulgar (Komrat, Kishinev: Pontos, 2006), 71-88.

⁹ "(Sekinci madde) İşbu seferden mukaddem yahud sefer esnasında canib-i ahârın arazisine çekilmiş ve raiyyetini kabul idiüb rizaen ikamet iden reaya-yı canibeyn tabii devletleri tarafından bir vakitte iade olunmaları iddia olunmayıb tebeiiyet eyledikleri devletin reaya-yı sairesi gibi ad olunub min'bad oteçhile haklarında muamele oluna kezalik şol kimesneler ik iki devlette malik-i emlak olanlar kimesne tarafından muhalefet olunmaksızın hallerine çesbân gördükleri vech üzre meskenlerini devleteynin birinde diledikleri tarafda ihtiyar eylemeğe mezun olalar lâkin canib-i ahârın memalikinde malik oldukları emlakı furuht iderek ancak bir devlete ihtiyar-ı tebeiiyet itmeğe mecbur olalar" (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 172-173).

¹⁰ Ufuk Gülsoy, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'nda Rumeli'den Rusya'ya Göçürülen Reâyâ* [Forced Migration of the non-Muslims from the Balkans to Russia during the War of 1828-1829] (İstanbul: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1993), 24-25.

The Treaty of Bucharest contained a special provision, Article 7, addressing this population and the Muslims remaining under Russian rule. Pursuant to Article 7, Ottoman subjects were accorded the right to sell their estates and emigrate within 18 months. The same right was provided to a Tatar clan (Yedisian / Kavoussan in French text) under Russian rule. This was the first time in which Muslims in Russia received the right to emigrate under a peace treaty between the Ottoman and the Russian empires. The text thus provides:

Les sujets ottomans qui, par suite de la guerre, sont ou venus ou restés dans les pays cédés présentement à la Russie, pourront, avec leurs familles et toutes leurs propriétés, passer librement dans les Etats de la Sublime Porte, et s'y fixer sans que personne les en empêche. Ils seront libres de vendre leurs biens à qui bon leur semblera, et d'emporter tout ce qu'ils voudront. Cette permission s'étendra également aux habitants des pays cédés qui y possèdent des biens et qui se trouvent actuellement dans les Etats Ottomans; et il leur sera accordé aux uns et aux autres, pour pouvoir mettre ordre à leurs affaires, un délai de 18 mois à dater de l'échange des ratifications du présent Traité.

Du même, les Tartares de la horde de Kavoussan qui, durant cette guerre, ont passé de la Bessarabie en Russie, pourront, s'ils le désirent, rentrer dans les Etats Ottomans, à condition toutefois que la Sublime Porte sera obligée de dédommager la Russie des frais que lui ont occasionnés l'émigration et l'établissement de ces Tartares. Pareillement, les Chrétiens qui ont des possessions dans les pays cédés à la Russie, ou qui y sont nés, mais qui se trouvent actuellement dans d'autres parties de l'Empire Ottoman peuvent, s'ils le désirent, revenir dans lesdits pays cédés et s'y établir avec leurs familles et leurs biens, sans que personne puisse y mettre obstacle; il leur sera également permis de vendre les biens quelconques qu'ils possèdent dans l'Empire Ottoman, et d'en faire passer le produit dans les Etats Russes, et ils jouiront pour cela du même délai de 18 mois depuis le jour de l'échange des ratifications du présent Traité.¹¹

These provisions have the character of a voluntary population exchange similar to those in the Balkans during the first half of the twentieth century. The mention of a specific Muslim Tatar tribe, the Yedisian, in the treaty is, however, remarkable. We find an explanation for it in the work of the famous Ottoman historian Ahmed Cevdet Pasha (1822–1895). According to him, the Tatar tribe was forcibly

¹¹ Gabriel Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. 2 (Paris: F. Pichon, 1897), 89. For the Turkish text of the article see Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 251.

transferred to Russian territory during the war. When the Russians occupied Bessarabia, they relocated the Yedisian tribe of the Bessarabian Tatars from Bessarabia to the Russian lands across the Dniester River. The clan then applied to the Ottoman state for resettlement in the Ottoman lands. During the negotiations for peace, the Ottoman delegates raised this issue. The Russian delegates declared, "The people in the Ottoman lands which were ceded [to Russia] may if they want, migrate to the Ottoman lands with their homes and goods [*evi barkı ile*]." They said it was not necessary to mention separately the name of the Yedisian tribe. But, according to Cevdet Pasha, the tribe made repeated attempts to be included expressly, and the Ottoman delegates declared that this was a wish of the sultan. Consequently, the name of the Tatar clan was incorporated in the treaty in a special point of Article 7.¹² There are documents in the Ottoman archives showing that, on the basis of this treaty, some Muslims migrated to Ottoman territories.¹³

Treaty of Adrianople, 1829

The short period of peace between Russia and the Ottoman Empire ended with another war in 1828 and 1829. During the conflict, the Russian troops occupied eastern Balkan provinces, including what now is Bulgaria and the city of Adrianople (Edirne), the largest Ottoman city in the Balkans and one of the most important seats of the sultans.

After this major defeat, a new peace treaty was signed on 2/14 September 1829. The Prut remained the Ottoman-Russian border. The Russian military administration in the eastern Balkans, including Adrianople, remained there more than eight months. Under the treaty, the Russians were to retreat from Adrianople and Kırkkilise (now Kırklareli) but receive the fortress of Yergögü. In a Russian proposal, the Russians linked their retreat from the Thracian lands to the Ottoman withdrawal from Yergögü. The Russians wanted the Ottoman military forces in the fortress to leave within two weeks and the [Muslim] population within four weeks; then the Russians would

¹² Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet* [History of Cevdet], vol. 10, simplified by Tevfik Temelkuran (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1974), 36.

¹³ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Ottoman Archive in Istanbul; hereafter, BOA), C.HR. 73/3627, 14 Rebi'ul-evvel 1228 [17 March 1813]. One of the documents shows that a certain Hüseyin and Ahmed from Kili, which was ceded to Russia, sought permission to sell their properties.

leave the Ottoman lands.¹⁴

During the war and under the subsequent military administration, the Russians again promoted the migration to Russia of the Orthodox population of the Balkans. An article of the peace treaty again secured the free emigration of the Orthodox population to Russia. Article 13 of the Treaty of Adrianople provided that the population could emigrate within 18 months. The same right was also given to the Muslim subjects of Russia.¹⁵ Like the Treaty of Bucharest in 1812, this new treaty also contemplated a voluntary population exchange.

Archival documents describe the implementation of Article 13. Sultan Mahmud II sent a *ferman*, or edict, to the provinces and ordered the public announcement of the article. In response, the governor of Trabzon, Osman Pasha, who was also the commander-in-chief of the Eastern Army, wrote to the sultan that he had made declarations explaining the content of Article 13 to the Christian population. According to the *ferman* of the sultan, Osman Pasha ordered compensation to be paid for the properties of the Armenians in Erzurum and other places that had been forcibly taken by the Kurds and insurgents.¹⁶

The emigration of the Orthodox population, however, was not really voluntary in practice. During their withdrawal from the Ottoman territories, the Russian military authorities tried to persuade the Orthodox population to emigrate and to depart with the Russian army. The Russians even promised money: Everybody who went with the Russian army would receive 100 asper (*kuruş*) as “marching money” (*harcırahı*) and would be exempt from all taxes for 20 years.

¹⁴ “Virilan takrirden malumları olduğu vechile kala-i merkume (Yergögü) kapularıyla iki aded tabyaları Rusya askerine teslim ve mustahfızın ile ahalişi çıkmağa başladıklarında tahliye hususu icra olunmuş ad olunacak ve mustahfızın iki hafta ve ahali dört haftada tahliye ideceklerdir” (BOA, HAT 1043/43144 E, 29 Zilhicce 1245 [21 June 1830]).

¹⁵ “[...]Il sera, en outre, accordé aux sujets respectifs, établis dans les pays restitués à la Sublime Porte ou cédés à la Cour Impériale de Russie, le même terme de dix-huit mois, à compter de l’échange de ratifications du présent Traité de paix, pour disposer, s’ils le jugent convenable, de leurs propriétés acquises soit avant, soit depuis la guerre, et se retirer avec leurs capitaux et leurs biens meubles des Etats de l’une des Puissances contractantes dans ceux de l’autre et réciproquement” (Noradounghian, *Recueil d’Actes Internationaux*, vol. 2, 172). For the Turkish text see Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 285-286. See also BOA, HAT, 1031/42875, 30 Rebi’ul-evvel 1245 [29 September 1829], f. 4.

¹⁶ BOA, HAT, 1045/43179 E, 27 Receb 1245 [22 January 1830]. The exact words are *ekrad ve eşkıya*.

The Russians also used Cossack units to force the population to migrate to Russia. Further, the Russian authorities spread the word that the Ottoman authorities would punish all Christians who helped the Russians and would impose high taxes on the Christians. When the Ottoman authorities sent a protest letter to the Russian commandant, Count Diebitsch, complaining that the Russian military was forcing the Orthodox population around Adrianople to migrate to Russia, Diebitsch declared that the Russian authorities recommended that the population not leave their homes. But there are many documents that attest to the forced emigration of the population to Russia.¹⁷

The Ottoman government and the local authorities also tried to halt the emigration of Ottoman subjects to Russia by grants of amnesty for collaboration with the Russian army, tax exemptions, and other means. The government also used the mediation of Orthodox clergy and notables (*kocabaşı*) to prevent emigration.¹⁸ But despite these efforts by the government, a large number of Orthodox Christians emigrated and the Russian government settled them in Walachia, Moldavia, Bessarabia, and the Crimea. Ufuk Gülsoy emphasizes that this population transfer in 1828-1830 was wider and more systematic than previous ones.¹⁹ After repeated efforts by the Ottoman authorities to halt the emigration of the Orthodox population and particularly after promising them tax exemptions through the mediation of representatives of Orthodox communities, most of the migrants who were not satisfied with life in Russia returned to their homes between 1830 and 1840.²⁰

These population transfers were a consequence of the Russian imperial policy of colonization of newly annexed territories. They were not the product of a nation-state policy of ethnic purification. Instead, it was for military, political, and economic reasons that the Russian government sought to settle migrants in these areas. The migrants did not only come from the Ottoman territories but also, they came from the German principalities and other European countries. In 1778, for example, around 75,000 people were settled in

¹⁷ Gülsoy, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'nda Rumeli'den*, 27-31; Kemal Beydilli, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşında Doğu Anadolu'dan Rusya'ya Göçürülen Ermeniler* [Forced Migration of Armenians from Eastern Anatolia to Russia during the War of 1828-1829] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988).

¹⁸ Gülsoy, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'nda Rumeli'den*, 41-64.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 24-25.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 71-82.

the territories left by the Tatars in the Crimea region. After the annexation of the Crimea by Russia in 1783, Russia tried between 1784 and 1787 to attract settlers from the Italian and German principalities. In 1822, migrants from Württemberg and Bavaria were settled in Sarata (in Bessarabia), and in 1823, migrants from Switzerland were settled in Saba.²¹ The Ottoman response was similarly imperial rather than national.

2. The Greek uprising and the establishment of an independent Greek state

The process of establishing nation-states in the Balkans was usually accompanied by forcible emigration of population groups and, in some cases, even by the ethnic purification. It differed from the population transfers between the Ottoman and the Russian empires that took place before or during the same period. During the establishment of the Balkan states, population transfers became the main instrument of ethnic homogenization.²²

The first ethnic cleansing in the modern sense that took place in the Balkans began in 1921, during the Greek War of Independence. The Greek rebellion against the Ottoman forces in the Peloponnese (Morea) was successful, and the Muslim population of this area became victims of the uprising. The Greek insurgents attacked the Muslims there and killed many of them. The Greeks viewed these attacks as part of a legitimate struggle against Ottoman rule. Indeed, they tried to kill or expel almost all Muslims from the peninsula:

The patriotic cry of revolution, proclaimed by the Greek Archbishop Germanos, was 'Peace to the Christians! Respect to the Consuls! Death to the Turks!' The only Turks who survived were those who were able to take refuge in strongholds. They fled with their families into the few areas, such as the Acropolis of Athens, which were held by Ottoman garrison troops. They were either besieged and ultimately killed or, in rare cases, rescued by Ottoman forces.²³

²¹ Ibid., 24.

²² İlhan Tekeli, *Göç ve Ötesi* [Migration and Behind] (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008), 44–49. Turkish scholar İlhan Tekeli calls these kinds of migrations "Balkanization migrations" [*Balkanlaşma Göçleri*] and claims that because the concept of "nation" in the Balkans was based on the ideas of Herder, the Balkan national movements aimed at ethnic cleansing, which affected Muslims primarily but also Jews.

²³ McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 11.

