

The Treaty of Berlin 1878: Implications for Muslims Migration in Bosnia-Herzegovina before World War 1

Azlizan Mat Enh,^{*} Suffian Mansor^{**} & Mohamad Rodzi Abd. Razak^{***}

Abstract

The intervention of the great powers in the Bosnian-Herzegovina conflict of 1875-1878 led the Turkish government to sign the Treaty of Berlin of 1878. One of the terms of the Treaty of Berlin was to put the administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the auspices of the mandate of the Austrian-Hungarian government. From this point onwards, the migration process in Bosnia-Herzegovina is reflected in its population, especially Muslims. This article examines the implications of the Treaty of Berlin on issues that led to the emigration of Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina to other regions of the Turkish Empire before the outbreak of World War 1. The analysis of primary data was used on the British records from its embassy in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The study found that religious issue was a crucial factor in the migration process happened in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The migration process intensified after Bosnia-Herzegovina was formally announced to be put under the Austrian-Hungarian administration in 1908.

Keywords: Migration, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Turkey, Austria-Hungary, the Treaty of Berlin

Introduction

The Bosnian-Herzegovina conflict erupted in 1875 began with a Christian uprising against the Turkish government in Bosnia-Herzegovina. These Christians were dissatisfied with the administration of the Turkish government in Bosnia and considered that Turkey has failed to meet the demands of great power to restore peace and safeguard the welfare of Christians as enshrined in the Hatti-Humayum Decree.¹ Christians in Bosnia-Herzegovina have gained Russian support in continuing their resistance against Turkey. Russia also supported Serbia in helping Bosnia-Herzegovina Christians against Turkey in 1876. When Serbia was defeated, Russia officially declared war on Turkey, leading to the Russo-Turkish War 1876-1877. The war brought defeat to the Turkish government, and it had to end the war by signing the Treaty of San Stefano in 1877.

The San Stefano treaty threatened other great powers such as Britain, France, Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Italy. The treaty allowed Russia to regain control of the Black Sea, which had been closed to all ships in the Treaty of Paris of 1856. Russia's control over the Black Sea would make Russia a new naval power in the Aegean Gulf and threaten the non-Slavic nations in the Balkan Peninsula.² The major powers unanimously urged Russia to review its claims in the Treaty of San Stefano with Turkey. A meeting between the major powers was held in Berlin. At the negotiations in Berlin in July 1878, Russia was forced to comply with the demands of its European counterparts to sign the Treaty of Berlin 1878 that had successfully blocked Russian power in the Black Sea and its ambition to form a Slavic country in the Balkans.³ The Treaty of Berlin 1878 also gave Austria-Hungary a mandate to rule Bosnia-Herzegovina temporarily. This article analyses how the settlement of Berlin that surrendered the Bosnian-Herzegovina administration to the Austrian-Hungarian

^{*} Azlizan Mat Enh (corresponding author) (PhD), Associate Professor, Research Center for History, Politics and International Affairs, Faculty of Social Sciences And Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: azlizan@ukm.edu.my.

^{**} Suffian Mansor (PhD), Senior Lecturer, Research Center for History, Politics and International Affairs, Faculty of Social Sciences And Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: smansor@ukm.edu.my.

^{***} Mohamad Rodzi Abd. Razak, Lecturer, Research Center for History, Politics and International Affairs, Faculty of Social Sciences And Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: rodzi@ukm.edu.my.

¹ Hatti Humayum Decree was drafted between the Turkish government and the great powers on February 18, 1856, prior to the signing of the Treaty of Paris 1856. Under the Hatti Humayun Agreement the Turkish government promised to improve the administrative and social quality of its empire through reforms to be introduced into the whole territory. The aim was to restore the image and prestige of the Turkish government.

² Letter from Lord A. Loftus to Earl of Derby, Doc. 18, St. Petersburg, 29 August 1876, In. D. Gillard, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs (B DFA): Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office*.

³ Azlizan Mat Enh (2014), "The First Balkan War, 1912-1913: An Analysis from British Records," *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, pp. 109-140.

government through the Treaty of Berlin 1878 became a turning point for the migration of Muslims from the country to emigrate to the Turkish territory in Asia Minor in search of protection.⁴

The Mandate for the Austria-Hungarian Rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina

In the resolution of the Bosnian-Herzegovina conflict in Berlin 1878, the Bosnian-Herzegovina administration was handed over to Austria-Hungary temporarily until peace in the country could be restored. These terms are outlined in clause XXV of the Treaty of Berlin 1878:⁵

Bosnia-Herzegovina: To be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary, Sandjak of Novi Bazar excepted, with right of Austria-Hungary to keep Garrisons, and to have Military and Commercial Roads....Administration will continue to exercise its functions there. Nevertheless, in order to assure the maintenance of the new political state of affairs, as well as freedom and security of communications, Austria-Hungary reserves the right of keeping garrisons and having military and commercial roads in the whole of this part of the ancient vilayet of Bosnia. To this end the Governments of Austria-Hungary and Turkey reserve to themselves to come to an understanding on the details.

