

## THE QUESTION OF FUAD PAŞA'S "POLITICAL TESTAMENT"

RODERIC H. DAVISON

*Fuat Paşa'nın "Siyasî Vasiyetnâmesi" adı ile anılan ve o devirdeki dünya devletlerinin siyasî temayül ve emelleri muvacehesinde Osmanlı Devletinin bekasını temin etmek için birtakım tavsiyeleri ihtiva eden mühim bir vesika, ortaya çıkaldan beri dikkati çekmiş ve defalarca münakaşa mevzuu yapılmıştır. Münakaşanın esasını, bu Siyasî Vasiyetnâme'nin muhtevası değil, fakat gerçekten Fuat Paşa tarafından mı, yoksa başka bir müellif tarafından mı kaleme alındığı ve Fuat Paşa'ya atfedildiği meselesi teşkil etmektedir. Konu, son defa Orhan F. Köprülü tarafından İslâm Ansiklopedisi'nin Fuat Paşa maddesinde ele alınmış, bulunan iki yeni vesika karşısında yeniden üzerinde araştırmalar yapılması gereğine işaret olunmakla beraber bir hükme bağlanmamıştır.*

*Bu makalenin yazarı olup Türk tarihi üzerindeki yayınları ile de tanılan ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin başkentindeki George Washington Üniversitesi tarih profesörlerinden bulunan Roderic H. Davison, Fuat Paşa'nın Siyasî Vasiyetnâmesi meselesini yeniden ele almaktadır. Prof. Davison, bu makalesinde şimdiki kadar mesele üzerinde yapılan bütün neşriyatı gözden geçirmekte, Doğu'da ve Batı'da mevcut bütün kaynakları ilk defa bir araya toplamakta ve bunların ışığı altında bâzı soruları çözmekte veya birtakım problemler vazz'etmektedir. Bu yazı Tanzimat devri Osmanlı tarihinde büyük bir önemi olan Fuat Paşa'nın Siyasî Vasiyetnâmesi meselesi üzerinde daha derinleşmek isteyenler için âdeta bir teşvik ve rehber mahiyetini taşımaktadır.*

BEKİR SITKI BAYKAL

One of the unsolved question of the Tanzimat period is whether Fuat Paşa wrote a political testament. It is quite possible that there may never be a definite answer to this question. But the document which is usually entitled "Fuat Paşa's Political Testament" is interesting and important to the historian of the nineteenth century. It is a clear and cogent analysis of the foreign policy which the Ottoman Empire

should pursue, and it also sets forth fundamental considerations on domestic reforms necessary to revitalize the empire. If this document is actually the work of Fuad Paşa, it represents for the historian one of the best summaries of the viewpoint of a great statesman who, together with Ali Paşa, guided the affairs of the Ottoman state for a crucial period of ten years or more after the Crimean War. If the "testament" was not actually written by Fuad, but was either dictated or outlined by him to a friend, or if it was written by a friend who was completely familiar with Fuad's views, it is almost of equal importance.

The question of the authorship of this document has been discussed several times in the past. Among the best known discussions in the article by Mehmed Galib in the first volume of the *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası*.<sup>1</sup> Another discussion is by Ali Fuad in his *Rical-i mühimme-i siyasiyye*.<sup>2</sup> The most scholarly and the most recent discussion, although it is brief, is by Orhan F. Köprülü in his article on Fuad Paşa in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*; here Köprülü states the problem clearly and introduces some new considerations<sup>3</sup>. There have also been at times discussions among several people or groups of the question of authenticity of the "testament." Probably the most lively discussion took place in the fall of 1869, after the "testament" was first published. This discussion, which seems to be unknown to modern scholars, extended to a number of newspapers in Istanbul and to the periodical press in Europe<sup>4</sup>. Again in 1896 there was a new consideration of the question of authorship of the "testament" when it was published almost simultaneously in three places. This episode in 1896 involved an exchange of private correspondence between Ahmed Rıza, Melküm Han, and Hikmet Fuad, after the Young Turk newspaper *Meşveret*

<sup>1</sup> Mehmed Gâlib, "Tarihten bir sahife — Âli ve Fuad Paşa'ların Vasiyetnameleri," *TOEM I* (1329/1911), pp. 70-84.

<sup>2</sup> (İstanbul, 1928), p. 173.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. IV, p. 678.

<sup>4</sup> Various examples of this will be referred to below. The most active argument on the questions seems to have been conducted by the two Istanbul papers, *Levant Herald* and *Levant Times and Shipping Gazette*. I have been unable to see a file of the *Levant Herald* for 1869. The *Levant Times*, 4 October 1869, Vol. 1, No. 257, is full of information, and the issue of 6 October 1869 has some also.



began to publish the "testament" serially.<sup>5</sup> None of these discussions so far has reached a final conclusion as to who wrote the document.