The most famous incident was the massacre of Muslims in the administrative centre of Vilayet Mora, Tripolitsa, in October 1821. Because of the insurgents' success, the representatives of the governor of the Eyalet Mora had fallen back, with his soldiers, to the centre of the Eyalet Tripoliçe (Tripolitsa). The Greek insurgents besieged the city, and after five months, it fell, in October 1821. The population usually numbered around 5,000, but because of the attacks of the revolutionaries, many Muslims from other places had taken refuge in this city. Those Muslims who attempted to leave the city because of the problematic siege conditions were captured and killed. In the end, the representatives of the Muslims in Tripolitsa agreed to cede the city to the Greek revolutionaries, and they entered into an agreement that allowed the Muslims to leave the city freely. But when the Greek insurgents entered the city, they began to kill the Muslims. According to Cevdet Pasha, 40,000 Muslims in the city capitulated because the insurgents promised to bring them to the Ottoman borders. They were almost all killed; only a small number survived.²⁴

During the massacres in the Peloponnese, in June 1821 the Ottoman army and volunteer troops suppressed the Greek revolt on the island of Chios (Sakız), massacring many people and taking many Greeks away as slaves.²⁵ After the news of the "Massacre on Chios" reached Europe, the European public turned against the Ottomans, and the Philhellenes (friends of Greeks) in particular began to put pressure on the governments in Western Europe to intervene. In Russia, Tsar Alexander, who had founded the Holy Alliance, died in 1825, and his successor, Tsar Nicholas, aimed to bring the Ottoman Empire under Russian influence.

The Protocol of St. Petersburg, 1826: On 4 April 1826, Russia and England signed a protocol in St. Petersburg. England, Russia, and France signed another protocol in London on 6 July 1827. The protocols addressed the establishment of a Greek principality under the suzerainty of the sultan. The first article of the St. Petersburg Protocol contemplated a forcible relocation of Muslims that would separate them from Christians and thus foreclose the conflict between the two groups in the new principality. Muslims were to sell their lands to Greeks and to leave the principality.²⁶ The St. Petersburg

²⁴ Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. 12, 31-33.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 51-53.

²⁶ Ali Fuat Örenç, *Balkanlarda İlk Dram. Unuttuğumuz Mora Türkleri ve Eyaletten Bağımsızlığa Yunanistan* [First Drama in the Balkans. Forgotten Turks of the Peloponnese

Protocol was the first treaty to form the basis for a forced population transfer in the Balkans, as decided by two of the Great Powers, Russia and Great Britain. On the basis of this agreement, the Russian ambassador sent a note to the Sublime Porte in March 1827 demanding the execution of the provisions of the protocol.²⁷

The provisions of the 1827 London Protocol entered into other negotiations in 1829 and 1832.²⁸ The Greek insurgents met in Epitavro in 1829, and after eight meetings formulated their demands and asked the English ambassador in Istanbul to mediate between the Greeks and the Ottoman government. Their first demand was that in Greek lands, no Muslim should remain. They viewed it as impossible to live together with Muslims in light of previous events.²⁹ The expulsion of Muslims from Greece was thus a decision not only of the Great Powers but also of the Greek nationalists. The decisions for forcible transfer of Muslims from nation-states thus resulted from a consensus between the nationalist groups and the Great Powers, notably Russia and England.

Another protocol signed by France and England on 22 March 1829 regarding the establishment of the Greek Kingdom contained a provision concerning the right of free emigration of both Muslim and Greek subjects.³⁰ On 28 June/9 July 1829, the French and British ambassadors delivered a proposal (*takrir*) to the Ottoman government based on this protocol. Article 1 of the proposal established the borders of the Greek principality, and Article 3 concerned the lands and properties of the Muslim population. Pursuant to the latter article, the owners of ordinary goods and lands as well as the lands and properties belonging to the Muslim pious foundations within the borders of the Greek principality would be allowed to sell these properties within a period of one year. This article clearly concerns the consolidation of the Greek lands from which the Muslim population

and Greece from Province to Independence] (İstanbul: Babiali Kültür Yayıncılığı, 2009), 130-131.

²⁷ BOA, HAT, 1317/51346D, 24 Şa'ban 1242 [23 March 1827]. Referring to the protocol of 23 March 1826 between Russia and Britain in St. Petersburg, the Russian ambassador demanded that the Ottoman government stop the war and comply with the provisions of the protocol.

²⁸ Öreñç, *Mora Türkleri*, 240-253.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 173-174.

³⁰ Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux*, vol. 2, p. 163. "Note des Ambassadeurs de France et de la Grande-Bretagne relativement aux bases de pacification et d'organisation de la Grèce en exécution du Protocole du 22 Mars 1829," dated 9 July 1829.

had already been expelled. Article 5 of the proposal contemplated general amnesty for the population associated with the revolt on both sides; the right of free emigration for Greeks in the Ottoman Empire; and the sale by Muslims in the Greek principality of their properties within one year.³¹ The negotiations again concerned the establishment of a Greek state, but still more the creation of a Greek state without a Muslim population.³²

While these negotiations continued, Russia defeated the Ottoman army and entered Adrianople, thus forcing the Ottoman government to request an armistice. On 14 September 1829, the parties signed a peace treaty in Adrianople, Article 10 of which determined the establishment of a Greek principality on the basis of the previous protocols and agreements.³³

On 3 February 1830, France, England, and Russia prepared another protocol for the establishment of an independent Greek kingdom. Article 5 of this document provided that Muslims who wanted to stay in the Greek state could live there under the guarantee of the Greek government. Article 6 recognized the right of free emigration for the subjects of the Greek kingdom and the Ottoman Empire.³⁴ This provision concerned mainly the Muslim population of territories that were still under Ottoman rule and were to be ceded to the Greek government within an agreed period of time.

During negotiations with the Russian ambassador, the Ottoman

³¹ “*devolet-i aliyye Rum tebasından memalik-i mahruseyi terk etmek istiyarlara emlak ve eşyalarını fîruhat etmeleri için bir sene mühlet ve serbestiyet üzere çıkub gitmelerine ruhsat ita ile ve Rum hükumeti dahi Yunan ahalisinden memalik-i mahrusede temekkün etmek istiyarlara ruhsat oire. Kaldı ki ticaret muamelatı bunlardan haric olarak [...]*” (BOA, HAT, 950/40835E, 25 Zilhicce 1244 [28 June 1829], f. 1). The French text: “*La Sublime Porte accordera à ceux de ses sujets Grecs qui désireront quitter le territoire musulman, un délai d’un an pour vendre leurs propriétés et sortir librement du pays. Le Gouvernement grec laissera la même faculté à ceux des habitants de la Grèce qui préféreront rentrer sur le territoire Ottoman*” (Noradounghian, *Recueil d’Actes Internationaux*, vol. 2, 163).

³² For more details see Öreñç, *Mora Türkleri*, 175–177.

³³ The treaties or protocols before the Treaty of Adrianople were the Treaty of London, 6 July 1827 and 10/22 March 1829 (quoted above), which are mentioned in Article 10 of the Treaty of Adrianople.

³⁴ Öreñç, *Mora Türkleri*, 187–188. In the Protocol of London, 3 February 1830, concerning the independence of Greece, Article 5 deals with amnesty on both sides, and Article 6 says: “*La Porte Ottomane accordera à ceux de ses sujets Grecs qui désireraient quitter le territoire turc, un délai d’un an pour vendre leurs propriétés et sortir librement du pays. Le Gouvernement grec laissera la même faculté aux habitants de la Grèce qui voudraient se transporter sur le territoire turc.*” (Noradounghian, *Recueil d’Actes Internationaux*, vol. 2, 179).

government opposed the free emigration abroad of the Greek Ottoman subjects as contemplated by Article 6. The Ottoman representative pointed to the 1,500 Greeks working in the Ottoman navy yard and demanded that the right to free emigration be restricted to the new Greek state. This response by the Ottoman government is interesting because it shows the difference of perspective between a nation-state and an empire. The Ottoman Empire did not want to lose its subjects, despite the revolts and separation movements of their given ethnic or religious groups.

On 27 March / 7 April 1830, the French, British, and Russian ambassadors in Istanbul sent a note to the Ottoman government regarding Greek independence.³⁵ Acting under pressure from Russia and other Great Powers, Sultan Mahmud II on 24 April 1830 declared his acceptance of the decisions of 3 February.³⁶ The provisions of the 3 February protocol were accepted in another protocol of 22 August 1830. After long negotiations between the Ottoman government and the representatives of the Great Powers, under the leadership of Stratford Canning, concerning the borders of the new Greek state, the compensation of Muslim estates, and Muslim emigration, a convention was signed in Istanbul on 21 July 1832. The evacuation of Muslims from places ceded to Greece pursuant to the agreements became difficult because of Greek attacks on Muslims. In particular, the compensation of Muslim estates became a vexed issue and a protracted process.³⁷ The Ottoman government even obtained a *fatwa* (justifying statement) from Sheikh-ul-Islam to persuade the Muslim population, for example in Ağriboz (Eubea), to relocate from the places that were to be ceded to Greece, and the government sent instructions for their evacuation.³⁸ The evacuation of the Muslims took place parallel to the evacuation of the Ottoman authorities and soldiers. In 1833 Athens and other places were handed over to Greek authorities.³⁹ During the evacuation of the majority, a small group of Muslims remained in their homes. In 1834 there were about 15,000 Muslim households, according to the Greek ambassador, Zografos. But they were systematically attacked by Greeks and forced to flee.

³⁵ BOA, HAT, 1220/47741B, 29 Zilhicce 1246 (10 June 1831), f. 1.

³⁶ Öreñç, *Mora Türkleri*, 192–198.

³⁷ BOA, HAT, 1294/50276, 29 Zilhicce 1250 [28 April 1835]. The Greek authorities hindered the sale of Muslim estates. The Ottoman government sent a note to the Greek ambassador in Istanbul concerning this problem. For a copy of the note see BOA, HAT, 1294/50276, 29 Zilhicce 1250 (28 April 1835).

³⁸ Öreñç, *Mora Türkleri*, 242–243.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 252.

The disposition of Muslim estates, houses, and *vakfs* (pious foundations) could not be resolved satisfyingly for the Muslim population.⁴⁰

Although the evacuation of Muslims from Greece was not compulsory in the final official versions of the international agreements, the establishment of the Greek kingdom ended with the expulsion of Muslims from the region. The consequence was that Greece became the first homogeneous nation-state in the Balkans. It then served as an example for other nationalist movements in the region.

3. Establishment of Serbia and fate of the Muslim population

The First Serbian Uprising began in 1804 and continued until 1812. The Treaty of Bucharest of 1812 contained an article (Article 8) giving some autonomy rights to the Serbs, but there was no separate provision regarding the emigration of the population from or into Serbian-populated areas.

On 7 October 1826, the Ottoman and Russian governments signed the Akkerman Convention, a treaty that revised the 1812 Treaty of Bucharest. In Article 5 of the convention, the Ottoman government agreed to issue a *ferman* granting privileges to the Serbs.⁴¹ A further provision of the convention dealt with Serbian demands that had already been submitted to the Ottoman government. This article included measures regarding the Muslim population in Serbia. They provided that "all goods of the Muslims were to be left under the direction of the Serbs" and "the settlement of Muslims in Serbia was to be banned except the Muslims serving to defend fortresses."⁴² This article shows clearly that among the national demands of the Serbs, as among those of the Greek national movement, was the expulsion of Muslims from Serbia.

Accordingly, the *ferman* of Sultan Mahmud II dated 17 October 1830 awarded the Serbs an autonomous administration under Miloš

⁴⁰ Ibid., 263–285.

⁴¹ Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 265–266.

⁴² "[...] hükümet-i dahiliye-i memleketleri müstakil olmak ve ifraz olunan Sırp kazaları iltihak ve izafe olunmak [...] ve aidatını cizyelerile beraber tediye ve ita etmeleri üzere ehl-i islâma müteallik ve raci olan cemî emval ve emlâkin emr-i idaresi Sırpî'lare terk ve havale olunmak." "[...] velhasil kıla muhafazasına mahsus olanlardan başka ehl-i islâmın Sırp memleketinde sâkin olmaları memnu olmak misillü bazı mevadda dair Sırp milleti hahiş ve emniyesini mukaddidema Südde-i Seniye'ye ba arzuhal arz ve inba etmiş [...]" (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 273).

Obrenović as hereditary prince (*knez*). It provided that Serbian districts, except fortresses under the rule of the Sultan, would be left to Serbian administration and Muslims who wished to leave their lands could sell their estates within a year and leave their homes. The incomes from the estates of Muslims who did not want to leave would be given to the treasury in Belgrade, which would give them to their owners. Another provision forbade the settlement of Muslims in the Serbian lands, with the exception of Muslims serving in the fortresses under the sultan's rule.⁴³ As a result, no Muslim could live in Serbia except in certain places.⁴⁴

In another *ferman*, dated 1833, that fixed the borders of the Serbian principality, the time limit (one year) for Muslims to sell their estates was extended to five years because one year was not enough. Within five years, Muslims in Serbian districts had to leave their homes. From that time on, no Muslim would be allowed to settle in the Serbian lands. But the Muslims in the vicinity of the fortress of Belgrade could live there forever.⁴⁵

Serbian Chief *knez* Miloš Obrenović tried to expel Muslims from the Serbian principality, and in this effort he was supported by the Russian ambassador in Istanbul. In July 1834, Serbian troops attacked the Muslim population in Sokol.⁴⁶ There were many other, similar, attacks on Muslims. Estates left by Muslims were taken by the leaders of the Serbian insurgents.⁴⁷

Between 1840 and 1860, there were many political developments, revolts, and changes in the government of the Serbian Principality. The Serbian authorities took measures to force Muslims still living in the vicinities of the fortresses to leave their homes. In 1862 an incident between Ottoman and Serbian soldiers caused Serbs to attack Muslims in Belgrade. For the solution of this conflict, a conference was held in Kanlıca, a district of Istanbul. Russia, France, England, Austria, Prussia, and Italy were represented. On 4 September 1862, the Kanlıca Protocol, consisting of 12 articles, was signed. Article 1 provided that, to prevent possible conflicts between Muslims and

⁴³ Ayşe Özkan, *Miloš'tan Milan'a Sırp Bağımsızlığı (1830-1878)* [Serbian Independence from Miloš to Milan (1830-1878)] (İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2011), 23-24.