The Berlin negotiations in 1878 confirmed the temporary acquisition of Bosnia-Herzegovina by the Austrian-Hungarian government. The major powers, especially Britain, agreed to the decision. The Berlin Treaty, which renewed the Treaty of San Stefano on March 1878, was signed between Russia and Turkey after Turkey's defeat in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. Through the Treaty of San Stefano, Bosnia-Herzegovina was granted the status of autonomous government. However, the Treaty of San Stefano worried the great powers because the treaty gave Russia the advantage of power and influence in the Balkans through the strength of the Slavs.⁶ Russian influence in the Balkans will allow Russia to reopen the Black Sea⁷ for Russia's military and economic interests, which instead threatened the interests of the merchant ships of other European superpowers. Thus, the Treaty of San Stefano, over the diplomacy of all European superpowers, was replaced by the Treaty of Berlin of 1878. The Treaty of Berlin aimed to curb Russian influence and the rise of Slavs in the Balkans. As a result, Bosnia-Herzegovina was handed over to the Austro-Hungarian interim administration and not to Turkey.⁸ This was due to their fears of increasing Russian power and influence through the strength of the Slavs in the Balkans.⁹ Therefore, they gave the reason that the surrender would reduce the pressure on the Turkish government in Bosnia-Herzegovina while facilitating the government to regain control of its empire.¹⁰ The Turkish government has only agreed to sign the treaty after it can be certain that the Austrian-Hungarian occupation is temporary and will end after the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is settled and reached a perfect state.¹¹ Therefore, Bosnia-Herzegovina had to accept without objection the decision of the major powers over Bosnia-Herzegovina's future arrangement under Austria-Hungary.¹² The Austro-Hungarian government unanimously agreed to accept Berlin's decision to place Bosnia-Herzegovina under its administration. Austria-Hungary has also long intended to take Bosnia-Herzegovina as part of its empire. The rise of the Pan Slav movement, which caused problems to the Turks in Bosnia-Herzegovina, also threatened its empire in the Balkans, made up of the Slavs. Through the takeover of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the government intended to control Pan Slav activities in the Balkans.¹³

⁴ Azlizan Mat Enh (2016), "Balkan War 2 In 1913 And The Diplomacy Of The Great Powers: Analysis from The British Documents," *Tamkang Journal Of International Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 95-138.

⁵ Louis L. Snyder (1958), *Document of Jerman History*, Britain: Greenwood Press, pp. 237-239.

⁶ FO 373/1/11, Bosnia-Herzegovina, handbook prepared under the direction of the historical section of foreign office No.10, Foreign Office, London, 1919, p. 20.

⁷ The Black Sea was closed to Russia through the Treaty of Paris in 1856. This was in the wake of Russia's defeat in the Crimean War in 1856. Through the Treaty of Paris 1856, the straits were placed under the care of the Turkey government completely and closed to all foreign ships including Russia. The Black Sea is important to Russia's economy and military. Through the Treaty of Paris as well, Russia was dropped from a protector to the Slav Christians in the Balkans in the Turkey colonies. Russia's advance into the Balkans would create a power clash between it and Austria Hungary, and even alarmed Britain.

⁸ Aydin Babuna (2011), "The Berlin Treaty, Bosnian Muslims, and Nationalism," in M. Hakan Yavuz & Peter Sluglett (eds.), *War & Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, Utah: The University of Utah Press, pp. 198-225.

⁹ FO 373/1/11, Bosnia-Herzegovina, handbook prepared under the direction of the historical section of foreign office No.10, Foreign Office, London, 1919, p. 20.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² M. S. Anderson (1966), *The Eastern Question 1774-1923*, New York: Macmillan St. Martin's Press, p. 210.

¹³ M. Hakan Yavuz & Peter Sluglett (eds.) (2011), *War & Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, Utah: The University of Utah Press, p. 4.