It would appear that no historian has tried to summarize all the evidence now available, and to pose questions which may lead to further research. That is the purpose of this article. But I should say at once that some relevant materials have not been available to me. There is further work to be done on this question by scholars in Turkey and in Europe who have access to various newspaper collections, government archives, and collections of private documents. The use of these materials can help to elucidate a number of interesting problems connected with the "political testament." These problems, together with the pertinent evidence on each, are considered in the following pages in this order: I. When and where has the "political testament" been published, and by whom? II. How did the various publishers obtain the document? III. In what language was the "testament,, originally written? IV. Did Fuad have the opportunity to write a political testament, and was he likely to do so? V. Does the "testament" conform to Fuad's known political ideas? VI. If Fuad did not write the "testament" who did write it? VII. What have been the opinions of Fuad's contemporaries and of later scholars on the question of authenticity? VIII. What are the possibilities of further research on this problem?

## I.

One may begin by asking when and where the document has been published, in order to compare the texts, to determine the circumstances of publication, and to identify the dates at which there may have been discussion of the document's authenticity. For convenience I designate these publications, or possible publications, from A to L. A) Mehmed Galib states that the "testament" was first published in an English periodical in London<sup>6</sup>. But he does not give the name

<sup>5</sup> This is summarized in Orhan F. Köprülü, "Fuad Paşa", *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* IV, p. 678. Part of the correspondence, from the private collection of Salih Keçeci is photographically reproduced in Mithat Cemal Kuntay, *Namuk Kemal* (İstanbul, 1944-1949), I, pp. 215-217.

<sup>6</sup> Mehmed Galib, "Tarihten bir sahife", p. 72 and note.

of the periodical or the date of publication. What he says may possibly be true, but I have so far not found the article he refers to, and it is not listed in Poole's index of periodical literature for the nineteenth century. B) It is a fact, however, that about seven or eight months after Fuad's death the "testament" was published in various newspapers of Istanbul, both Turkish and foreign-language papers, and probably first in the *Levant Herald* in Beyoğlu<sup>7</sup>. C) A translation of the "testament" into French is referred to by Mehmed Galib, but he does not state clearly whether this was published. D) The same author then mentions a translation from the French into Turkish by Ahmed Ârifî Paşa and Ethem Pertev Paşa, but again he does not state whether this translation was published. Since Pertev Paşa died in 1872 while he was vali of Kastamonu, this translation must have been made before that date.

A few years later, the "testament" was published in English in three different books by J. Lewis Farley. At least first two of these books had two editions each. It was through Farley's works that the "testament" became rather widely known in Europe. The books in question are E) *The Decline of Turkey* (London, 1875) pp. 27-36; F) *Turks and Christians* (London, 1876), pp. 235-244; and G) *EgyptCyprus and Asiatic Turkey* (London, 1878), pp. 228-245. Farley was a curious character, a British subject who had been in Syria in 1857-1858, and then was in Istanbul in 1860-1861 as accountant-general of the bank of Turkey. He later served as Ottoman consul in Bristol. In several of his earlier books he wrote about the economic condition of the Ottoman Empire and its resources, and tried to attract foreign capital and settlers to develop the empire. Farley claimed to be on "terms of personal intimacy with both Fuad and Ali Pashas."<sup>8</sup> He became anti-Turkish during the crisis of 1875-1877, and wrote as a propagandist for the Slavs of the Balkans. In 1875 he was proposing to the Russian ambassador in London, Shuvalov, a lecture and press campaign in favor of

<sup>7</sup> My knowledge of this is based on the *Levant Times and Shipping Gazette*, 4 October 1869, which refers to the publication by the *Levant Herald*. This publication must have been in late September or early October. The *Levant Times* also reports that the "testament" was published in other Istanbul newspapers, which are not named.

<sup>8</sup> *Turks and Christians*, p. vii. Also in *The Decline of Turkey*, p. 26 Farley says that Âli Pş. "expressed his views very freely to me" in Istanbul in 1870.



the Christians of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>9</sup> It is not clear why Farley included Fuad's "testament", which was strongly anti-Russian in tone, in books through which he sought to win the favor of the Russian government. The British ambassador in Istanbul, Sir Henry Elliot, believed Farley to be "of doubtful impartiality," in view of the fact that his writing changed in this period from a pro-Turkish to an anti-Turkish tone. Elliot intimated that Farley may have shifted his views because "the Ottoman government, for reasons of economy, stopped his salary as consul."<sup>10</sup> There is another question in connection with Farley: why did he not publish Fuad's "testament" in an earlier book of his, *Modern Turkey* (London, 1872), which appeared three years after Fuad's death? Of course Farley may not have possessed a copy of the "testament" at this date. But in this very book Farley praised the *Levant Herald* as the most important source for his information on Turkey;<sup>11</sup> and it was this paper which, as we have seen, had published Fuad's "testament" in 1869. One wonders whether Farley did know about the "testament" before he first published it in 1875, and what he thought about its genuineness.