⁴⁴ Alexandre Popovic, *Balkanlarda İslam* [translation of: *L'Islam Balkanique*] (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995), 191.

⁴⁵ Özkan, *Sırp Bağımsızlığı*, 30-31.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 35-41.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 61.

Serbs, the Ottoman government would transfer the estates of Muslims living around Belgrade to Serbs, and the Serbian government would pay for these estates. Pursuant to Article 8, Muslims in Serbia would sell their estates and leave Serbia as soon as possible, but within five months.⁴⁸ The European powers thus decided again for the forcible emigration of the remaining Muslim population from Serbia, as demanded by the Serbian government.

After this conference, the Ottoman government sent a functionary to regulate the sale of Muslim properties, and the Muslims from Užice and Sokol were transferred to Bosnia. Nearly 8,000 Muslims were transferred to the Ottoman territories from the fortress of Belgrade and other fortresses. Only Ottoman military forces remained in the fortress of Belgrade and other fortresses, including Šabac, Smederevo, and Kaladovo. These fortresses themselves were finally ceded to the Serbian government in 1867.⁴⁹

4. Muslims in the Danubian Principalities of Walachia and Moldavia

One of the provisions added to the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829 concerned the Muslims in the principalities of Walachia and Moldavia. This provision prohibited Muslims from settling on the banks of the Danube, and required the Muslim population there to leave their estates within 18 months.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Ibid., 192-199; Safet Bandžović, *Iseljavanje muslimanskog stanovništva iz Srbije i Crne Gore tokom XIX stoljeća* [Emigration of Muslims from Serbia and Montenegro during the Nineteenth Century] (Sarajevo: El-kalem, 1998), 18-25.

⁴⁹ Özkan, *Sırp Bağımsızlığı*, 200-204; Popovic, *Balkanlarda İslam*, 191.

⁵⁰ Eflâk ve Buğdan Hakkında Edirne Andlaşmasına Bağlı Senet: [Act regarding Walachia and Moldavia, attached to the Treaty of Adrianople] "[...] Tuna'nın sahil-i yesarisi kurbinde kâin bilcümle adalar Eflâk ve Buğdan toprağının ecza-yı mütemmimesi addoluna ve nehr-i mezkûrun vasati memalik-i mahrusaya duhul ettiği mahalden Purut nehrine munsap olduğu mahalle kadar memleketeyn-i mezkûreteyn beyninde hudut ola Devlet-i Aliye Eflâk ve Buğdan arazisini taaddi ve taarruzdan ziyade temin için Tuna'nın sahil-i yesarisinde bir gûna müstahkem mahal alıkonamak ev ehl-i islâmdan olan tebasının sahil-i mezkûrda bir gûna mesken ve imarını tecviz eylememek üzere taahhüt eder binaberin katiyen kavil ve karar olundu ki sahil-i mezkûrun cemiinde Eflâk ve Karayova memleketlerinde ve kezalik Buğdan memleketinde ehl-i islâmdan birisi hiç bir vakitte temekkün etmeyüp yalnız Dersaadet lâzimesiçün kendiliğinden hububat veyahut sair eşyanın iştirası zımında yedlerinde emr-i âli olarak gelen tüccarın memleketeyn-i mezkûreteyne dühulü caiz ola ve Tuna nehrinin sahil-i yesarında kâin bilâd-ı islâmiye ve anlara ait arazi badezin Eflâk memleketine munzam olmak üzere memleket-i mezkûreye red oluna ve sahil-i mezkûrda mukaddema mevcut olan istihkâmat hiç bir vakitte tecdit ve ipka olunmaya ve ehl-i islâm taifesi ahad-i nastan mağsup olmayarak gerek bilâd-ı mezkûrede ve gerek Tuna'nın sahil-i yesarisinde kâin sair mahallerde olan emlâk ve

Even the Treaty of Paris of 1856, which followed the Crimean War (1853–1856), included an article concerning the population issue. Article 21 granted the Orthodox population of the territory that had been occupied earlier by Russia and was now ceded to Moldavia the right to emigrate to another country within three years.⁵¹

5. San Stefano Negotiations in 1878 and the Russian Proposal for the Expulsion of all Muslims from Bulgaria

The Muslims in the Balkans became a topic of negotiations between the Ottoman Empire and Russia in 1878. In the existing Balkan historiography there is so special emphasis on these negotiations. Only a few studies mainly by Turkish historians deal with the Russian proposal for an exodus of all Muslims from the newly created Bulgarian Principality.⁵²

During the Russo-Ottoman war of 1877–1878, the largest mass migration of Muslims from the Balkans took place. The reports of the British ambassador in Istanbul, A. H. Layard, give a detailed picture of these migrations. In his report on 16 January 1878, A. H. Layard writes that “*the Mussulman population, with the horrors committed upon the Mahomedans during General Gourko’s raid of last summer fresh in their memories, are flying terrified before the Russians’ advance. In many districts, the Christians, and the Jews, who were the special victims of*

arazilerini onsekiz mah zarfında yerlilere furuht eyliyeler[...]” (Erim, Devletlerarası Hukuku, 290–291).

⁵¹ “*Le territoire cédé par la Russie sera annexé à la Principauté de Moldavie, sous la suzeraineté de la Sublime Porte. Les habitants de ce territoire jouiront des droits et privilèges assurés aux Principautés, et, pendant l’espace de trois années, il leur sera permis de transporter ailleurs leur domicile, en disposant librement de leurs propriétés” (Gabriel Noradounghian, Recueil d’Actes Internationaux de l’Empire Ottoman., vol. 3, 1856–1878 [Paris: F. Pichon, 1902], 77). For the Turkish text see Erim, Devletlerarası Hukuku, 350.*

⁵² For a detailed discussion of this issue, see: Mehmet Hacısalihoğlu, “San Stefano Negotiations between the Ottoman Empire and Russia in 1878 and the Question of Muslim Population”, *International Balkan Annual Conference Prishtina*, Ed. Özgür Oral et al. Istanbul University (in publication); Bilal Şimşir, *Rumeli’den Türk Göçleri/Turkish Emigration from the Balkans, Belgeler/Documents*, Vol. II, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989, CLXVI–CLXX; Karpat, *Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*, 175–182; Wolfgang Höpken, “Flucht vor dem Kreuz? Muslimische Emigration aus Südosteuropa nach dem Ende der osmanischen Herrschaft (19./20. Jahrhundert),” in *Zwangsmigrationen in Mittel- und Südosteuropa*, edited by Wolfgang Höpken (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1996), 1–24, here, 7; Fikret Adanır, “Bevölkerungsverschiebungen, Siedlungspolitik und Ethnisch-kulturelle Homogenisierung: Nationsbildung auf dem Balkan und Kleinasien, 1878–1923,” in *Ausweisung – Abschiebung – Vertreibung in Europa 16. – 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Sylvia Hahn, Andrea Komlosy, and Ilse Reiter (Innsbruck, Vienna, Bolzano: Studienverlag, 2006), 172–192, here, 175.

Bulgarian cruelties, are accompanying them. The towns and villages are deserted, and the property of their inhabitants abandoned".⁵³ On 21 January 1878, Layard reports of "cruel treatment and massacres of those who have remained in the districts occupied by the Russians and their auxiliaries."⁵⁴ He emphasizes in his report from 6 February 1878 the attacks "by the Cossacks and armed Bulgarians upon the inoffensive populations" and their flight "in a continuous stream forwards Constantinople and Gallipoli."⁵⁵

The treatment of the Muslim population in the occupied territories gives evidence that Russia aimed at the expulsion of all Muslims from the Eastern Balkans and establishment of a Bulgarian state without Muslims. To the question why Russia wanted to establish a Bulgarian state without Muslims gives the British ambassador a comprehensible answer: "it has been the policy of Russia all along to have only Bulgarians in Bulgaria, and to exclude from it Mussulmans, Greeks, and all others who might interfere with the design to render the new State a mere Russian dependency".⁵⁶

After the Ottoman request, an Armistice Protocol between the Ottoman and Russian governments was signed on 19/31 January 1878 in Adrianople by Grand Duke Nicholas and the Ottoman representatives Server and Namik. The protocol consisting of five articles decides in the first article the establishment of a Bulgarian principality, "determined by the majority of the Bulgarian population."⁵⁷ The other articles were on Montenegro, Serbia, Romania, Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵⁸ In a document titled

⁵³ Foreign Office, F.O. 424/66, Confidential 3508, pp. 95-96, published in Bilâl N. Şimşir, *Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri / Turkish Emigration from the Balkans*, vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968), 973-975.

⁵⁴ F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, pp. 37-38, published in *ibid.*, 283-285.

⁵⁵ FO. 424/67, Confidential 3598, pp. 279-280, published in *ibid.*, 331-332.

⁵⁶ Layard to the Earl of Derby, British Foreign Secretary, No. 278, February 26, 1878, F.O. 424/68, Confidential 3602, pp. 90-91, published in *ibid.*, 350. Emphasis by the author.

⁵⁷ "La Bulgarie dans les limites déterminées par la majorité de la population bulgare et qui, en aucun cas, ne sauraient être moindres que celles indiquées par la conférence de Constantinople, sera érigée en Principauté autonome, tributaire avec un gou[vernement] national, chrétien et une milice indigène, l'armée ottomane n'y séjournera plus" (BOA, HR. SYS. 1220/2, f. 28, 29).

⁵⁸ The second article granted independence and a territorial extension to Montenegro. The third article granted Romania and Serbia their independence. The fourth article granted Bosnia and Herzegovina an autonomous administration and guarantees of reforms for other "Ottoman Christian territories." The fifth article addressed the war reparations that the Ottoman government would have to pay to Russia. BOA, HR. SYS. 1220/2, f. 28, 29.

“Observations sur le Protocole d’Adrianople du 19/31 Janvier 1878,”⁵⁹ it was noted that the Bulgarian principality would contain the territories in which Bulgarians were the majority population. After the mass migration of Muslims during the war, now almost everywhere was a Bulgarian majority. On the other hand, the Russian delegates refused to make a survey of the population proportion before the war.⁶⁰ In this way, the Russian government secured the creation of a large Bulgarian state reaching the Aegean coasts.

On the first day of San Stefano negotiations on 14 February 1878 Russian delegates demanded the total expulsion of all Muslims from the Bulgarian principality. Before the beginning of the official negotiations in Adrianople, the Ottoman plenipotentiary Safvet Pasha visited the Russian plenipotentiaries Ignatiev and Nelidov on 13 February and according to Safvet Pasha the Russian plenipotentiaries talked in this meeting mainly about the “inability of the two races now to live together.”⁶¹ In this way they gave the sign for their official

⁵⁹ BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 65, 66.

⁶⁰ *“Ce mode de procéder, appliqué dans d’autres circonstances, pour fixer la destinée politique d’un pays, pourrait paraître rationnel, mais si l’on sache que, par suite de l’invasion, la population Musulmane qui était en majorité de ce côté-ci des Balkans a émigré en masse, on comprend immédiatement le danger et l’iniquité de cette méthode. En effet les Bulgares sont assurés d’être presque partout en majorité, puisqu’à part un nombre relativement restreint de Grecs et de Juifs, ils se trouvent être aujourd’hui les seuls occupants de tous les pays en vue.*

Le correctif naturel de ce procédé dérisoire, c’est de poser en principe que l’on prendra pour base du rapport entre la population Bulgare et la population non Bulgare l’état des choses avant l’invasion de permit impossible que les Plénipotentiaires Russes rejettent ce mode de procédé et refusent de la laisser introduire dans les instructions à donner à la commission qu’ils ont sans doute instituée pour fait une enquête à ce sujet.

Il semble également nécessaire qu’il soit appliqué dans les Préliminaires de paix que l’on opérera sur chaque sandjak ou district pris dans son ensemble et non sur chaque commune considérée isolément. Enfin aucune localité où la majorité Bulgare existerait ne pourra faire partie de la Principauté si elle s’en trouve séparée par des localités non annexées.

Dans les contrées où la population non Bulgare contrebalancerait à peu près la population Bulgare l’on devrait prendre en considération, comme élément de décision, la proportion des terres possédées par l’une et l’autre catégorie.

Il n’est pas besoin qu’il soit dit que les Musulmans établi sur le territoire de la Principauté pourront continuer à l’habiter; c’est de plein droit; mais il faudra stipuler lors des Préliminaires de paix, que les propriétaires Musulmans qui fixeraient leur résidence personnelle hors de la Principauté, pourront toujours y conserver leurs immeubles les feront valoir par d’autres mains, autrement le gouvernement de la Principauté pourrait faire une loi déclarant que tous les émigrants sont tenus de rentrer dans un délai déterminé, faute de quoi leurs immeubles seraient considérés comme vacants” (BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 65, 66).