Following the acquisition of the mandate to administer Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Austrian-Hungarian government implemented several reforms in the political, agricultural, economic, social and religious spheres. The reforms have brought many reactions from the people of Bosnia-Herzegovina. In essence, the Austrian-Hungarian reform and occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina were not favoured by the majority of the population, especially the Muslims and Serbians. As such, the reforms implemented by the Austrian-Hungarian government have had certain effects on the people of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The most significant result of the Austrian-Hungarian takeover of Bosnia-Herzegovina was the mass migration of Bosnia-Herzegovina's Muslims to Islamic countries, especially Turkey and other Asian Minor countries.¹⁴ Muslims consider the Berlin Agreement of 1878, which handed over Bosnia-Herzegovina to the Catholic Christian government, to be a betrayal of Bosnia-Herzegovina Muslims who have been over 400 years under the Turkish Islamic system of government. For the Serbs, the Bosnia-Herzegovina uprising in 1875-1878 against the Turkish government united Bosnia-Herzegovina with Serbia to form Greater Serbia, not to hand it over to Austria-Hungary.¹⁵ Without Bosnia-Herzegovina, the idea of the formation of Greater Serbia would not have been achieved. In addition, Serbs who are Orthodox Christians feel that their religion is superior to Catholic Christians, so they are not willing to be under the leadership of a Catholic Christian government. Furthermore, Orthodox Serbs were once tortured under the leadership of the Catholic Christian government during the Byzantine occupation of Bosnia.¹⁶

It is estimated that 130,000 Muslims have left Bosnia-Herzegovina after Austria-Hungary took over administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Thus, the takeover of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary broke the existing multi-ethnic imperialist rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina and, most notably, the occurrence of "ethnic cleansing" on Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina due to the mass migration of Bosnia-Herzegovina Muslims to Muslim countries, especially in Turkey and other Asian Minor countries.¹⁷ This shows how the European superpower wants to solve problems in the Balkans but does not consider the human rights of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the future of Muslims in Europe.¹⁸

Emigration of the Muslim Community from Bosnia-Herzegovina

Since 1878 thousands of Bosnians have been reported to have emigrated from Bosnia-Herzegovina due to the transfer of administration from the Islamic government to the Christian government. However, the number has increased since 1880. This is as reported by a British embassy official in Sarajevo:

There is no longer doubt that a very extensive emigration of the Mohammedans of these provinces will take place. Up to the present moment, I hear that a hundred and ten heads of families living in this town have applied for passports to quit the country, and at Mostar there are not it is said, a dozen Mussulman families who are not making preparations for departure. The Mohammedans of Mostar have applied to the Porte for a steamer to take them to Asia Minor... I think do not thoroughly realise the lost that will result to the country in general, and to the local exchequer in particular, for many years to come from the departure of so many of wealthiest inhabitants..¹⁹

However, the actual number of emigrants before 1882 cannot be ascertained because the government did not keep such official records.²⁰ Initially, most of these migrations were carried out by prominent families. For example, in June 1882, nine noble families were followed by 300 emigrants to Turkey.²¹ This number is increasing and continuing and is not confined to the elite but involves all levels of society. One by one, the Muslim families left Bosnia.²² By August 1882, it was reported that 15 Muslim families and 118 people had left Bosnia-Herzegovina, and many were looking for a suitable

¹⁴ FO7/1203, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 22 November 1881.

¹⁵ Azlizan Mat Enh (2010), "Malaysia's Foreign Policy towards Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992-1995," *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 311-320.

¹⁶ "Letter of Consul Holmes to Sir H. Elliot, Doc.86, Mostar, 10 September 1875," in: D. Gillard (ed.), *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, Britain: University Publications of America, Part 1, Vol. 2, p. 95.

¹⁷ FO7/1203, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 22 November 1881.

¹⁸ Azlizan Mat Enh (2010), "World War I: Who Was to Blame?," *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. XIII, No. 3, pp. 45-88.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Noel Malcolm (1994), *Bosnia A Short History*, London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd, p. 139.

²¹ FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 7 June 1882.

²² FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 16 June 1882.

time to emigrate throughout 1882.²³ Most of them were made up of traders and the middle class. For the rich, to consider that emigration is a great sacrifice to them.²⁴ They leave their possessions, including agricultural land and livestock, without being sold or taken care of before leaving.²⁵ While for the peasant community, they wait until their harvest. This has led to an increasing number of migrants over time as these groups are waiting for the right time to emigrate from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

This number then increased in 1883 where 700 families had emigrated from Bosnia-Herzegovina to seek refuge in Islamic countries, especially in Turkey.²⁶ The migration continues from year to year. However, the entire migrant population cannot be precisely identified. This is because many of them emigrate without legal permission. As a result, the actual number of migrants is more significant than that recorded. The Turkish government initially agreed to accept and provide protection to the Bosnian-Herzegovina population in Turkey. They were housed alongside other Bosnian-Herzegovina Muslim communities in Turkey.²⁷ However, the government was eventually forced to reject their presence because the Turkish government could no longer accommodate the large numbers of people living in Turkey.