About two decades after Farley's three books appeared, the "testament" was published in three separate places in Europe. H) It appeared in the *Revue de Paris* in French.<sup>12</sup> I) Next, apparently immediately thereafter, Ahmed Rıza began to publish the "testament" part by part in *Meşveret*.<sup>13</sup> Presumably this version was published in Turkish, but *Meşveret* at this time also had a French supplement, and possibly the "testament" was published there also.) J) Then the same document was published in Turkish as a separate brochure of 29 pages, in Geneva in 1314/1896-97, under the title *Vasiyetname-i Siyasiyye*. This version was brought out at the Mizan Press by the famous

<sup>9</sup> Shuvalov to Jomini, 2/14 October 1875, summarized in R. W. Seton-Watson. "RUSSO-British Relations During the Eastern Crisis (I)," *Slavonic Review* III (December, 1924), pp. 430-431. The Russian ambassador considered subsidizing Farley.

<sup>10</sup> Elliot to Derby 322, 4 July 1875, Public Record Office (London), FO 78/2384.

<sup>11</sup> p. ix.

<sup>12</sup> Fuad-Pasha, "Testament politique", *Revue de Paris* III, No. 21 (1 November 1896), pp. 126-135.

<sup>13</sup> I have been unable to see *Meşveret*; reference to this is in Orhan Köprülü's article.

Murad Bey, and on the cover was the seal of the Committee of Union and Progress.<sup>14</sup>

K) Again, in 1903 there was a new publication of the "testament" in English in the well-known magazine *Nineteenth Century*.<sup>15</sup> On the first page of this article an astonishing note by the editor states that this is a translation from an authentic copy, and that the "testament" has never before been published in English. Since Farley had previously published it in English at least three separate times, the latter claim is of course untrue, but presumably the editor was unaware that this was so. L) Finally, the "testament" was published in Turkish by Mehmed Galib on pp. 75-84 of his article, with the statement that this was his own translation made from the French, since he did not have a copy of the translation by Ârifî Paşa and Pertev Paşa. I do not know what French version Mehmed Galib used.

All of the six versions that I have seen —three by Farley, one in the *Revue de Paris*, one in the *Nineteenth Century*, and one by Mehmed Galib— have the same content, though there are differences among them in paragraphing and phraseology, and one or another version omits an occasional sentence. This similarity is no proof at all that the document was really written by Fuad. But it is evidence that all the versions probably came from one original copy, whoever may have been the author. It would be interesting, however, to compare these versions with the one published in Istanbul in 1869, with the versions of *Meşveret* and Mizancı Murad, and with any other versions which may have been published.

## II.

After collecting and comparing the textual publications of the "testament", one may next ask how the various publishers obtained the document. This is a more difficult question to solve. Mehmed Galib gives no indication of original source for any of the versions he men-

<sup>14</sup> I have been unable to see a copy of this. It is listed as 1569 in Enver Koray, *Türkiye Tarih Yayınları Bibliyografyası, 1729-1950* (Ankara 1952), and described very briefly in Kuntay, *Namık Kemal* I, p. 214, note 36.

<sup>15</sup> "The Political Testament of Fuad Paşa," *Nineteenth Century* LIII, No. 312 (February, 1903), pp. 190-197.



tions. The *Levant Herald* in 1869 explained only partly how a copy of the document was obtained. As quoted in the *Levant Times and Shipping Gazette* of 4 October 1869, the explanation is as follows: "The original had been confided by Fuad Pasha to an old servant with instructions to forward it to the Sultan through the Valideh-Sultan. No one through whose hands the packet passed knew anything of its contents. The very great precautions, however, taken by Fuad Pasha to prevent an indiscretion, led to an irresistible breach of trust, and the cover was opened before it reached its destination." This is, of course, an incomplete and quite unsatisfactory explanation, which may be intended only to conceal the fact of a forgery. The *Levant Times* adds that the *Levant Herald*, which was a bi-lingual newspaper, published somewhat different accounts on successive days in its French and English stories of the origin of the document. Presumably the version quoted above is the English account, although this is not clearly stated. The *Levant Herald*, which was generally quite anti-Russian, would undoubtedly be pleased to publish a document which was also very anti Russian, and therefore might not inquire scrupulously into its origin<sup>16</sup>.

When Farley first published Fuad's "testament" in 1875 he also gave an unsatisfactory explanation of how he obtained it. According to Farley, he was entrusted with a life of Fuad Paşa by İzzet Bey, Fuad's grandson, and he reprints an undated note on this subject from İzzet to himself<sup>17</sup>. It is not clearly stated that the "testament" was part

<sup>16</sup> One should note that the *Levant Herald*, like other Istanbul newspapers of the time, was not completely trustworthy and often printed unverified or biased news. Almost all Istanbul papers of that era accepted subventions from European powers, from the Bab-ı Âli or from the Khedive İsmail. Among the papers which accepted subventions were the *Levant Herald*, the *Levant Times*, and *La Turquie*. See, for example, G. Douin, *Histoire du regne du Khedive İsmail* (Rome, 1933-1934), II, p. 595; Andraes David Mortdmann, *Stambul und das moderne Türkenenthum* (Leipzig, 1877-1878), II, p. 137; and Bressier to Bismarck, 12 chiffre, 22 January 1867, Preussische Geheime Archiv (Dahlem), on a Prussian proposal to buy the favor of *La Turquie*. But it is also true that the *Levant Herald* was as highly regarded as any paper of the time in Istanbul. An American who read the whole Istanbul press reported that "the *Levant Herald* is universally read, and its opinions much regarded even among the Turks." American Hoard of Commissioners for Foreign Missions archives (Boston) Vol. 284, 317, encl., 15 November 1871.