⁶¹ *“J’ai reçu ce matin la visite du Comte Ignatiev et de M. Nélidoff. Les négociations commenceront demain. Le langage des Plénipotentiaires Russes semble faire prévoir une grande rigueur pour le maintien et le développement des bases déjà fixées, particulièrement en ce qui touche la Bulgarie et l’impossibilité de faire vivre désormais ensemble les deux races. L’idée russe paraît être l’assimilation complète de la nouvelle Principauté de Bulgarie avec la Serbie telle*

demand in the first session of formal negotiations.

On 14 February the first official meeting took place, and the first proposal of the Russian delegates was about a "radical" solution of the Muslim question in Bulgaria:

Mr. Nelidow responded that the situation had been radically changed since then, that Bulgaria was completely stripped of its Muslim inhabitants, who had emigrated *en masse* at the instigation of the Ottoman commanders themselves, with the sole exception of Osman Pasha, who, by reassuring the Muslim population, was able to keep it in Plevna. To the question how the fate of the Muslims in Bulgaria will be determined, the Russian representatives stated that it was now impossible for them to remain in Bulgaria and that, as for the question of organization of Bulgaria, the solution must be radical.⁶²

On the other hand, the Russian delegates demanded the return of all exiled Bulgarians to Bulgaria: "during this discussion, the Russian representatives declared that they had received an absolute order to require the return to Bulgaria of all exiled Bulgarians."⁶³

Safvet Pasha reported this Russian proposal to the Ottoman government. The Ottoman government knew that Great Britain would resist this Russian demand and informed the British ambassador about this issue immediately. On 16 February 1878 the British ambassador, Layard, reported this to his government:

Prime Minister informs me that at Conference with the Turkish Plenipotentiaries at Adrianople yesterday the Russian Plenipotentiary

qu'elle a existé jusqu' à présent" (BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 28, Safvet Pasha to Premier Ministre, No. 2, 13 February 1878, Adrianople).

⁶² *"Monsieur Nelidow a répondu que la situation s'était depuis lors profondément modifiée, que la Bulgarie s'était complètement dépeuplée de ses habitants Musulmans qui avaient émigré en masse à l'instigation même des Commandants Ottomans à l'exception seulement d'Osman Pacha qui en rassurant la population Musulmane, avait pu la maintenir à Pleona. Ayant alors demandé comment serait réglé le sort des Musulmans en Bulgarie, les Plénipotentiaires Russes ont déclaré que leur séjour en Bulgarie était désormais impossible et que la solution devait être radicale quant à la question de l'organisation de la Bulgarie"* (Report of Safvet Pasha to Ahmed Vefik Pasha, President of the Council of the Ministers, on 14 February 1878, Adrianople, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 28, p. 4; translated and underlined by the author).

⁶³ *"Dans le cours de cette discussion les Plénipotentiaires Russes ont déclaré qu'ils avaient reçu l'ordre absolu de demander le retour en Bulgarie de tous les exilés bulgares"* (Report of Safvet Pasha to Ahmed Vefik Pasha, President of the Council of the Ministers, on 14 February 1878, Adrianople, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 28, pp. 6-7).

insisted that the Mussulmans who had left territories comprised in new Bulgarian State should not return and that endeavors should be made to remove the whole Mahommedan population.⁶⁴

The British Foreign Ministry informed the Austro-Hungarian government. The foreign minister Count Andrassy also rejected this idea as a “monstrous” proposal:

As directed by your Lordship, I have asked Count Andrassy what he thought of the demand of Russia for the expulsion of the Mahommedan population from Bulgaria. I found his Excellency boiling over with indignation at the proposal, for which it would be necessary to go back to the time of the barbarians to find a parallel. When Europe had called upon Turkey for toleration, it was monstrous to see such a proposal brought forward.⁶⁵

6. Safvet Pasha’s proposal for a population exchange

In response to the Russian proposal to expel all Muslims from Bulgaria, the Ottoman representative Safvet Pasha prepared a proposal for population exchange and represented it to the Russian delegates on 15 February 1878. According to this proposal all Muslims from the northern part of the Balkan Mountains would be exchanged with Bulgarians in the southern part of the Balkan Mountains and the Muslim and Bulgarian population would be divided along the Balkan Mountains. Both sides would be compensated “by mutual substitution of their estates on each side of the Balkans.”⁶⁶ As Safvet Pasha reported, “This plan was refused by the Russian delegates as it

⁶⁴ F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 334, no. 699, published in *ibid.*, 346.

⁶⁵ After receiving this information, the British Foreign Ministry contacted the British ambassador in Vienna on 19 February to ask Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister Count Andrassy his opinion regarding the expulsion of Muslims from Bulgaria. In a telegram on 20 February 1878, the British ambassador in Vienna, H. Elliot, reported the reaction of Count Andrassy. F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 383, No. 833, published in *ibid.*, 347.

⁶⁶ “*Tout en réservant la question de la constatation des points du territoire où existe la majorité bulgare, nous avons longuement discutés les limites de la Principauté, après avoir proposé dans intérêt de la tranquillité des populations de limiter la Principauté de Bulgarie à la partie située au-delà des Balkans et avoir constaté que dans le pays situé en deçà des Balkans la propriété Musulmane représentait les deux tiers de terre des bulgares, j’ai émis l’idée de ramener les habitants Musulmans au-delà des Balkans de ce côté-ci et de faire passer les bulgares établis dans cette dernière partie du pays de l’autre côté des montagnes en indemnisant les uns et les autres par la substitution réciproque des terres possédées de chaque côté des Balkans*” (BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 44, 45, 46, 47, p. 6-8, Report from Safvet Pasha to Ahmed Vefik Pasha, Président du Conseil des Ministres, No. 13, 15 February 1878). For the Turkish text see B. Şimşir, *Rumeli’den*, CLXIX-CLXX.

ran counter to the fundamental principles already accepted by the Ottoman government [in the armistice protocol]."⁶⁷

This proposal of population exchange occurred during a very critical situation for the Ottoman Empire. The San Stefano negotiations were a dictate and the acceptance of the Russian proposal would end not only the existence of the Ottoman Empire but also the existence of the Muslims in the Balkans. The Ottoman proposal aimed at securing at least one part of the Balkan territories in the Ottoman hands.

After the negative reactions of the British and Austrian governments, the Russian government did not insist on this point and withdrew its proposal to expel the Muslim population. The Russian semiofficial newspapers denied even the news about this Russian proposal as "utterly untrue".⁶⁸ The British ambassador of Istanbul, Layard, commented this Russian denial in his report from 26 February 1878. Layard regards this as "one of many audacious statements that the Russian Government is in the habit of making when it wishes to deceive Europe or to retreat from a false position." He confirms that "the demand for the removal of the Mahommedans from the new Principality was made at the first Conference between Safvet Pasha and Russian Plenipotentiaries. Of this fact, there is documentary evidence. The demand was resisted by Safvet Pasha, and does not appear among the last conditions of peace to which the assent of the Porte was required." According to the report of Layard "the demand of Russia has been modified to the extent that the Mussulmans who have remained in the provinces occupied by the Russians are to be

⁶⁷ "Ce projet a été repoussé par les Plénipotentiaires Russes comme étant contraire aux bases déjà acceptées par le gouvernement Ottoman" (Report of Safvet Pasha, No. 13, p. 8).

⁶⁸ The Agence Russe published a semiofficial article: "[...] denying, as utterly untrue, the telegraphic intelligence reported by the foreign press, that the Russian Government had demanded the expulsion of all Mussulmans from Bulgaria. It states that Russia, where the greatest tolerance exists, and where thousands of Mussulmans live peaceably under her rule, has instituted the principle of perfect equality between the Mussulman and Christian population of Bulgaria, where now, perfect security, happy in their deliverance from Turkish functionaries, from Turkish troops, from Bashi-Bozouks, and Circassians, the curse equally fatal to Mussulmans and Christians, from which Russia wishes to deliver Bulgaria for ever." Ibid, 348. The British ambassador of St Petersburg expresses his suspicion saying "Experience has led me to distrust Russian humanitarian principles. With regard, therefore, to this article I can only say, 'Credat Judaeus appelles non ego' ['Let Appella the Jew believe, not I']." Augustus Loftus, British ambassador in St. Petersburg to the Earl of Derby, British Foreign Secretary, February 22, 1878, F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 451, no. 956, p. 482, no. 1036, published in *ibid.*, 348.

allowed to reside in certain places, but those who fled in consequence of the outrages of the Bulgarians and Cossacks are not to be allowed to return." Layard emphasized that "the dreadful massacres of the Mahommedans that have taken place and are still taking place, and the general exodus of the Turkish population, have greatly reduced their numbers. No one acquainted with Bulgarian fanaticism, and with what occurred in Servia, will entertain a doubt that the few Mussulmans who may be permitted to reside for the present in Bulgaria will be speedily driven out of the Principality." Finally, Layard expresses his opinion on the Russian Balkan policy and says that Russia wanted to have "only Bulgarians in Bulgaria, and to exclude from it Mussulmans, Greeks, and all others who might interfere with the design to render the new State a mere Russian dependency".⁶⁹

Russia reached the Aegean Sea via the new Bulgarian principality, which had received the vital port of Kavala. However, Russia could not achieve the creation of an ethnically cleansed Bulgarian nation-state during the negotiations of San Stefano. Great Britain and Austria-Hungary resisted this Russian plan, and the balance of powers in Europe hindered Russia from implementing an expulsion of Muslims from the Balkans. Particularly Great Britain was concerned and saw in the territorial extension of Bulgaria a danger to British interests in the Mediterranean. When Russian troops advanced to the vicinity of the Ottoman capital, Great Britain sent a naval force to the Sea of Marmara on 16 February; the Austro-Hungarian government also opposed a Russian advance toward the Ottoman capital.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Layard to the Earl of Derby, British Foreign Secretary, No. 278, February 26, 1878, F.O. 424/68, Confidential 3602, pp. 90-91, published in *ibid.*, p. 350. Emphasis by the author.

⁷⁰ Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Türkiye ve Rusya* [Turkey and Russia] (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990), 85. As a pretext for its action, the British government cited the need to save the Christians and foreigners in Istanbul from a possible attack by the Muslim refugees. British Foreign Secretary Lord Derby declared to the Ottoman ambassador in London that the British Navy came as an ally of the Ottoman Empire. But he also talked about the Russian atrocities against the Muslim population and expressed his fear that similar atrocities could be carried out among the Muslim refugees and Christians and foreigners in Istanbul. "*Partout où les russes entrent, les bulgares procèdent contre les musulmans par le massacre, le feu et le pillage. En présence de ces actes de vandalisme, confirmés par nos dernières informations, il est naturel que nous redoutions précisément de voir Constantinople devenir le théâtre de scènes analogues. Quant aux projets hostiles que les Musulmans nourrissent à l'endroit de leurs concitoyens chrétiens et des étrangers, le Gouvernement Impérial irait, étant donné le moindre indice, de telles dispositions, jusqu'à demander le concours d'une force étrangère*" (telegram of Server Pacha to Musurus Pacha, London, 14 February 1878, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 39).

After seeing the Ottoman refusal and the British resistance, the Russian delegates declared that the Russian government did not want to separate Bulgaria from the Ottoman Empire although the Russian public wished the establishment of an independent Bulgarian principality.⁷¹

The San Stefano negotiations continued, addressing the fate of the *vakfs* of Muslims and the properties and estates of Muslims in Bulgaria and Serbia. Safvet Pasha demanded that Muslims who took up residence outside Bulgaria should keep their properties.⁷² Russia insisted also on the ceding of territories in the Balkans and in Eastern Anatolia as war reparations.⁷³ On 14/26 February 1878, an agreement regarding the population issue was signed. According to this agreement, the Sublime Porte would not punish Ottoman subjects who were in contact with the Russian army during the war, and if some individuals wanted to leave with their families behind the Russian army, the Ottoman authorities would not hinder them.⁷⁴

⁷¹ "Ils ont ajouté que si l'on avait dû céder au sentiment public qui s'est manifesté en Russie, la Bulgarie aurait dû être érigée en Principauté indépendante, mais que le Gouvernement Russe n'avait pas voulu la détacher de l'Empire Ottoman" (Report of Safvet Pasha, No. 13, p. 6).

⁷² "Ayant ensuite discuté les questions relatives au sort réservé aux propriétés possédées par les Musulmans en Bulgarie et dans le territoire à annexer à la Serbie, j'ai demandé que l'on tint compte des droits des Vakoufs, ce qui a été consenti par les Plénipotentiaires Russes en ce sens que les Vakoufs donneraient lieu à une indemnité. J'ai demandé en outre que les propriétaires Musulmans qui fixeraient leur résidence hors de la Principauté fussent autorisés à y conserver leurs biens qu'ils feraient valoir par d'autres mains. Cette disposition n'a point paru soulever des difficultés sérieuses" (BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 44, 45, 46, 47, f. 47, Report on 15 February 1878 by Safvet Pasha, p. 9).

⁷³ The sultan sent a telegram to the Russian tsar, stating that acceptance of these demands was impossible, and also informed Safvet Pasha in Adrianople. The Russian delegate Ignatiev then declared that if the negotiations did not end in eight days, he would be obliged to issue an ultimatum. BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 58, Telegram of Safvet Pasha to Prime Minister, 17 February 1878.