The migration process among Bosnian Muslims is not due to coercion. However, the Austro-Hungarian administration, which wants to form a hegemonic nation-state, has made Bosnian Muslims a minority due to religious differences and the segregation process in multi-ethnic society in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Therefore, the mass exodus of the Muslim community encompasses various layers of the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is made up of aristocratic classes, merchants, wealthy landowners and other middle-class and not to neglect peasants. Therefore, several factors lead to the emigration of Muslim communities from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Factors of the Muslim Emigration

Islam

Religious factors play an essential role in encouraging the Bosnian-Herzegovina Muslims to emigrate to other Islamic countries.²⁸ They refused to be ruled by the Christian government. As an independent country, in terms of principles and theory, all the religious leaders in Bosnia-Herzegovina were given the freedom to teach and practice their religious teachings without any government intervention. Every religious institution will receive the same treatment by the government. However, in practical terms, the Austrian-Hungarian government in Bosnia-Herzegovina gave many privileges to the church and the Catholic Christians.²⁹ In addition, the government also elected and appointed all religious leaders. In all three religions, the Catholic Church is the group that grew and changed at the fastest rate. For example, the Catholic Church has proliferated in just six years, from 800 in 1878 to 3,876 in 1884 alone in Sarajevo alone.³⁰ The Catholic Church is the most active church under the Austrian-Hungarian government compared to thousands of years ago in the history of churches in Bosnia-Herzegovina.³¹ They believe that Islam forbids its people to be put under the leadership of the Christian government and want to remain under the protection of the Sultan.

In addition, apostasy cases or conversion of religion from Islam to Catholic Christianity were also factors in the migration of Bosnian Muslims. In 1891, the government passed a law banning religious conversion among people under the age of 18 and established a commission to investigate cases of religious conversion. Anyone who wants to change religion before that age needs to get permission from their guardian. This was done after the Muslim community demanded that the government take serious cases of religious conversion among Muslims. What worries these Muslims is that the case

²³ FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 7 August 1882.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 16 June 1882.

²⁶ FO 7/1057, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 26 June 1883.

²⁷ FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 7 June 1882.

²⁸ FO7/1057, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report Sarajevo, 26 June 1883.

²⁹ FO 7/1086, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 10 September 1885. See also Azlizan Mat Enh (2006), "Reformasi Austria-Hungary di Bosnia-Herzegovina dan kesannya terhadap Muslim 1878-1907," *Jurnal Ilmu Kemanusiaan*, Vol. 13, pp. 89- 95.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ FO7/1057, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report Sarajevo, 26 June 1883.

The Treaty of Berlin 1878: Implications for Muslims Migration in Bosnia-Herzegovina before World War I involves a lot of underage Muslim girls. These girls want to change religion mostly because they want to marry a Catholic Christian man.

Apostasy is the biggest problem and the main challenge facing the Muslim community since the Austrian-Hungarian government took over the Bosnian-Herzegovina administration. From 1879 to 1900, during the 22 years of the Austrian-Hungarian administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina, there were 33 officially reported religious conversion cases.³² The first identified case of religious conversion was in 1881 when a girl under the age of 16 converted to marry a Catholic Christian carpenter.³³ On the other hand, for the Austro-Hungarian government, it is just an isolated case, and it did not take the issue seriously:

In general, I can state that since 1878, that is to say is 22 years, altogether, 33 Bosnian Herzegovina Mohammedan have changed religion – only 1 or 2 a year. As a set off against this 29 person have gone over to the Mohammedan faith. These data are sufficient proof that if now and there such cases occur, which I in the highest degree disapprove of they are rare and isolated.³⁴

In addition, in 1890, there was a case in which a girl became a Christian at the age of 16. He worked with the Austrian-Hungarian officials, eventually converted to Christianity, and lived as a nun in the church. The girl was said to be influenced by the priest's teachings and hidden in the church.³⁵ Such an incident not only made the girl an apostate but also embarrassed her family members. Although the Catholic priests do not openly encourage them to adopt the Catholic religion, they do their best to help those who come to them convert to Catholicism. These women will be protected and hidden by the Church in Catholic schools or the priest's house. The church did not want to cooperate or tell where the girls were hidden.³⁶ In addition, the case involved a widow named Sala Sibiric with two of her children, reportedly from a region known as Konjica in Herzegovina.³⁷

She and her two children were reported to have been Christianized by Archbishop Stadler during his visit to the area. The Muslim community is becoming increasingly angry with the government for being silent on the matter. If the government is weak in addressing religious conversion, the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina will disappear.³⁸ The issue of religious conversion was a factor in which the Muslims migrated out of the concern and lost confidence in the Austrian-Hungarian government's resolve to address this issue.