<sup>17</sup> *The Decline of Turkey*, p. 26, note. I am not sure of the identity of this İzzet Bey. I. A. Gövsa, *Türk Meşhurları Ansiklopedisi*, pp. 197-198, lists Keçecizade İzzet

of this biography, though this is the implication. Perhaps Farley would not have inquired carefully into the origin of the document, since he was very favorable to Fuad, and saw in him the prototype of an English liberal.<sup>18</sup> Farley also, because he greatly disliked Mahmud Nedim Paşa, continued to think very highly of Fuad by contrast, even after Fuad's death. When in 1896 the *Revue de Paris* published the "testament," there was a very exact note by the editor on the first page of the article explaining that Hikmet Fuad Bey, the grandson of Fuad Paşa, had furnished the "testament" in French. The note stated further that this was a translation by Ârifî Paşa, and that the original copy in Turkish remained in Hikmet Fuad's hand<sup>19</sup>. The editor of the *Nineteenth Century* in 1903 was far less explicit in explaining where he got the "testament". His note seems to indicate that the document came to him from one of the Young Turks, since he remarks that the "testament" throws light upon "the manner in which the Turkish Reform Party of the present day still view the affairs of their country." Where Ahmed Rıza and Mizancı Murad obtained the document I do not know.<sup>20</sup> None of the explanations of the origin of the "testament" trace it back to Fuad's own hands. The clearest is the explanation of Hikmet Fuad; what he does not say is how he inherited, or otherwise obtained, the document. There must be further explanations of the origin of the "testament" and how it came into the hands of the various publishers. This is a matter for further research.

Fuad Paşa, son of Fuad's son Nazim Bey. Orhan Köprülü in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* IV, p. 680 mentions İzzet Fuat Paşa as the son of Fuad's son Kâzım Bey. Did Fuad have two grandsons of the same name? Perhaps *Türk Meşhurları* is in error.

<sup>18</sup> See especially his *Turkey* (London, 1866).

<sup>19</sup> This statement raises the interesting question as to whether Ârifî translated the "testament" from French into Turkish, as Mehmed Galib asserts, or from Turkish into French, as Hikmet Fuad told the editor of the *Revue de Paris*.

<sup>20</sup> Although the manner in which the "testament" came into Ahmet Rıza's hands is not clear to me, one can guess at his reasons for being interested in the document. He was probably trying to use the enlightened views of Fuad's "testament", with its statements on Ottoman brotherhood and equality, to bolster the cause of the Young Turks, and also to counteract the anti-Turkish sentiment aroused in Europe by the Armenian massacres of 1894 and the Greek revolt in Crete of 1896. In 1896, when Ahmed Rıza published Fuad's "testament," he was attempting to prove to Europe the traditional tolerance of Islam. Cf. Ahmed Rıza, "La Tolerance musulmane," *Revue occidentale*, 2<sup>e</sup>ème serie, XIII, 6 (1 novembre 1896/25 Descartes 108), pp. 304-317.



## III.

Another pertinent question is to ask what language the "testament," was originally written in. Mehmed Galib, offering no proof, states that it was first written in English. If this is true, it is a strong argument against the probability of Fuad's having written the document himself. For although Fuad had spent three years in London as a young man, his knowledge of English, so far as I know, was not extensive, and in any case he was far more fluent in Turkish and in French. But in the discussion about the document in the Istanbul newspapers of 1869, there was apparently no thought that the "testament" was originally written in English. The question then debated was whether French or Turkish was the original language. Fuad could easily have written in either. For Sultan Abdülaziz, of course, the "testament" would have had to be in Turkish, since the Sultan was not fluent in French. Farley labels his publications of the "testament" in English as translations, but does not indicate the original language and leaves one to guess whether it was Turkish or French. But a careful reading of Farley's version leads one to suspect that it is a translation from the French, since some of his phrases and words, even though they are in English, are typically French. On the other hand, the French version in the *Revue de Paris* is written in very good French and sounds as if it were originally composed in that language; yet the editor's note here states that he is told, presumably by Hikmet Fuad, that the French translation "renders only imperfectly the eloquent beauty of the original [Turkish] text. Ali Fuad in *Rical-i mühimme-i siyasiyye* does not state what the original language of the "testament" was, but he implies that this was not Turkish when he says that Ârifî Bey translated the document into the bombastic literary language of his time. Nothing can be learned about the original language from Mehmed Galib's version, since this is admittedly a translation from the French. Does the Geneva edition of H. 1314 read as if it were an original composition, and not a translation? Of course Fuad's grandson Hikmet Fuad asserted that the original draft of the "testament" was in Turkish and was preserved among his papers in Istanbul.<sup>21</sup> But one wonders