⁷⁴ BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 51. The entire article signed by the Ottoman delegates (Safvet and Sadullah) and the Russian delegates (Ignatiev and Nelidov) on 14/26 February 1878 was as follows (BOA, HR.SYS.1220/3, f. 31):

"Tant que les troupes Impériales Russes séjourneront dans les localités qui, conformément au présent acte, seront restituées à la Sublime Porte, l'administration et l'ordre des choses resteront dans le même état que depuis l'occupation. La Sublime Porte ne devra y prendre aucune part durant tout ce temps et jusqu'à l'entière sortie de toutes les troupes.

Les troupes Ottomanes ne devront entrer dans les localités qui seront restituées à la Sublime Porte, et cette dernière ne pourra commencer à y exercer son autorité, que lorsque pour chaque place et province qui aura été évacuée par les troupes russes, le Commandant de ces troupes en aura donné connaissance à l'officier désigné à cet effet de la part de la Sublime Porte.

La Sublime Porte rend l'engagement de ne sévir d'aucune manière, ni laisser sévir contre les sujets Ottomans qui auraient été compromis par leurs relations avec l'armée Russe pendant la guerre. Dans le cas où quelques personnes voudraient se retirer avec leurs familles à la suite des troupes Russes, les autorités Ottomanes ne s'opposent pas à leur départ.

The borders of the principality of Bulgaria were set on 17 February / 1 March 1878,⁷⁵ and on 18 February / 2 March 1878, the document was signed.⁷⁶ On the same day an agreement concerning the population in the regions ceded to Russia, mainly the territories in northeastern Anatolia, Batum, Ardahan, and Kars, was signed by Ignatiev, Nelidov, Safvet, and Sadullah. According to this agreement, the population in these territories could emigrate within three years of the ratification of the treaty. After three years those who remained would be regarded as Russian subjects.⁷⁷

The Preliminary Treaty was signed on 3 March 1878 in San Stefano (Yeşilköy). According to this treaty, Muslims in the territories ceded to Serbia and those in the Bulgarian principality could sell their properties and emigrate within three years.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the

Immédiatement après la ratification des préliminaires de paix, les prisonniers de guerre seront rendus réciproquement par les soins des Commissaires spéciaux nommés de part et d'autre et qui se rendront à cet effet à Odessa et à Sébastopol.

Le Gouvernement Ottoman payera tous les frais de l'entretien des prisonniers qui lui seront restitués, en dix-huit termes égaux dans l'espace de six années, d'après les comptes qui seront établis par les Commissaires susmentionnés.

L'échange des prisonniers entre le Gouvernement Ottoman et ceux de la Roumanie, de la Serbie et du Monténégro aura lieu sur les mêmes bases, en déduisant toutefois dans le décompte à établir, le nombre de prisonniers restitués par le gouvernement Ottoman du nombre de prisonniers qui lui seront restitués. [Signed by] Safvet, Sadoullah, Ch. N. Ignatiev, Nélidov. San Stéfano, le 14/26 Février 1878."

⁷⁵BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f.17.

⁷⁶BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f. 39.

⁷⁷"Les habitants des localités cédées à la Russie, et qui voudraient fixer leur résidence hors de ces territoires, seront libres de se retirer, en vendant leurs propriétés immobilières. Un délai de trois ans leur est accordé à cet effet, à partir de la ratification de présent acte. Passé ce délai, les habitants qui n'auront pas quitté le pays et vendu leurs immeubles, resteront sujets russes.

Les biens immeubles appartenant à l'Etat ou aux fondations pieuses, sises en dehors des localités précitées, devront être vendus dans le même délai de trois années, suivant le mode qui sera réglé par une Commission spéciale Russo-Turque. La même Commission sera chargée de déterminer le mode de retrait par le Gouvernement Ottoman, du matériel de guerre, des munitions, des approvisionnements et autres objets appartenant à l'Etat, et qui existeraient dans les places, villes et localités cédées à la Russie et non occupées actuellement par les troupes russes" (BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f. 41).

⁷⁸Article 4: "Les musulmans qui possèdent des propriétés dans les territoires annexés à la Serbie, et qui voudraient fixer leur résidence hors de la principauté, pourront y conserver leurs immeubles en les faisant affermer ou administrer par d'autres. [...]" The same regulation was made in Article 11 regarding the Muslims who emigrated from Bulgaria and had property in that principality; Schopoff, *Les Réformes*, pp. 357 and 361. Article 21 of the same treaty says: "Les habitants des localités cédées à la Russie, qui voudraient fixer leur résidence hors de ces territoires, seront libres de se retirer, en vendant leurs propriétés immobilières. Un délai de trois ans leur est accordé à cet effet à partir de la ratification du présent acte. Passé ce délai, les habitants qui n'auront pas quitté le pays et vendu leurs immeubles resteront sujets russes. [...]" (Schopoff, *Les Réformes*, 265). "(Yirmibirinci madde) Rusya'ya terk olunan mahaller ahalsi başka mahalle gidüb ikamet itmek isterler ise emlaklerini

Treaty of San Stefano (Annex 13) proposed reforms were for Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia (Kosovo), and Thrace which remained in the Ottoman hands.⁷⁹

7. Revision of the “Preliminary” Treaty of San Stefano and the issue of refugees

Here I will summarize the debate on the population issue during the diplomatic negotiations and meetings for the organization of a congress to revise the Treaty of San Stefano.

After the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, the European powers began to discuss its revision. The fate of the Muslims in Bulgaria was also debated. During a meeting with Count Andrassy on 8 April 1878 on Bulgaria, Essad Bey, the Ottoman ambassador in Vienna, declared that the rights of Muslims must be guaranteed.⁸⁰ According to another report from Vienna, on 9 April 1878, the Austro-Hungarian government again addressed the Russian government concerning the establishment of a Bulgarian state and demanded the protection of the “Greek population” in the region.⁸¹

During the discussions concerning the revision of the treaty, now called the Preliminary Treaty of San Stefano, various Ottoman representatives contacted the ministers of different European countries. Ottoman politicians and diplomats, including Safvet Pasha, the foreign minister, and certain ambassadors – Karatheodori Pasha in Brussels, Halil Bey in Budapest, Musurus Pasha in London, Turhan Bey in Rome, Esad Bey in Vienna, Sadullah Bey in Berlin – tried to win the support of various European states for the Ottoman cause. During this effort, the Ottoman foreign minister prepared a draft describing the composition of the population in the Bulgarian principality. The

satub çekilmekte serbest ve muhtar olacaklardır ve bu babda kendilerine işbu mukavelenamenin tasdiki tarihinden itibaren üç sene mühlet verilmiştir mühlet-i mezkûrenin inkizasında emlâklerini satub memleketden çıkmamış olanlar Rusya tebeiyetinde kalacaklardır [...]” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 397). The same article deals further with property issues and pious foundations.

⁷⁹ “*Dans les provinces de l’Epire, de la Thessalie et le restant de la Macédoine de la vieille Serbie (vilayets de Prizren et Kossowo) et de la Thrace, les règlements élaborés pour la Bosnie et Herzégovine par la Conférence de Constantinople, seront mis en vigueur après avoir été adaptés aux besoins locaux*” (BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 8).

⁸⁰ Essad Bey to Safvet Pacha, No. 9275/237, 8 April 1878, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 187, p. 3: “*Il a ajouté qu’il se proposait d’exiger des garanties pour les Musulmans qui continueraient à résider en Bulgarie tant sous le rapport de leur indépendance politique et religieuse qu’à l’égard de leurs droits de propriété.*”

⁸¹ Annex to 9283/238, Vienna, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 199.

Ottoman ambassador in London, Musurus Pasha, met on 20 April 1878 with the British foreign secretary, the Marquess of Salisbury. Lord Salisbury informed him that the British government supported the limitation of the Bulgarian principality to the territory between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains.⁸²

On 9 June 1878, Safvet Pasha sent a telegram to the Ottoman ambassadors in Paris, Rome, London, Vienna, Berlin, and St. Petersburg, notifying them that the newspapers in Europe had published a memorandum purporting to be from the Sublime Porte and describing the pressure exerted by the Russian delegates during the negotiations of San Stefano.⁸³ The European public criticized the Treaty of San Stefano as a document dictated by Russia.⁸⁴

In July 1878, the European Commission of the Rhodope undertook an investigation in Thrace and interviewed refugees in different places. According to a report by the Ottoman members of the commission, Yusuf Rıza and Nashid Rashid, on 17 July 1294 (1878), every Muslim refugee reported sufferings among family members and countless killings committed by the Russians, particularly the Cossacks, and the refugees declared that they would not return to their homes until the Russian troops withdrew and the Ottoman administration returned.⁸⁵ However, the Russian member of the

⁸² "Il est spécialement de l'avis du gouvernement Impérial de limiter la Principauté de Bulgarie à la partie comprise entre le Danube et les Balkans" (confidential telegram from Musurus Pasha to Safvet Pasha, No. 7236/197, 20 April 1878, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 203, p. 2).

⁸³ This memorandum was apocryphal: "Nous venons d'apprendre que les journaux de l'Europe ont publié un mémorandum comme émanant de la S. Porte sur la pression exercée par les Plénipotentiaires Russes lors des négociations du Traité de San Stefano. Le mémorandum est apocryphe. La S. Porte n'a jamais adressé à personne une telle pièce: vous pouvez l'affirmer de la façon la plus catégorique" (BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 233 and 234, Telegram of Safvet Pasha to the Ottoman Representatives, No. 51/409/55, 9 June 1878).

⁸⁴ Correspondence Politique, Edition Française, XVIème année, Vienne, 5 Juin 1878, No. 129, describes the negotiations between 2/14 February and 19 February/3 March in Adrianople and San Stefano, pointing out the pressure applied by Russian delegates. BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 237.

⁸⁵ "Muhacirin-i merkumenin suret-i hal ve kallerinden anlaşıldığına göre içlerinde az çok zulüm ve taaddi görmemiş eşyalarını heman kâffeten gayb etmişler ise de familyası azasından dahi zayıfatı olmayarak toplica gelebilmiş hiç bir şahs yokdur. Bunlar meyanında kırk elli biçarenin bir ipele bağlı olduğu halde katil edildiğini gören adamlar ve beş on gurus almak için gözü önünde çocuklarının kanına girilmiş ve razz-ı irz ve namusunu Kazakların elinden kurtarmak kasdıyla firar ederken cigerparesini yol üzerine tesadüf eden caylara atmağa mecbur olmuş baba ve analar dahi müşahade olunmuşdur ki herbirinin yürekler dayanmayan süz ü güdâzı komisyon azasınca başka başka tesirâtı mucib olmakda idi. Kasabada ırzına tasallut ve bekareti izale edilmiş bir hayli kadın bulunduğî haber alınarak anlarda komisyon celb ile görüldüğü gibi takrirleri dahi mazbataya derc etdirildi. [...] bu biçarelerin hedef oldukları tîr-i taaddiyat ekseriyet üzere Rus

commission, seeing the adverse effects of these statements by the refugees, opposed questioning the refugees about their reasons for emigration and difficulties during emigration and tried to terminate the work of the commission. In this effort, he was supported by the German member of the commission. The French, and mainly the British, members of the commission, however, declared energetically that the commission would continue to function. "Since the Russian commissioner was ashamed to hear the statements of the refugees," he rarely participated in the work of the commission.⁸⁶ This kind of investigation helped to revise the territorial settlements of the Treaty of San Stefano.

The Treaty of Berlin of 1878, which revised the Treaty of San Stefano, also has provisions concerning the right of emigration of Muslims and their property in the Bulgarian principality and Serbia.⁸⁷

8. 1879 Treaty of Istanbul between the Ottoman Empire and Russia

Russia viewed the Treaty of Berlin as a defeat and insisted on concluding a separate treaty with the Ottoman Empire. Lord Salisbury declared to the Ottoman ambassador in London that Russia did not want to regulate the issue of withdrawal from the occupied Ottoman territories in the Treaty of Berlin. According to him, Russia wanted a separate treaty with the Ottoman Empire and connected this issue with the preparation of a new treaty.⁸⁸

askeri semtinden gelmiş ve irad olunan es'ileye her takımın cevapları başka başka ise de fakat vatanlarına gitmek arzusunda bulunup bulunmadıkları hakkındaki suale kadın erkek heman cümlesi tarafından 'vatanımız gözümüzde tütüyor. Şimdi gitmege hazırız. Ancak yüzlerinden ırz ve can ve malca bu derecelerde zarar gördüğümüz Rus askeri oradan çıkub hükümet-i Osmaniye gitmeyince kendimizi denize atar avdet etmeyiz' tarzında cevap verilmiştir" (Rapport, No. 231, BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/2, f. 27, p. 1).

⁸⁶ BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/2, f. 27, pp. 1-2.

⁸⁷ Article 2 (establishment of Bulgarian principality), Point 12, states with respect to Muslims who do not want to live in Bulgaria and their property: "*Les propriétés musulmanes ou autres qui fixeraient leur résidence personnelle hors de la principauté pourront y conserver leurs immeubles en les affermant ou en les faisant administrer par des tiers*" (Schopoff, *Les Réformes*, 376). Further, the point deals with a commission to address the issue of property and pious foundations in Bulgaria. For the Turkish text see Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 409. The same provision applies to the Muslims from Serbia in Point 39; see Schopoff, 386. The Muslims who wanted to leave their lands that were ceded to Serbia were allowed to sell the lands within three years; Özkan, *Sırp Bağımsızlığı*, 324-325.