The Loss of Privileges

One of the reasons the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina emigrated from the country was the loss of their privileges.³⁹ Under the rule of the Turkish government, the Muslims had good jobs and were important officials in the government. Now those positions have been taken over by Christian staff. Now, they are no longer as influential in the government department as they were before Austria-Hungary. The situation has led to feelings of inferiority among Muslims. This is because those who once ruled are now ruled by foreigners in their own country. The government's belief that the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina will socialise and adapt to the new government is inaccurate.⁴⁰ The Muslims who had long been hostile to the Austrian-Hungarian government could not contain their anger against the government, as the government tried to intervene in matters related to Islamic affairs. The privileges enjoyed by the Muslims before the advent of Austria-Hungary were now abolished, such as the right to arms and changes in the agrarian system, which greatly affected the landlords.⁴¹ This issue is a sensitive issue for Muslims and difficult for them to accept and obey: "...many villagers will probably never hear of it, others will disregard it, and I believe that the only

³² FO7/1304, Excerpt from the speech by Her Von Szell, Hungarian Prime Minister, in an answer to an interpellation in Hungarian Parliament on the Bosnian Administration, Sarajevo, 28 November 1900.

³³ FO 7/1315, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 26 June 1901.

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ FO 7/1290, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 27 November 1890.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ FO 7/1345, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 3 April 1903.

³⁸ FO 7/1345, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 9 April 1903.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 3 July 1879.

⁴¹ Nur Ainul Basyirah Alias, Emy Azziaty Rozali & Shamsul Azhar Yahya (2019), "Toleransi Agama Dan Keadilan Sosial Di Bosnia & Herzegovina Era Penguasaan Uthmaniyyah Abad Ke-15 Hingga Abad Ke-17M," *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 89–98.

effectual method of collecting all arms in the country would be to makeof the different parishes personally responsible for their delivery to the authorities.”⁴²

Even before that, since the uprising in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1875-1878, one of the causes of dissatisfaction of the Christian community was the issue of arms ownership among Muslims. Under the Austria-Hungary administration, Muslims were required to surrender weapons. The culture of having weapons among Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina is symbolic that symbolises them as Muslims and the people of the Sultan. They have been practising possession of weapons since a young age. It is impossible to force them to leave the culture, and even this culture is recognised by British officials who report as: “That as is was impossible to disarm the Turkish population, who wore arms from their childhood...”⁴³

The importance of owning such weapons existed not only after Austria-Hungary’s arrival but also since the rule of the Turkish government. The Turkish government granted the right to possession of weapons to all Muslims in its empire, including in Bosnia-Herzegovina since ruling Bosnia 400 years ago. This has become a practice and tradition to Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Therefore, the decision of the Austro-Hungarian government to withdraw the law has been considered embarrassing to Muslims. However, gun ownership among Muslims is a sensitive issue that is difficult for Muslims to hand over as this is their tradition and culture.

In addition, much of the abandoned Muslim land was transferred to Christian landlords. As a result, the rights of Muslims have mainly been usurped by their Christian friends. Austria-Hungary’s policy was to encourage the arrival of Christians throughout its empire to immigrate to Bosnia-Herzegovina. This was intended to give more opportunities to Christians from the Austro-Hungarian empire to settle and assimilate with the local Bosnian community:

Looking at the matter from a political point of view, as they are perhaps more inclined to do, it will doubtless, by the transfer of much land to Christian and foreign proprietors and the introduction of Austrian and other colonists, facilitate the task of governing and the eventual assimilation of the province with the rest of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.⁴⁴

This policy is a loss to the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is because when more and more Muslims emigrate, especially the rich, this is a loss to the country, as they are mostly traders and aristocrats who have status in society. However, this policy was an Austrian-Hungarian strategy to maintain its power in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Muslims are also very angry with the Austro-Hungarian government when their houses of worship were also desecrated and disrespected by the government. However, they can still accept if the house of worship is used during the war by the government but not by insulting Islam by placing items that are forbidden by Islam which the Austro-Hungarian government did:

I would like have mentioned what may appear trifling but is at the mussulman of this town. All the mosques advantageously situated have been used by the military authorities as stores and magazines. To this, in principle, the people do not object, and in wartime, even the Turkish government stored grain, ammunition, clothing in the mosque, but the prejudice of the Muslims have been offended by wine and hogs lard having also been stored in some of them by the Austrians.⁴⁵

The attitude of the Austro-Hungarian government, which has no respect for Islam and is insensitive to the feelings of the Muslim community, has caused Austria-Hungary to fail to get the support of the Muslim community during its administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina. During the rule of the Turkish government, mosques and Muslims always had a special place in the Turkish government. The Muslim population had lost this privilege under the Austro-Hungarian administration. This is one of

⁴² FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 3 July 1879.