<sup>21</sup> Hikmet Fuad to Ahmed Rıza, 11 Kanunuevvel 1896, in Kuntay, *Namık Kemal*, I, p. 216. Orhan Köprülü refers apparently to the same letter in his article, p. 678, and calls the author Mustafa Hikmet Bey. Nearly the same statement is in *Revue de Paris*, *loc. cit.*, p. 126.

how well founded was Hikmet Fuad's knowledge of the original. When he wrote this assertion to Ahmed Rıza, Hikmet Bey was in Paris and did not have the draft with him. This contradictory evidence so far leaves the matter in confusion. Three different possibilities for the language of the original "testament" have been advanced —English, French, and Turkish.

Of these three possibilities, English seems to be the least likely. If the "testament" was written by Fuad, or by another Turk, or by Melküm Han (on whom see below), French or Turkish is the more probable language. But if the "testament" was written by a propagandist for England, it might have been originally in English. This possibility is pure speculation, induced only by the facts that the document itself shows great friendliness toward England, and that it was published early in an English-language newspaper and in English books. But Fuad had himself often shown such friendliness to England and the expression of it in the "testament" is not in itself enough to mark the document as a forgery by some partisan of England.

The question of the original language is more important than the question of what language the "testament" was originally published in; but it is worth noting that the latter too is not yet certainly known. Since I have not seen the *Levant Herald* for 1869 I do not know whether it printed the "testament" in English or in French, though one might guess from the account in the *Levant Times* that French was the language of publication. Mehmed Galib says that the document was first published in England, and therefore presumably in English. From this partial evidence it is apparent only that the "testament" was not first published in Turkish. This in itself was not altogether unusual in that period. Mustafa Fazıl Paşa's famous letter of 1876 to Sultan Abdülaziz was, for example, first published in French.

#### IV.

Apart from questions of language, and place and date of publication, one must ask whether Fuad Paşa had the opportunity to write such a testament, and whether he was likely to do so. One answer is



clear: he certainly had the opportunity. Fuad was overworked, tired and sick in the years 1861 and 1868, and went in the winter of the latter year to Nice, on medical advice, for rest and recuperation. There he died on February 12, 1869. He could easily have employed some of his period of illness to write a testament, if he had so wished. He was not too ill to travel, and therefore presumably not too ill to write, at least for a time. Although there is no certainty of the date when the "testament" was composed, the date usually given is January 3, 1869, more than a month before Fuad's death.<sup>23</sup> If this is a true date, it indicates that Fuad was not at the end of his strength when he is supposed to have finished the "testament." But of course such a date could easily have been supplied by a forger, since the fact of Fuad's death was known at once all over the world. Whether Fuad was likely to write a testament is still another question. This was not a usual practice among Ottoman statesmen. But Fuad was unusual in many respects; he defied Ottoman conventions in such matters as having a statue in his garden, and may have broken with convention in this matter also. One can reach no positive conclusion by this speculation. It may also be asked Fuad expected to die, rather than to recover, I do not know. The fact that the text of the "testament" asserts he is writing from his death-bed proves nothing, since a forger could also have asserted this. Orhan Köprülü asks whether a man on his death-bed would write in such a fine literary style. This is a good question, but presupposes that the "testament" was written originally in Turkish. As a matter of fact, the *Levant Times* found the document suspicious, among other reasons, because it looked like an attempt to imitate Fuad's style of writing in *French*, not in Turkish.

<sup>22</sup> This date is accepted by Orhan Köprülü and many others. Farley, *Decline of Turkey*, p. 27, says that Fuad died on February 11, but this is certainly too early. Various Paris newspapers, without being explicit, indicate that Fuad died on February 13, 1869: *Journal des Débats* (14 February 1869), *La Presse* (14 February 1869), *Le Constitutionnel* (14 February 1869). The (London) *Times* (15 February 1869) says explicitly that Fuad Paşa dies on the morning of February 13. But these papers may all be in error.

<sup>23</sup> This date is given by Farley in his three published versions of the "testament" and also by the *Revue de Paris*, which adds that the document was then sent to the Sultan on February 11, 1869. The *Nineteenth Century* says only that the "testament" was "addressed to the Sultan Abdul Aziz in 1869 one day before the death of its author," which presumably would be February 11. Mehmed Galib dates the "testament" only vaguely "in the year 1285 a few days before his death."