⁸⁸ BOA, Y. PRK. HR. 3/77, f. 2, 19 Teşrin-i sani [November] 1878 [1 December 1878], telegram from the Ottoman embassy in London.

The Treaty of Istanbul of 8 February 1879 between the Ottoman Empire and Russia was based on previously signed treaties, notably the Preliminary Treaty of San Stefano (*Ayastefanos mukaddemat-ı sulhiyesi*) and the Treaty of Berlin.⁸⁹ Seven states signed the Treaty of Berlin. The Treaty of Istanbul would replace the Treaty of San Stefano, which was signed by the two states. According to the official Ottoman documents, the demand for a separate treaty came from the Russian government, because there were points, which were not included in the Treaty of Berlin, and the Ottoman-Russian issues that were to be addressed separately. According to the Ottoman representatives, the Russian proposal sought to revitalize or confirm the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano. The Ottoman government did not want to negotiate a new treaty and postponed the undertaking, but Russia put pressure on the Ottoman government by prolonging the Russian military occupation of the province of Edirne. Finally, the British government recommended that the Ottoman government negotiate a separate peace treaty with Russia. The Ottoman delegates negotiated and, according to their report to the Ottoman government, they obtained "big" changes in the Russian treaty draft.⁹⁰

In this treaty too, population transfer and the right of emigration were central issues. In the Russian draft, there was an article concerning the Muslims in the territories ceded to Russia, mainly in Eastern Anatolia, Kars, Ardahan, and Batum.⁹¹ Article 7 provided that Muslims in the territories ceded to Russia (*Rusya'ya terk olunan mahaller ahalisi*) were to be allowed to sell their properties and emigrate (*çekilmekte muhtardır*) within three years. If they remained in their lands, they would become Russian subjects.⁹² In the Russian draft, it was noted that this provision was taken from the Treaty of

⁸⁹ BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 1. Mukavelename, 29 Zilhicce 1295. In the first article of the draft, the treaties of 30 March 1856, Paris; 13 March 1871, London; 19 February 1878, San Stefano (*Ayastefanos Treaty Mukaddemat-ı sulhiyesi*; the word "treaty" is deleted); and 13 July 1878, Berlin were mentioned as the basis of the new treaty.

⁹⁰ BOA, Y.A.RES. 2/13, f. 1, 16 Safer 1296 [9 February 1879]. Meclis-i Mahsus-ı Vükela mazbatası suretidir.

⁹¹ However, in the eventual article, the names of these territories and the identification of the population group as Muslims were omitted.

⁹² Rusya ile İstanbul Andlaşması, "(Yedinci madde) Rusya'ya terkolunan mahaller ahalisi bu ilkâlar haricinde ikamet etmek istedikleri halde emlaklerini satıp çekilmekte muhtardır bunun için kendilerine muahede-i haziranın tasdiki tarihinden itibaren üç sene mühlet verilmiştir mühlet-i mezkûrenin inkızasında emlaklerini satıp memleketten çıkmamış bulunanlar Rusya tabiiyetinde kalacaklardır" (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 426). For the draft of this article see BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 12.

San Stefano, Article 21.⁹³

Another article of the treaty concerns the Orthodox Ottoman subjects and their emigration to Russia. In the Russian draft (*layiha*), Article 7 declared a general amnesty for Ottoman subjects (both Russian and Ottoman subjects, in the final version) who had had a relationship with the Russian army (both armies, in the final version) and provided that the Ottoman authorities would engage in no opposition if some of them (in the final version, the word “some” was deleted) departed behind the retreating Russian army.⁹⁴ This article too was taken from the Treaty of San Stefano, Article 27. After some changes, including renumbering the article as Article 8, it was accepted.⁹⁵ In this way, Russia tried to secure the emigration to Russia of the Ottoman Orthodox subjects. Russia was thus continuing its settlement policy and its policy toward the Ottoman Orthodox subjects. Concerning the population issue, the Treaty of Istanbul was a confirmation of the Treaty of San Stefano. The comments of the Ottoman authorities on the Russian draft indicate that there were no disagreements or disputes regarding the content of these two articles.

9. Greek-Muslim conflicts over Crete in 1897

In the 1890s, there were revolts and conflicts involving the Greek insurgents on Crete. The insurgents attacked the Muslim population and forced many people to leave their lands and migrate to the city centers. During these conflicts, England, Russia, and France

⁹³ BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 20, p. 5.

⁹⁴ “Rusya askerinin arkası sıra familyaları ile beraber çekilmek isteyecek bazı kesanın azimetine memurin-i Osmaniye tarafından muhalefet olunmayacaktır (Ayastefanos muahedesinin yigirmiyedinci bendi)” (BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 19, p. 4, 1878.2.8). Changes in the article as Article 8, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 13.

⁹⁵ “Sekizinci madde: Devlet-i aliyye ile Rusya devleti esna-yı muharebede tarafeyn ordularıyla icra ettikleri münasebatdan dolayı müttehim bulunan Rusya veya Osmanlı tebası hakkında hiç bir suretle mücazat etmemekliği ve etdirilmekliği müteakibilen taahhüd ederler. Rusya askerinin arkası sıra familyalarıyla beraber çekilmek isteyecek kesanın azimetine memurin-i Osmaniye tarafından muhalefet olunmayacaktır” (BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 13). For the final form of the treaty in French see BOA, Y.A.RES. 2/13, f. 5, 27 January / 8 February 1879. Articles VII and VIII: “Article VII. Les habitants des localités cédées à la Russie qui voudraient fixer leurs résidences hors de ces territoires seront libres de se retirer en vendant leurs propriétés immobilières. Un délai de trois ans leur sera accordé à ces effets à partir de la ratification du présent acte. Passé ce délai, les habitants qui n’auraient pas quitté le pays et vendus leurs immeubles resteront sujets russes. Article VIII. Les deux parties prennent mutuellement l’engagement de ne sévir ni de laisser sévir d’aucune manière contre les sujets russes ou ottomans qui auraient été compromis par leurs relations avec les armées des deux Empires pendant la guerre. Dans le cas ou quelques personnes voudraient se retirer avec leurs familles à la suite des troupes russes, les autorités ottomanes ne s’opposent pas à leur départ.”

intervened. They negotiated with the Ottoman government and made proposals regarding the withdrawal of the Ottoman military forces from Crete and the appointment of Prince George, the son of the Greek king, as governor of the island. According to the study by Pınar Şenişik, during these negotiations, the representatives of the European powers favored a forced expulsion of Muslims from the island and argued that this measure would halt interethnic conflicts or at least the clash between the Greeks and the Muslims.

Interestingly, it was the British representatives in particular who insisted on the expulsion of Muslims from the island.⁹⁶

After the Ottoman-Greek war of 1897, a peace treaty was signed on 22 November / 4 December 1897. Article 7 of the treaty provided that the Muslims in Thessaly were free to emigrate to the Ottoman Empire within three years. The same right was also given to Greeks who were living in the territories ceded to the Ottoman Empire after the war. It is useful to study the negotiations to see the respective attitudes of the two countries regarding the issue of emigration:

The changes to Article 7, as drafted, were made during the negotiations.⁹⁷ The Ottoman representatives reported on 26 October 1897 (29 Cemaziyelevvel 1315/14 Teşrin-ievvel 1313) to the grand vizier that in the fourth and fifth sessions with the Greek representatives, the latter demanded changes in Article 7.⁹⁸ They demanded a reciprocal right (*mütekabiliyet*) for the population in the region ceded to the Ottoman Empire to migrate to Greece. Another demand concerned the right of the population in the territory ceded to Greece to emigrate. Here the Greek representatives claimed that the article, as drafted, obliged non-Muslims who would come to the

⁹⁶ Pınar Şenişik, *The Transformation of Ottoman Crete. Revolts, Politics and Identity in late Nineteenth Century* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 169, 195.

⁹⁷ BOA, BEO, 1056/79137, f. 14 and the draft of the treaty f. 16.

⁹⁸ At the beginning of the negotiations, the draft of Article 7 of the peace treaty was as follows: "*Bu kere muharebe sebebiyle asakir-i şahane tarafından işgal olunub Yunanistan'a iade kılınan mahallerin seknesi ile ahali-i asliyesi memalik-i şahaneye muhaceretde ve orada ikametgâhlarını tayinde serbest olacıkları gibi muahede-i hazıra tasdiknamelerinin mübadelesi tarihinden itibaren beş sene müddet zarfında evvelce memurin-i aideye ita olunacak bir beyanname mucebince tabiiyyet-i osmaniyeyi kabul ve ihtiyar etmek hakkını haiz olacaklar ve bununla beraber 24 Mayıs 1881 tarihli mukavelename mucebince Yunanistan'da kain emlaklarından tamamıyla ve bila mani' istifade ve bunları idarede devam eyeleyeceklerdir. Huudun yeniden tashihî münasebetyile devlet-i aliyeye iade kılınan mahallerin seknesinden ve ahali-i asliyesinden bulunan teb'a-i Yunaniyeye aynı fevaid bahşolunmuşdur. Muahede-i hazıranın tasdikından itibaren Tesalya'da mütemekkin ahali-i Müslime beş sene için hudmet-i askeriyeden muaf olacaktır"* (BOA, BEO, 1056/79137, f. 17).

Ottoman Empire for trade reasons to accept Ottoman citizenship, a requirement they regarded as unacceptable. They stated that the article should address only the Muslims of Thessaly.⁹⁹ In the following sessions, the Greek representatives received a proposal for revision of this article. According to the new proposal, the territory of Thessaly was given to Greece in 1881, and although the region was occupied by the Ottoman army during the war of 1897, it did not become an Ottoman territory but remained a Greek one. According to Article 4 of the preliminary treaty, only the population of the ceded territories had the right to emigrate freely, so that this provision could not be applied to the population of Thessaly. However, the Ottoman representatives insisted upon giving the right to free emigration to the population in the areas that had been occupied by the Ottoman army and returned to Greece after the war. The Greek representatives decided to consult the Greek government in Athens.¹⁰⁰ In the next session, the Greek representatives requested some changes and the Ottoman representatives accepted them: 1) One word was changed in the first point of Article 7, based on Article 8 of the agreement of 24 May 1881, which determined the right to free emigration of the

⁹⁹ “[...] işbu muhaceretleri veya ikametleri sebebiyle memalik-i şahanede tabiiyet-i osmaniyeyi ihraz edecekler hakkındaki son fıkranın Tesalya’dan gelecek ahalinin tabiiyet-i devlet-i aliyeyi kabule mecbur olmaları manasını mutazammın olub işbu fikra hükmünün yalnız İslamlara hasrına birşey dinemeyub hükümet-i seniyyenin bu suret-i tahrirden maksadı dahi bundan ibaret olmak melfuz olduğuna ve ikametkah tayiniyle laeclülticare[?] gelecek olan ahali-i gayri müslimenin tabiiyet-i saltanat-ı seniyyeyi kabule fikra-i mezkure hükmünce mecbur olması lazım gelüb bu ise biloücuh muvafık maslahat ve şayan-ı kabul olmayacağına mebni işbu fıkranın dahi şu mülahazata tevofiken suret-i münasibde tebdili taleb olunması üzerine”, BOA, BEO 1056/79137, f. 14, 14 Teşrin-i evvel 1313/29 Cemaziyellevvel 1315 [26 October 1897].

¹⁰⁰ In the seventh and eighth sessions the Greek representatives represented the order regarding the change in the Article 7, which they recieved from Athens: “29 Cemizyelevvel 1315 [26 October 1897] tezkire-i cakeranemizle arz olunan yedinci maddesine bu kere Atinadan aldıkları talimata istinaden zikr olunan murahhaslar tarafından mukaddemat-ı sulhiyenin dördüncü maddesinin buna dair olan fıkrasında ‘yalnız iade idilan arazide mütemekkin ahalinin serbesti-i muhacereti’ tabiri kullanılmış ve Tesalya kıtası her ne kadar asakir-i şahane tarafından işgal edilmiş ise de hükümet-i seniyyenin taht-ı tasarruf-ı hakikiyesine girmeyub oralaradaki arazi ise hükümet-i Yunaniyeye aid olduğu ve mukaddemat-ı mezkûrenin bu suretle tahriri dahi yalnız bu kere idilecek kat’i tahdid-i hududdan sonra iade olunacak arazideki ahalinin serbesti-i hicreti maksadına müstenid olduğunu bil-beyan madde-i mezkûrenin ol vechüle tashihi taleb olunması üzerine mukaddemat-ı mezkûrenin fikra-i mebhusesinin asakir-i merkume canibinden işgal olunan mahallere şamil olacağı bu maddenin süfera-yı düvel-i muazzama ile hin-i müzakeresinde karargir olmuş ve bu yerlerin asakir-i şahane tarafından zabt ve işgali dahi oraların kaideten taht-ı idarei-i saltanat-ı seniyyeye girmiş olduğu cihetle bu yolda itiraz dermianına kat’a mahal olmadığı [...] taraf-ı cakeranemizden bil etraf beyan edilmesine mebni muma ileyhima keyfiyeti bu suretle Atina’ya bil-işar yemiden talimat isteyeceklerini ifade eylemelerinden naşi bu babda bir karar ittihazı atıye talik olunmuş” (BOA, BEO. 1056/79137, f. 4, p. 1, 10 Cemaziyelahir 1315/25 Teşrinievvel 1313 [6 November 1897]).