⁴³ Letter from Sir A. Buchanan to Earl of Derby, Doc.258, Vienna, 17 May 1876. Cited from D. Gillard (ed.) (1984), *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, Part 1, Vol. 2, Britain: University Publications of America, p. 204.

⁴⁴ FO 7/1203 Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 22 November 1881.

⁴⁵ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman kepada Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 23 January 1879.

The Treaty of Berlin 1878: Implications for Muslims Migration in Bosnia-Herzegovina before World War I
the factors that led to the mass emigration of Muslims. Their emigration was a sign of protest to the Austro-Hungarian government.

Attack on Muslims during the Uprising of 1879

The failure of the reforms implemented by the government to help the farmers made the crops unmanageable. The bad weather hit Bosnia-Herzegovina throughout 1879. The long snow, followed by heavy rains throughout the summer, brought devastation to the crops.⁴⁶ They need help such as seeds and equipment to allow them to replant. It is not the landlord's responsibility to provide such assistance to farmers who are mostly Christians. Most of landlords are Muslims. Disputes in agricultural issues involving Muslim landlords with Christian farmers continue to arise and become problems that the government does not immediately resolve. The Austro-Hungarian government allegedly failed to implement reforms in agriculture to protect both parties effectively, as stated below: "Then again, the agrarian question is a continued thorn in the side of the Mussulmans and Christians, the former consider that their interests are not sufficiently protected, while the latter are disappointed that they have not been put in the place of the Mussulmans as proprietors of the soil."⁴⁷

This situation has prompted the Christian farmers to act rapaciously against landlords who are predominantly Muslim. They refused to cultivate and left their farm.⁴⁸ When the landlords demanded their share or rent of land leased to farmers, they attacked the landlords. This makes the landlords always feel their safety is at stake. In addition, landlords also suffered losses because the land leased to the Christian farmers was neglected. This has threatened the peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina due to clashes between landlords and farmers.

The failure to implement effective reforms in agriculture and administration resulted in them suffering from food shortages and not having enough supplies to meet their needs.⁴⁹ This frustration caused many peasants to join the revolt against the government in 1879, but the victims were Muslim landlords.⁵⁰ The Muslims are no longer safe to live in Bosnia-Herzegovina without the Sultan's help. It was also a factor in the emigration of Bosnia-Herzegovina Muslims to other Turkish territories for protection.

Violence against the Muslims in the Revolt of 1882

The Muslims can no longer deal with the Christian community, which have given them many hardships.⁵¹ The Christian community became increasingly rampant under the Austrian-Hungarian government. They were victims of the Serb Christians because of the failure of the Austrian-Hungarian reforms and the Serb hatred of the Austrian-Hungarian presence in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Their homes were raided, and various acts of violence were committed against the Muslims by the Christian rebels. Their children were abducted and family members killed if they refused to cooperate with the Serb rebels. The military law of 1882, which prevented locals from storing weapons, made Muslims unable to respond to the rebels. They only use weapons such as knives and axes at home to defend themselves. The government failed to guarantee their safety.⁵²

The family defended themselves as long as possible with axes and anything that came to hand... One of the grievances of the Mohammadan population is that they do not receive sufficient protection from the government against these insurgents bands, and yet have been deprived of the means of defending themselves.⁵³

The Increase of Hanging Punishment

The hanging and killings imposed on the rebels who are against the Austrian-Hungarian government in Bosnia-Herzegovina were higher than in the Turkish government days, which greatly disappointed

⁴⁶ FO 7/1026, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Report On The Trade of Bosnia-Herzegovina For The Year 1880, 5 March 1881.

⁴⁷ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman kepada Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Bosna Serai, 28 October 1879.

⁴⁸ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 19 February 1879.

⁴⁹ Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani, Mat Zin Mat Kib & Azlizan Mohd Eah (2020), "Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation (1963-1966) and the Peace Talks for Restoration of Relationship," *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol, 23, No. 3, pp. 103-142.

⁵⁰ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman kepada Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Bosna Serai, 25 September 1879.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² FO7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report Sarajevo, 21 October, 1882.

⁵³ Ibid

the people.⁵⁴ According to the rebels, although the people had launched a massive uprising against the Turkish government, the punishment was not as arbitrary as the present Austrian-Hungarian government to end the uprising.⁵⁵ However, according to them, Bosnians were being beheaded almost every day, and most of them were not tried. They consider that such actions will not prevent the people's opposition to the government but will cause the situation to worsen. This is because it is not a wise move for a civilised government and not a practice for a free country.⁵⁶