## V.

Aside from the question of style, one might conclude from internal evidence that the document is genuinely Fuad's. There are no assertions in it which seem to contradict the known opinions held by Fuad —and as is well-known Fuad often spoke openly and bluntly and did not conceal his views, even though he sometimes temporized or spoke on both sides of a question. The ideas contained in the testament —that civil and political institutions must be changed, if the Ottoman Empire is to survive; that Islam is flexible enough to absorb new truths from Europe; that there must be fusion and equality of peoples of all religions and races within the empire, but all separatist movements must be stopped; that justice, education and communications must be improved; and that Russia is the major enemy and England, France and Austria the best friends —all these conform to views that expressed at other times. But some who knew Fuad well could have written these views, or Fuad might have dictated them, or Fuad might have talked in general terms during his illness and some companion have written the "testament." The internal evidence is again inconclusive. All that is certain is this: that whoever wrote the "testament" had a good understanding of the domestic and the foreign situation of the Ottoman Empire, and was acquainted with Fuad's view on these matters. It seems possible, therefore, even without conclusive proof as to who wrote the "testament", to accept it as a second-hand if not a first-hand expression of Fuad's views.

## VI.

If Fuad did not write the testament, who did? Here again one is, in the present state of the evidence, reduced to speculation. There were apparently some individuals in Fuad's suite during his last illness who had sufficient education and sufficient knowledge of Fuad to do this. The former wife of Kibrîşli Mehmed Paşa met Fuad in Rome, and said he was accompanied by Armenian physician who acted also as his chamberlain. The *Levant Times* asserted that Fuad had "one

<sup>24</sup> Melek-Hanum, *Six Years in Europe* (London, 1873) pp. 199-203.



faithful and devoted friend by his side during his last moments —Rüstem Bey." Rüstem Bey is not otherwise identified, but this must be Françesko Rüstem Bey, later Paşa, who was Ottoman minister in Florence at the time of Fuad's death. The *Levant Times* adds that Fuad's oldest servant died of grief two or three days after Fuad died. The names of those who forwarded the "testament" to the Valide Sultan are not given. Could the bearer have been Hoca Tahsin Efendi, who accompanied Fuad's corps from Nice to Istanbul?

Emile Burnouf, who discussed the "testament" after it appeared in the *Levant Herald*, thought that the document was probably written by a Greek who knew Fuad Paşa well.<sup>25</sup> Mehmed Galib speculates that Âli Paşa might have written the "testament", or caused it to be written, and then rejects the hypothesis. Presumably only the reason why Âli would want such a document written would be to tell the Sultan some bald truths, or to impress Abdülaziz with the praise of himself (Âli) which the testament contained; but neither argument is convincing. The most usual hypothesis has been that the Persian, Melküm Han, wrote the testament. This is the essence of Mehmed Galib's argument —that Melküm, having failed to obtain a position, even with Fuad's sponsorship, in the Ottoman government, wrote the document to gain Âli's favor and included words of praise for Âli for this reason. Others, including Ali Fuad and Clément Huart, have inclined to the same theory of authorship. But so far there is no proof that Melküm Han really did write the "testament". What does seem to be clear is that he could have written it—he apparently knew Fuad, and like Fuad he was a Freemason; he had ideas on reforms which coincided with some of Fuad's; he had been educated partly in France, and knew French well, so he could have written the testament in that language; and he was a refugee from Iran, living in Istanbul about

<sup>25</sup> Emile Burnouf. "La Turquie en 1869," *Revue des deux mondes*, Vol. 84, 2nd period (15 December 1869), p. 964. Burnouf can offer no proof of this. But he praises the "testament" as very intelligent on many points, and then on p. 977 says that the Greeks are the best educated and most intelligent people in the Ottoman Empire. This may offer an indication as to why he thought that a Greek wrote it. But one should note that the "testament" is anti-Greek in tone; if a Greek wrote it, this could only be a Phanariote Greek of Istanbul who disliked this independent Greek state.

<sup>26</sup> Ali Fuad, *Rical-i Mühimme-i Siyasiyye* (Istanbul, 1928), p. 173; Clément Huart, "Fuad Pasha", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* II, p. 116.

the time of Fuad's death and for a little while thereafter. The fact that the "testament" was anti-Persian in tone, and spoke of Persia as a despotism, may lend support to the theory of Melküm's authorship, since he was in conflict with the Persian government of the time. But to show that Melküm Han was in a position to write the "testament" does not prove that he did so.

## VII.

What have others said about the authenticity of the document? There is so far no agreement. The *Levant Herald* of 1869 printed the "testament" with an apparent claim that it was genuinely Fuad's work. The *Levant Times* in its issue of October 4, 1869, said that although the "testament" expressed sound views on the proper policy for the Turkish government to pursue, the document itself was a fraud. Most of the other newspapers of Istanbul, added the *Levant Times*, also believed that the document was apocryphal. At about the same time, a nephew of Fuat Paşa, one "Madjid Bey," wrote a letter to *La Turquie* stating formally that the "testament" was not the work of Fuad Paşa. "Madjid Bey" was not only Fuad's nephew, but also director of the Bureau of the Press. Since this was so, and since *La Turquie* was a semi-official paper which reflected the views of the Bab-ı Âli, is it possible that Madjid's denial of the document's genuineness reflected in fact the opinion of the Sadrazam Âli Paşa himself? A few days later *The (London) Times* reported from Istanbul: "Fuad Paşa's political

<sup>27</sup> On Melküm Han see Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia* (London, 1930), I, pp. 297-399; Charles Mismar, *Souvenirs du mondemusulman* (Paris, 1892), pp. 132-143 where Melküm's father and his Armenian origins are also discussed.