Muslim population, whether Greek subjects or not: *iktisab* instead of *ihtiyar*, which did not change the meaning of the article and therefore was accepted by the Ottoman representatives. 2) In Article 3, “its districts” (*nevahisi*) was added to the sentence *Tesalya’da emlaki olan müessesat*; this too was accepted. The Greek representatives demanded the addition of a fourth point to the article, granting the same right to the population in the region ceded to the Ottoman Empire.¹⁰¹ This too was accepted.¹⁰²

In the end, the Ottoman demand to provide a free emigration right to the population of Thessaly was accepted, but with the limitation that only the Muslims of Thessaly had the right.¹⁰³ The desire of Greek representatives during the negotiations to limit the right to Muslims can be interpreted as an indication that the Greek government was fearful of a voluntary migration of its Greek population to the Ottoman Empire.

10. Treaties in the aftermath of the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913

This section aims to describe the parallels between the treaties after the Balkan Wars and the nineteenth-century treaties discussed above, to support the primary contention of this paper that forced population transfers, ethnic cleansing policies, and negotiations for population exchange in the Balkans existed before the Balkan Wars of the early twentieth century. There were several peace treaties and

¹⁰¹ The Greek wish for an additional fourth point to the article: “*gerek Tesalya sekine veya ahali-yi asliyesine ve gerek orada bulunan ve devlet-i aliyyeye iade kılınan arazide emlaki mutasarrıf olan müessesat veya navahi vekillerine aynı fevaid ita olunmuşdur*” (BOA, BEO, 1056/79131, f. 12, 20 Cemaziyelahir 1315/4 Teşrinisani 1313 [16 November 1897]).

¹⁰² BOA, BEO, 1056/79131, f. 12. In the end it was as follows: “*Madde 7 – Tisalya’nın sekencesile ahali-i asliyesinden olup 24 Mayıs sene 1881 tarihli mukavelenamenin on üçüncü maddesi mucubince tabiiyeti Yunaniye’yi iktisab etmiş veya etmemiş olan müslümanlar memalik-i şahaneye muhacerette ve orada ikâmetgâhlarını tayinde serbest olacaklardır. Tabiiyyet-i Yunaniye’yi iktisab etmiş olanlar muahede-i hazıra tasdiknamelerinin mübadelesi tarihinden itibaren üç sene müddet zarfında evvelce memurin-i aideye ita olunacak bir beyanname mucebince tabiiyyet-i Osmaniye’yi kabul ve ihtiyar etmek selâhiyetini haiz olacaklardır. Muhacirin-i merkumenin cümlesi marüzzikr mukavelenameye teofikan Yunanistan’da kâin emlaklerinden tamamiyle ve bilâ mani istifade ve bunları idare devam eyliyeceklerdir. Hududun yeniden tashihî münasebetile Devlet-i Aliye’ye iade kılınan mahallerin [sekinesinden] ve ahali-yi asliyesinden olanlara veyahut elyevm mahal-i mezkûrede mukim bulunanlara müteakiben aynı fevaid bahşolunmuştur.*” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 439–440.)

¹⁰³ The Ottoman archives contain documents concerning the emigration of some population groups by this agreement. After the settlement of the borderline, the village of Koçkılani / Koçoklani remained on the Ottoman side, and part of the population of the village used the right to emigrate (“*hicret hakkı*”) to Greece. BOA, BEO. 1501/112516, 12 Safer 1318 [12 June 1900].

agreements concerning migration of population groups in the aftermath of the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913. When we compare these agreements with those of the second half of the nineteenth century, we find no considerable difference. The treaties remain in the tradition of the treaties of the nineteenth century and continue it:

The *Treaty of Istanbul* between Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire, signed on 16/29 September 1913, provides in Article 7 that the [Muslim] population in the territories ceded to Bulgaria will become Bulgarian citizens. However, if they wish, they can obtain Ottoman citizenship by applying within four years.¹⁰⁴ Article 8 provides that the members of the Bulgarian population who left their homes during the war have the right to keep their properties and return to their homes within two years.¹⁰⁵

An annex to the same treaty, Protocol No. 1, provides in Article C for an exchange of population within the area along the Ottoman-Bulgarian borders to a distance of 15 kilometers. According to the protocol, villages are to be exchanged in their entirety and the population is to be compensated through the substitution of estates on each side.¹⁰⁶

The *Treaty of Athens* of 1/14 November 1913 between the

¹⁰⁴ “Madde 7: Canib-, Hükümet-i Seniyyeden Bulgaristan’a terk edilen arazinin ahali-i asliyesinden olup orada ihtiyar-ı ikamet etmiş bulunan eşhas Bulgar tebaası olacaklardır. Ahali-i merkumeden bu suretle Bulgar tabiiyetine geçmiş olanlar Bulgar memurin-i mahalliyesine sadece bir beyanname itası ve Osmanlı şebenderhanelerinde bir muamele-i kaydiye icrası suretiyle dört sene zarfında bulundukları yerlerde tabiiyet-i Osmaniyeyi ihtiyariyle eylemek salâhiyetini haiz olacaklardır. [...] İhtiyar-ı tabiiyet keyfiyeti şahsî olup hükümet-i Osmaniyeye mecburî değildir. Elyeom sağır bulunanlar sin-ni rüşde vusullerinden itibaren dört sene zarfında hak-kı hiyarlarını istimal edeceklerdir. [...] Mamafih ahali-i merkume şehir ve kasabat ile karyelerde bulunan her gûna emval-i gayri menkulelerini muhafaza edebilirler ve bunları eşhas-ı sâlise marifetiyle idare ettirebilirler”. (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 462–463).

¹⁰⁵ The rights of the Bulgarians in Article 8: “Memalik-i Osmaniyedeki Bulgar cemaati memâlik-i mezkûredeki camaat-ı saire-i huristyaniyenin elyem haiz oldukları aynı hukuku haiz olacaklardır. Tebea-i Osmaniyeden olan Bulgarlar emval-i menkule ve gayri menkulelerini muhafaza edecekler ve hukuk-ı şahsiye ve tasarrufiyelerinin istimal ve intifaı hususunda zerrece iz’âç edilmeyeceklerdir. Vakayi-i ahire esnasında mesken ve mevalarını terk etmiş olanlar nihayet iki sene zarfında vâdet edebileceklerdir” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 463–464).

¹⁰⁶ “Her iki taraftaki Bulgar ve Müslüman ahalinin bir de onların bütün hudud-i müşterek boyunca nihayet on beş kilometroluk bir muntaka dahilindeki emlâkinin ihtiyarî olarak müteakilen mübadelesi teshil hususunda iki hükümet beyinde ittifak hasıl olmuştur. Mübadele köylerin tamamile mübadelesi suretinde vukubulacaktır. Nefs-i kurâ ile etrafındaki emvalin mübadelesi iki hükümetin himayesi tahtında ve mübadele olunacak köyler heyet-i ihtiyariyesinin iştirakile icra olunacaktır. İki hükümet canibinden tayin olunacak muhtelif komisyonlar mebhusun anı karyeler ile efrad-ı ahali beyinde mübadele-i emvale ve icab ederse bu mübadelelâtan mübeis farkları tavize iptidar edeceklerdir” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 466).

Ottoman Empire and Greece provides in Article 4 for the granting of Greek citizenship to the population in the territories ceded to Greece. Those who want to obtain Ottoman citizenship must apply within three years to the Greek authorities and the Ottoman representatives in Greece. Further, Article 6 provides that these Muslims will retain their right to the properties they have left.¹⁰⁷

The provisions of these treaties were not always easy to implement. One of the documents in the Ottoman archives shows, for example, that the interruption of the Ottoman-Greek diplomatic relations because of the World War I made it impossible to handle according to the Treaty of Athens.¹⁰⁸

The *Treaty of Istanbul* of 13 March 1913 between Serbia and the Ottoman Empire provides in Article 4 that members of the population in the areas ceded to Serbia will become Serbian subjects and, if they wish, within three years after the signing of the treaty they can receive Ottoman citizenship.¹⁰⁹

Again, the *Treaty of Brest-Litovsk* of 3 March 1918 between Russia and the Ottoman government, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, provides in Article 11 that Muslim subjects have the right to sell their estates and migrate to the Ottoman Empire.¹¹⁰ According to archival documents, many Muslims in Russia petitioned the Ottoman embassy in Moscow for permission to emigrate to the Ottoman

¹⁰⁷ “Yunanistan’ın zir-i idaresine intikal eden arazi-i Osmaniyyede mütemekkin kesân Yunan tebeası olacaklar. Ve Yunan memur-ini aidesine bir beyanname itası ve Osmanlı şehbenderhanelerinde bir muamele-i kaydiye icrası suretiyle bugünden itibaren üç sene zarfında tabiiyet-i Osmaniyyeyi ihtiyar eylemek salâhiyetini haiz olacaklardır.” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 478–479).

¹⁰⁸ BOA, M.V. (Meclis-i Vükela) 208/115, f. 1: 20 Temmuz 1333 [1 August 1897]: “Yunan hükümeti ile münakid Atina muahedesi mucebince Yunan tabiiyetini ihraz idiüb tabiiyet-i Osmaniyyeyi ihtiyar itmeksizin mahalın Osmaniyyeye gelmiş olan eşhasdan hakk-ı hayarlarını bilistimal Osmanlı tabiiyetini ihraz etmek isteyenlerin suret-i kaydları ve Yunanilik sıfatını muhafazada ihtar edenlerin hudud-ı Osmaniyyeden ihracları hakkında müttehiz karar üzerine vilayat ve elviye-i müstakileye tebligat icra edilmiş isede ahiren hükümet-i mezkure ile münasebat-ı siyasiyenin münkat’ olmasına mebni vaz’-ı hazıra göre eşhas-ı merkume hakkında olunacak muameleyi müstefid dahiliye nezaretinin 19 Temmuz 1333 tarihli ve 409 numarolu tezkiresi okundu.”

¹⁰⁹ “Sırbistan’a terk edilen arazide sakin bulunan eşhas Sırp tebeası olacaklar ve muahede-i hazranın imzasından itibaren üç sene zarfında Sırp memur-ini müteallikasına bir beyanname itası suretiyle tabiiyet-i Osmaniyyeyi ihtiyar eylemek salâhiyetini haiz bulunacaklardır”. (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 490–491).

¹¹⁰ “İslâm dininde bulunan Rus tebeası emval ve emlaklerini nakde tahvil etmek ve emval-i mevcudelerini beraberlerinde götürmek suretiyle memalik-i Osmaniyye’ye hicret etmek hakkını haiz olacaklardır” (Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuku*, 516).

Empire.¹¹¹

The negotiations between Greece and the Ottoman Empire for a population exchange in 1914 were canceled because of the beginning of the First World War. The Bulgarian-Greek voluntary population exchange after the First World War, the Turkish-Greek agreement for a compulsory population exchange in 1923,¹¹² and other such exchanges can be regarded as the continuation of a tradition that began in the nineteenth century.

Conclusion

The primary conclusion of this article is that the forced migrations, ethnic cleansing policies, and population exchanges in the Balkans did not begin with the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, but had a long tradition beginning at the latest in the first half of the nineteenth century and renewed several times during the century. Expulsions and massacres during and after the Balkan Wars were only a continuation of what had been practiced for more than a century.

As a further conclusion, we can distinguish different forms of population transfers during the nineteenth century. Between the Ottoman and the Russian empires, there was a competition for the Orthodox population, which both empires wanted on their side. As the Russian ambassador in Istanbul notes: "*The sympathies of our co-religionists in Turkey have always formed the real basis of our influence in the East*".¹¹³ In contrast, the attitude of Russia toward Muslims during the war of 1877–1878 and the Russian proposal for the total expulsion of Muslims represent ethnic purification policies that would be described today as ethnic cleansing.

During the establishment of Greece and Serbia as nation-states, however, the population issue was characterized by the expulsion of

¹¹¹BOA, HR.SYS. 2296 A/4 A, 1 January 1918.

¹¹² Renée Hirschon, *Crossing the Aegean. An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003); Turkish translation: *Ege'yi Geçerken. 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, translated by Müfide Pekin and Ertuğ Altınay (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005); Nedim İpek, *Mübadele ve Samsun* [Population Exchange and Samsun] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000); İbrahim Erdal, *Mübadele. Uluslaşma Sürecinde Türkiye ve Yunanistan 1923–1925* [Population Exchange. Turkey and Greece in the Process of Nation-Building, 1923–1925] (İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2012).

¹¹³ Rossiyskiy Gosudarstveniy Istoricheskiy Archiv, Fond 1561, Op. 1, Ed. 3 (1877), p. 3, Zapiski I. P. Ignatieva (in French).