Among others, they suggested that the government work with the local people to get their views and advice before decisions are made on the people. They also demanded the right to discuss and freedom of speech in their country freely. They further reminded the government that all laws that impede freedom and create dissatisfaction must be abolished. If the government fails to contain the people's anger, this reform will end with a revolution someday.⁵⁷ However, these demands cannot be fully met by the government. Since the Bosnian-Herzegovina takeover, the government has been trying to strengthen its position in Bosnia-Herzegovina rather than improve the population's economy. Therefore, the reforms intended to change the lives of the poor, especially the peasantry, cannot be fully implemented. The following is a statement expressing the dissatisfaction of Muslims as reported:

They ask, with much justice, what they have gained by the Austrian occupation. They have lost all their former consideration and importance in the country and before the government, they are with few occupations excluded from taking part in the administration of the province, their commerce has been ruined and passed into the hand of the foreigner, their taxes have been increased, the cost of living has doubled and now they are asked to give their blood for a government they dislike.⁵⁸

The peasants also claimed that their fate was still unveiled under the Austria-Hungarian administration.⁵⁹ The great powers mandated that Austria-Hungary introduce reforms to create a better administration and bring peace to Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, the peasants and eventually all classes and segments of society complained and were dissatisfied with the Austrian-Hungarian government. Therefore, locals were wondering about the reforms the government should introduce to uphold their fate. Instead, they claim that their fate is better under the Turkish government than under the new regime.⁶⁰ For the Muslims, they want to remain Sultan, and emigration is the best option for them.

Change in the Waqf System

The waqf law of 1882 enacted by the Austrian-Hungarian government significantly altered the implementation of this waqf system. Among them, the law specifies that only the government will appoint a committee member to handle matters related to waqf. Second, the local government will closely monitor all financial matters relating to the expenditure of waqf property. The expenditure will be audited, and a receipt will be issued for each expense incurred on the waqf property.⁶¹ Moreover, they also disagree that the salary of the mufti or Reisul Ulama will be paid using the income from the waqf property. The Muslim community did not welcome Austrian-Hungarian intervention and control in the management of waqf:

Provincial vakuf commission has been underground and reorganise. I need hardly say that it was not very pleasing to the Mohammedan population, or at least not to the mussulman clergy or "Ulama" and to the influential classes of whom so many were pecuniarily interested in the matter. But, above all, they cannot reconcile themselves to the idea of being subject in their religious affairs to the control of foreign Christians officials control which they perceived was not even exercised over the native Christian communities.⁶²

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Mohd Irwan Syazli Saidin & O'Neill, J. R. M. (2021), "Book Review: Fred Halliday (2014): The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology," *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*. Vol. 16, No. 1, 195–196.

⁵⁷ FO7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report Sarajevo, 21 October, 1882.

⁵⁸ FO 7/1203 Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Serajevo, 22 November 1881.

⁵⁹ Consul Freeman, FO 7/1005, Holmes to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 20 September 1880.

⁶⁰ FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 1 July 1879.

⁶¹ FO 7/1263, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 23 March 1895.

⁶² Ibid

Both reforms in the field of waqf management and the appointment of Reisul Ulama received opposition from the Muslims. They do not feel happy with their religious affairs being controlled and determined by foreign officials.⁶³ They also oppose the government's actions because such control over religious issues does not apply to other Christian communities in Bosnia-Herzegovina. They demand that the government give them complete freedom to handle all religious matters.⁶⁴ They also warned the government that fifteen thousand Muslims were preparing to emigrate from Bosnia-Herzegovina.⁶⁵ The emigration could give the Austrian-Hungarian government a bad image.

Meanwhile, the government's intention to establish a waqf commission in Bosnia-Herzegovina under the control of the government also has its reasons. They know that the purpose of the government is to regulate all expenditure on the waqf, which is free to operate without the control and responsibility of Constantinople. This indirectly eliminated the mufti's power to safeguard the waqf property instead of giving the local government more power over the waqf lands.⁶⁶

Similarly, the appointment of Reisul Ulama without the consent of Sheikhul Islam in Constantinople was intended to separate relations between leaders of the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina with the Turkish government. This is because the Austrian-Hungarian government is concerned that relations between the two and the influence of Constantinople may undermine their position in Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, the petitions sent to the Austrian-Hungarian government received no positive response. Instead, the government did not accept the petition because Bosnia-Herzegovina had a Minister of Finance who should take care of the matter. In addition, the government has rejected the petition because they believe that the Muslims often make similar demands, which the government cannot realise. This is because if the government accepts the demands of Muslims, the government will also face pressure from the Orthodox Christians in Bosnia-Herzegovina.⁶⁷ Thus the claim of Muslims on two crucial issues for the Muslims, namely the system of appointing the Reisul Ulama and the manner of implementation of the waqf, was not agreed upon. According to the Austrian-Hungarian government, the Muslims often filed protests against their government for defaming Austria-Hungary. This has provoked anger among Muslims.