<sup>28</sup> I have not seen this issue of *La Turquie*, which must be approximately October 4 or 5, 1869. The *Levant Times* reported the fact of the letter in its issue of 6 October 1869.

<sup>29</sup> I am not certain of the correct name of "Madjid Bey," but I assume he is the same person as the Macid Efendi mentioned as the son of Fuad Paşa's brother Reşad Bey in *Sicill-i Osmanî* II, p. 381, s. v. "Reşad," and III, p. 458, s. v. "İzzet Molla." The *Levant Herald* referred to him in an issue of December, 1868 (the exact date was not on the fragment I saw) as "Machad Bey", Director of the Bureau de la Presse. Mordtmann, *Stambul und das Moderne Türkenthum*, II, p. 176, refers to him also, as Macid ("Madschid") Bey.



testament is now positively ascertained to be apocryphal."<sup>30</sup> The *Times* gave no further explanation, and one is left to guess whether its source of information was the letter of "Madjid Bey," or whether there was further proof that the "testament" was not genuine. Two months later Emile Burnouf, in the *Revue des deux mondes*, called the testament "apocryphal." The only proof he offered was this argument: that in the "testament" it is said that the medreseler can serve as the basis for a reorganization of education in the Ottoman Empire—but it is impossible, he said, that a man who knew Europe as well as Fuad did should have such a mistaken opinion. The only conclusion to be drawn from this partial evidence is that most of the published comments of 1869 view the "testament" as a fraud.

When Farley published the "testament", he presented it as a genuine document. The fact that in one of his editions it is mis-dated "1862" is probably a typographical error, and not significant.<sup>31</sup> Several contemporary European writers, who knew the Ottoman Empire fairly well, accepted the "testament" printed by Farley as the genuine work of Fuad. One of these writers is Amand von Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, who seems to have been a Freemason, to have known a great deal about the Yeni Osmanlılar, and who claims in one of his works to have used notes made by Midhat Paşa.<sup>32</sup> Another European writer who accepted Farley's version as genuine is Karl Braun-Wiesbaden, a member of the German Reichstag who travelled in the Ottoman Empire and talked to many people. He claimed that İzzet Bey gave the "testament" to Farley.<sup>33</sup> A later European writer, Alois Hajek, also accepted the document as genuine, but indicated no source for his knowledge of it.<sup>34</sup> It is not apparent, however, that any of these three writers had special knowledge of the "testament" which would enable him to form an independent judgment on its authenticity. One European writer, a Frenchman who was resident in Istanbul from 1854 on, violently condemned the "testament" as a fraud, but offered no proof of his

<sup>30</sup> 11 October 1869, despatch from İstanbul dated 9 October 1869.

<sup>31</sup> *Turks and Christians*, p. 235.

<sup>32</sup> His reference to the "testament" is in *Unter dem Halbmonde: ein Bild des ottomanischen Reiches...* (Jena, 1876), p. 115.

<sup>33</sup> *Eine türkische Reise* (Stuttgart, 1876), II, pp. 189-192. He gives two dates for the "testament"—3 January 1869 and 11 February 1869.

<sup>34</sup> *Bulgarien unter der Türkenherrschaft* (Stuttgart, 1925), p. 214.

view. This was M. Benoit Brunswik.<sup>35</sup> But Brunswik had special reason to dislike the views expressed in the "testament", since he was not only very anti-English, but also believed that the efforts of the Ottoman statesmen to reform the empire without European interference were a farce. One other European, long resident in the empire and actually an official of the Ottoman government for many years, Dr. Josef Koetschet, believed the document was genuine.<sup>36</sup> Dr. Koetschet was a Swiss physician who had been very close to Ömer Paşa and later to other important Ottoman officials, and was generally well-informed. There is also a hint in Ali Fuad's account that Müşir Süleyman Paşa may have considered the "testament" to be genuine.

When later in 1896 the controversy over the authenticity of the "testament" again arose, one of Reşid's grandsons, Reşad Fuad Bey, maintained that the "testament" neither written nor inspired by his grandfather.<sup>37</sup> Another grandson, Hikmet Bey, wrote that the document was genuine, and this assertion was accepted by Ahmed Rıza Bey. One of the arguments advanced by Hikmet Bey against Melküm's claimed authorship is that the "testament" was not written in Armenian or Persian.<sup>38</sup> Melküm Han claimed in 1896 that he himself had written the "testament."<sup>39</sup> Mehmed Galib believed also that Melküm was the author. The complete lack of agreement in the evidence so far leads only to the conclusion of Orhan Köprülü — we do not know who was the author.

<sup>35</sup> *La vérité sur Midhat Pacha* (Paris, 1877), p. 2.