Muslims. The expulsion of Muslims from Greece and Serbia was primarily carried out according to multilateral agreements. Russia and the European powers played a crucial role in this process. It seems that the nationalist movements in the Balkans viewed the fight against Ottoman rule almost as a fight against their Muslim neighbors. The leaders of the national movements considered the expulsion of Muslims a prerequisite for genuine autonomy of the nation-state. Greece became the first example of a "homogenized" nation-state in the Balkans. It had already expelled most of its Muslims during the war of independence. The Great Powers, notably Russia, played a decisive role in this process. Under the pretext of ending conflicts between Muslims and Greeks, or Muslims and Serbs, the European states agreed concerning the forced emigration of Muslims from Greece and Serbia. They regarded the Muslims as a threat to the independence of the Balkan states.¹¹⁴ Justin McCarthy supports this conclusion. As he writes in the first chapter of his detailed book on the expulsion of the Muslims,

As will be seen, creating a nation by expelling Turks and other Muslims was a principle that was to be followed by Bulgarians, Russians, and Armenians. It was the misfortune of the Muslim communities of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus that they lay in the path of the new nationalisms. Their misfortune was compounded by the fact that the power upon which they depended, the Ottoman Empire, did not have the strength to defend them.¹¹⁵

Another prominent historian on the migration of Muslims, Nedim İpek, also emphasizes the policy of the Balkan nations to establish ethnically "purified" nation-states as one of the main reasons for the emigration of Muslims. He regards the anti-Turkish attitude of the European powers or their policy in the Near East as the general reason for this emigration. He quotes, for example, Theodore Roosevelt, who said during the First World War, "to leave the Turks in Europe is a crime against humanity!"¹¹⁶

Why are these "early" forced population transfers not well

¹¹⁴ We find the same explanation in the studies by Kemal H. Karpat. He writes that the Muslims, who were a strong minority and owned the larger part of the lands, were regarded as a hindrance to the establishment of nation-states, and that the success of the establishment of nation-states depended on the expulsion of the Muslims. Karpat, *Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler*, 175.

¹¹⁵ McCarthy, *Death and Exile*, 13.

¹¹⁶ İpek, *Mübadele ve Samsun*, 2.

known in the Balkan historiography and why do the historians in the Balkans tend to view the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 as the beginning of forced population transfers, ethnic cleansing, and population exchange? In my opinion, the main reason for this attitude is that before the Balkan Wars mainly the "Turks" (Muslims of different ethnic origins) suffered from the population transfers, but during and after the Balkan Wars, the Balkan Christians also became victims of treaties and agreements. The latter attracted much greater attention by the Balkan historians or historians from the Balkans than the Muslims and their sufferings.

Bibliography

- BOA-Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Ottoman Archive in Istanbul)*
 BOA, BEO 1056/79137, f. 14.
 BOA, BEO, 1056/79131, f. 12.
 BOA, BEO, 1056/79131, f. 12.
 BOA, BEO, 1056/79137, f. 14, f. 16.
 BOA, BEO, 1056/79137, f. 17.
 BOA, BEO. 1056/79137, f. 4.
 BOA, BEO. 1501/112516, 12 Safer 1318 [12 June 1900].
 BOA, C.HR. 73/3627, 14 Rebi'ul-evvel 1228 [17 March 1813].
 BOA, HAT 1043/43144 E, 29 Zilhicce 1245 [21 June 1830].
 BOA, HAT, 1031/42875, 30 Rebi'ul-evvel 1245 [29 September 1829], f. 4.
 BOA, HAT, 1045/43179 E, 27 Receb 1245 [22 January 1830].
 BOA, HAT, 1220/47741B, 29 Zilhicce 1246 (10 June 1831), f. 1.
 BOA, HAT, 1294/50276, 29 Zilhicce 1250 (28 April 1835).
 BOA, HAT, 1294/50276, 29 Zilhicce 1250 [28 April 1835].
 BOA, HAT, 1317/51346D, 24 Şa'ban 1242 [23 March 1827].
 BOA, HAT, 950/40835E, 25 Zilhicce 1244 [28 June 1829], f. 1.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/2, f. 27.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 187, p. 3.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 199.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 203, p. 2.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 233 and 234.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 237.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 28.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 39.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 44, 45, 46, 47, p. 6-8.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1219/5, f. 58.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 28, 29.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 51.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 65, 66.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/2, f. 8.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f. 39.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f. 41.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 1220/3, f.17.
 BOA, HR.SYS. 2296 A/4 A, 1 January 1918.
 BOA, HR.SYS.1220/3, f. 31.
 BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 1.
 BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 12.
 BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 13.
 BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 19.

- BOA, HR.TO. 476/19, f. 20.
BOA, M.V. (Meclis-i Vükela) 208/115, f. 1.
BOA, Y.A.RES. 2/13, f. 1.
BOA, Y.A.RES. 2/13, f. 5.
BOA, Y.PRK.HR. 3/77, f. 2.

Rossiyskiy Gosudarstveniy Istoricheski Arhiv (St. Petersburg)
Fond 1561, Op. 1, Ed. 3 (1877), Zapiski I. P. Ignatieva.

- Foreign Office (published in Bilâl N. Şimşir, *Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri / Turkish Emigration from the Balkans*, vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968): F.O. 424/66, Confidential 3508, pp. 95–96, published in *ibid.*, pp. 973–975; F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 334, no. 699, published in *ibid.*, p. 346; F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 383, No. 833, published in *ibid.*, p. 347; F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, p. 451, no. 956, p. 482, no. 1036, published in *ibid.*, p. 348; F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, pp. 279–280, published in *ibid.*, pp. 331–332; F.O. 424/67, Confidential 3598, pp. 37–38, published in *ibid.*, pp. 283–285; F.O. 424/68, Confidential 3602, pp. 90–91, published in *ibid.*, p. 350.
- Adanır, Fikret, “Bevölkerungsverschiebungen, Siedlungspolitik und Ethnisch-kulturelle Homogenisierung: Nationsbildung auf dem Balkan und Kleinasien, 1878–1923,” in *Ausweisung – Abschiebung – Vertreibung in Europa 16. – 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Sylvia Hahn, Andrea Komlosy, and Ilse Reiter (Innsbruck, Vienna, Bolzano: Studienverlag, 2006), pp. 172–192.
- Ağanoğlu, Yıldırım, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Balkanların Makus Talihi: Göç* [Ill Fate of the Balkans from Empire to Republic: Migration], 7th ed. (Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012).
- Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet* [History of Cevdet], vol. 10, simplified by Tevfik Temelkuran (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1974).
- Bandžović, Safet, *Iseljavanje muslimanskog stanovništva iz Srbije i Crne Gore tokom XIX stoljeća* [Emigration of Muslims from Serbia and Montenegro during the Nineteenth Century] (Sarajevo: El-kalem, 1998).
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler” [Exile as a Method of Settlement and Colonization in the Ottoman Empire], *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11 (1949): 524–569 and 13, no. 1–4 (1952): 56–78.
- Braude, Benjamin and Bernard Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. 1, *The Central Lands*,

- (New York, London: Holmes & Maier Publishers, 1982).
- Beydilli, Kemal, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşında Doğu Anadolu'dan Rusya'ya Göçürülen Ermeniler* [Forced Migration of Armenians from Eastern Anatolia to Russia during the War of 1828-1829] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988).
- Charanis, Peter, "The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3, no. 2 (1961): 140-154.
- Emgili, Fahriye, *Yeniden Kurulan Hayatlar. Boşnakların Türkiye'ye Göçleri, 1878-1934* [Re-established Lives. Migration of Bosniaks to Turkey, 1878-1934] (İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2012).
- Erdal, İbrahim, *Mübadele. Uluslaşma Sürecinde Türkiye ve Yunanistan 1923-1925* [Population Exchange. Turkey and Greece in the Process of Nation-Building, 1923-1925] (İstanbul: IQ KültürSanatYayıncılık, 2012).
- Erim, Nihat, *Devletlerarası Hukuku ve Siyasi Tarih Metinleri* [Texts of International Law and Political History], vol. 1, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Andlaşmaları* [Treaties of the Ottoman Empire] [Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953].
- Erkan, Süleyman, *Kırım ve Kafkasya Göçler, 1878-1908* [Crimean and Caucasian Migrations, 1878-1908] (Trabzon: KATÜ Kafkasya ve Orta Asya Ülkeleri Araştırma Merkezi, 1996).
- Ersoy-Hacısalıhoğlu, Neriman and Mehmet Hacısalıhoğlu, eds., *89 Göçü. Bulgaristan'da 1984-89 Azınlık Politikaları ve Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç* [Forced Migration of 1989. Minority Policy in Bulgaria between 1984 and 1989 and Forced Migration to Turkey] (İstanbul: BALKAR and BALMED, 2012).
- Gülsoy, Ufuk, *1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'nda Rumeli'den Rusya'ya Göçürülen Reâyâ* [Forced Migration of the non-Muslims from the Balkans to Russia during the War of 1828-1829] (İstanbul: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1993).
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet (Ed.), *1864 Kafkas Tehciri: Kafkasya'da Rus Kolonizasyonu, Savaş ve Sürgün* [Caucasian Exodus of 1864: Russian Colonization of Caucasia, War and Exodus], İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Balkan ve Karadeniz Araştırmaları Merkezi (BALKAR) & İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi (IRCICA), 2014.
- Hacısalıhoğlu, Mehmet, *Doğu Rumeli'de Kayıp Köyler. İslimye Sancağı'nda 1878'den Günümüze Göçler, İsim Değişiklikleri ve Harabeler* [Lost Villages in Eastern Rumelia. Migrations, Name Changes and Ruins in the Province of İslimye/Sliven from 1878 to the Present] (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2008).

- Halaçoğlu, Ahmet, *Balkan Harbi Sırasında Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri, 1912-1913* [Turkish Migrations from the Balkans during the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995).
- Hirschon, Renée, *Crossing the Aegean. An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003).
- Hirschon, Renée, *Ege'yi Geçerken. 1923 Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi*, translated by Müfide Pekin and Ertuğ Altınay (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005).
- Höpken, Wolfgang, "Flucht vor dem Kreuz? Muslimische Emigration aus Südosteuropa nach dem Ende der osmanischen Herrschaft (19./20. Jahrhundert)," in *Zwangsmigrationen in Mittel- und Südosteuropa*, edited by Wolfgang Höpken (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1996), pp. 1-24.
- İpek, Nedim, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Göçler* [Migrations from Empire to Republic] (Trabzon: Serander, 2006).
- İpek, Nedim, *Mübadele ve Samsun* [Population Exchange and Samsun] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).
- İpek, Nedim, *Rumeli'den Anadolu'ya Türk Göçleri* [Emigration of Turks from the Balkans to Anatolia] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994).
- Karpat, Kemal H., *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler* [Ethnic Formation and Migrations from the Ottomans to the Present], translated by Bahar Tırnakçı (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010).
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet, *Türkiye ve Rusya* [Turkey and Russia] (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990).
- McCarthy, Justin, *Death and Exile. The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*, 2d ed. (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1996).
- Nazır, Bayram, *Macar ve Polonyalı Mülteciler. Osmanlı'ya Sığınanlar* [Hungarian and Polish Refugees. Refugees in the Ottoman Empire] (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2006).
- Noradounghian, Gabriel, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, 3 vols. [Paris: F. Pichon, 1897, 1897, 1902].
- Örenç, Ali Fuat, *Balkanlarda İlk Dram. Unuttuğumuz Mora Türkleri ve Eyaletten Bağımsızlığa Yunanistan*, [First Drama in the Balkans. Forgotten Turks of the Peloponnese and Greece from Province to Independence] (İstanbul: Babıali Kültür Yayıncılığı, 2009).
- Özgür Baklacioğlu, Nurcan, *Dış Politika ve Göç. Yugoslavya'dan Türkiye'ye Göçlerde Arnavutlar, 1920-1990* [Foreign Policy and Migration. Albanians in the Migrations from Yugoslavia to Turkey, 1919-1990] (İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2011).
- Özkan, Ayşe, *Miloş'tan Milan'a Sırp Bağımsızlığı (1830-1878)* [Serbian

- Independence from Miloš to Milan (1830-1878)] (İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2011).
- Popovic, Alexandre, *Balkanlarda İslam* [translation of: *L'Islam Balkanique*] (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995).
- Radova, Olga K., "Pereselencheskoe Dvizhenie v XVIII - Pervoi Polovine XIX vv. Osnovnye Etapy i ikh Osobennosti" [Migrations in the Eighteenth and First Half of the Nineteenth Centuries. The Principal Stages and Their Distinguishing Characteristics], in *Istoriia i Kultura Gagauzov*, edited by S. Bulgar (Komrat, Kishinev: Pontos, 2006), pp. 71-88.
- Saydam, Abdullah, *Kırım ve Kafkasya Göçleri, 1856-1876* [Crimean and Caucasian Migrations, 1856-1876] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997).
- Schopoff, A[ntanas], *Les Réformes et la Protection des Chrétiens en Turquie 1673-1904* (Paris: Plon Nourrit et Cie, 1904).
- Şemşik, Pınar, *The Transformation of Ottoman Crete. Revolts, Politics and Identity in late Nineteenth Century* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011).
- Sundhaussen, Holm, "Forced Ethnic Migration," *Europäische Geschichte Online (EGO)*, Mainz European History Online (EGO), published by the Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz 2010-12-03. URL: <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/europe-on-the-road/forced-ethnic-migration/holm-sundhaussen-forced-ethnic-migration>
- Tekeli, İlhan, *Göç ve Ötesi* [Migration and Behind] (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008).
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Tarihi* [Ottoman History], vol. 4, part 1, 5th ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995).