<sup>36</sup> Dr. K[Josef Kotschet]. *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben des Serdar-i Ekrem Omer Pascha* (Sarajevo, 1925), p. 251.

<sup>37</sup> Ali Fuad, *Rical-i Mühimme-i Siyasiye*, p. 173. Ali Fuad adds that "other informed persons" held this view also, but he does not name individuals.

<sup>38</sup> See references in note 21 above.

<sup>39</sup> Orhan Köprülü's article in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* IV, 678. I do not know where Melküm's letter to Ahmet Rıza is, or whether it now exists. Melküm's claim of authorship is referred to by Ahmed Rıza in his letter to Hikmet Fuad of 9 Kanunuevvel 108 (Kuntay, *Namuk Kemal*, I, p. 215). This letter is actually of 1896, but Ahmed Rıza was using the positivist calendar, which began with 1789, the year of the French Revolution, as the year 1. Thus 1896 became 108. In this letter, however, Ahmed Rıza did not use the name of the positivist month.



## VIII.

What, then, are the possibilities of learning more about this document through research? One can mention only possibilities, but there are many of them. Can the final original copy of the "testament" be found—perhaps in the Yıldız archives, if it ever reached the Sultan? Can the original publication which Mehmed Gâlib says took place in London be identified, and is there any correspondence connected with it? I tend to doubt Mehmed Galib's statement on this. Did Ârifî Paşa or Pertev Paşa leave any papers which would indicate what they knew about the document they were translating? Can the original material sent by İzzet Bey to Farley be located, if Farley left any papers? Do İzzet's memoirs mention the document? Where did Ahmed Rıza get his copy of the "testament"? Where did Mehmed Galib get the French version that he used? Where did the editor of the *Nineteenth Century* get his copy in 1903? Can those individuals who were with Fuad Paşa during his last illness in Nice be identified, and did they leave any papers? Did Âli Paşa, who was grand vizier at the time of Fuad's death, express any opinion about the "testament," either in a private letter, or in a document which might be found in the archives of the Bab-ı Âli, or did he say anything to a colleague which the latter might have written down? Do the unpublished notes of Cevdet Paşa mention the "testament"? What do the files of newspapers of Istanbul for the fall of 1869 reveal—both those in Turkish and those in foreign languages? Did the editor of the *Levant Herald*, MacCoan, leave any papers? Did any of the foreign ambassadors in Istanbul in 1869 write despatches or private letters which indicated special knowledge on this subject? Or are there any records left by members of the Yeni Osmanlılar Cemiyeti, whose leaders were still in Europe at the time Fuad died, that speak of his "testament"? Or any such records by Mustafa Fazıl Paşa? Or did any of the Polish refugees in the Ottoman Empire, some of whom had connections with Fuad as well as with other Ottoman statesmen, and also with the Yeni Osmanlılar, mention this document? <sup>40</sup> Or has Melküm Han left any private papers?

<sup>40</sup> It may be that two other possibilities of authorship of the "testament" should be considered in this connection. The first is whether may any of the Yeni Osmanlılar might have written it. They did publish articles anonymously, or attribute them to others sometimes, as Ziya Paşa did with his *Zafername* and the

Where is his letter to Ahmed Rıza? Are the papers of Hikmet Bey, including the original draft of the "testament," or the papers of Reşad Fuad, available for examination?

Some of these questions may already be answered, or may be susceptible of easy answers, by scholars in Europe and in Turkey. Some of them present greater difficulties, and some may prove to be foolish questions. But it seems quite possible that through diligent research, or by pure chance, some of these questions may ultimately have answers. Such answers would then contribute to a better evaluation of the document. It might be possible to discover whether Fuad Paşa actually wrote or inspired the "testament"; if he did not write it, who did; whether it was written for reasons of from purely private motives; why it took the form of a vasiyetname to Sultan Abdülaziz rather than a more simple memorandum; what language the "testament" was originally written in; what was the language of original publication; when and where it was first published; and whether it was intended by its author for publication, or whether the publication was a breach of confidence. The result of investigation, however it may turn out, will be interesting and significant to the historian of the Tanzimat period.

---

commentary on it. But the praise of Âli Paşa in the "testament" seems to make it unlikely that one of the Yeni Osmanlılar wrote it. The other possibility is that a Polish refugee wrote the "testament." Its anti-Russian tone sounds very much like the sentiments of the Polish refugees after 1863. If, as is often suspected, the documents published in G. Giacometti, *Les responsabilités (Mesuliyet)* (Istanbul, 1294) were forged by Poles, is it possible that Fuad's "testament" might also have been forged by a Pole? On the question of authenticity of *Les responsabilités* see B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880* (Oxford, 1937), p. 681, and W. L. Langer, *European Alliances and Alignments* (New York, 1931), p. 68 and note 2. Since the *Levant Herald* was usually quite anti-Russian, is it possible that its editor received the "testament" from a Pole. The *Levant Herald* (18 February 1871) defended the authenticity of the documents in *Les responsabilités* just as vigorously as it earlier defended Fuad's "testament".