Besides that, in December 1900, Muslim representatives from all over Bosnia-Herzegovina, including the Mufti (Mostar) and Bali Bey (wealthy landlords), met with the Austria-Hungarian government represented by Baron Von Kallay and Baron Kutchers. The issues discussed are about the administration of the waqf property and the system of appointing Reisul Ulama.⁶⁸ However, the discussion still failed to meet the demands of the Muslims.

Thus, the failure led a Muslim delegation led by Haji Sali Effendi, a mufti from Mostar, to Constantinople to complain to the Sultan. Along with him were five other leaders from each province of Bosnia-Herzegovina. They comprise Hamdi Bey Hassan Pasic (Travnic), Pilgrims Suleiman Bey Cevic (Banjaluka) Iskandar Bey (Bihac) and Haji Osman Effendi (Tuzla).⁶⁹ The delegation's mission was to express their frustration and anger against the Austrian-Hungarian administration in Bosnia-Herzegovina, especially against the Muslims. However, their actions were considered against the government. As a result, they have been found guilty of several charges. Among them, first, they are said to have incited the public to oppose the government. Second, inciting the people to leave Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the third, accused of smuggling weapons to disrupt domestic security while inciting the Muslims to oppose the government. Eventually, six of them were found guilty and banned from entering Bosnia-Herzegovina. They will still be sentenced if they return home and stay in Bosnia-Herzegovina.⁷⁰

The verdict sparked outrage among the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina. As a result, their trial was conducted in Travnik province. The government is worried that the Muslim uprising against the government will erupt if they are tried in Sarajevo or Mostar. However, due to concerns over the

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ FO 7/1315, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 29 March 1901.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ FO 7/1304, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 28 November 1900.

⁶⁸ FO 7/1315, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 29 March 1901.

⁶⁹ FO7/1329, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 20 March 1902.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

resurgence of all Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina over the verdict, in 1903, all six leaders were allowed to return to Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, they refused to return to Sarajevo and stayed in Constantinople.⁷¹

On the other hand, Muslim dissatisfaction and opposition to the Austro-Hungarian administration have brought a new dimension to political developments among Bosnian Muslims. The first political association to fight for Muslim rights was established, the Muslim National Organization (MNO), in 1906. Before this, Muslims never had any political party. Thus, the MNO was the first Bosnian single political party to voice their dissatisfaction, rights, and interests, which the government had previously ignored.⁷²

Muslim Migration

The Muslims who emigrated from Bosnia-Herzegovina left their farmlands and homes alone. Most Bosnian Muslims were made up of landlords. When they left their lands, the lands were taken by the peasants who rented them. In addition, the government also gazetted lands that were idle as government property. Some Muslims have left their property behind in the hope of a return to Bosnia with a new settlement. However, many of them are stranded on the journey and die from cold weather and food shortages and illnesses. The influx of those seeking refuge is estimated to exceed 100,000 between 1878 and 1912.⁷³ Most Bosnia-Herzegovina noble families migrated to Istanbul, Izmir, and Damascus. Others chose to settle in Haifa, Nablus and Caesarea in Palestine to form Bosnian settlements. The Bosnian Muslims chose to settle in the states at the Balkan border under the Turkish territory near Bosnia-Herzegovina. They emigrated to other Turkish territories as a form of loyalty and sincerity. These include loyalty to the state, military service, protecting the country's borders and security, including paying taxes to the government.⁷⁴ Their loyalty is seen as their fundamental obligation to the Turkish imperial empire that ruled Bosnia-Herzegovina for over 400 years.

In the early stages of the Turkish government under Sultan Abdul Hamid II, it was believed that Turkey should protect the refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina. Therefore, the government has provided housing, transportation and agricultural land for them to undertake.⁷⁵ The government welcomes them well and provides everything they need. It is undeniable that history has proven that the Turkish government has always been concerned about the fate of the Muslims and the Muslims in the Balkans.⁷⁶ However, the gradual and widespread emigration of Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1875 to 1913 posed a significant challenge to the Turkish government and its settlers as they faced issues of congestion and famine.⁷⁷ They had to beg in the streets and mosques for food. In addition, local governments can no longer provide homes and vehicles when they arrive. The migration in the Turkish territory was from Bosnia-Herzegovina and throughout the empire in the Balkans and Europe that began in the 1860s after Turkey defeated Russia, its allies in the Crimean War 1856.⁷⁸ Migration is, therefore, a burden not only to immigrants but also to the Turkish government. The number of emigrants to Istanbul alone has exceeded hundreds. The Turkish government in 1880 deported 200,000 immigrants to Anatolia for protection and life. That same year the Turkish government had to open a bank account to help the 60,000 immigrants. By 1904, the Turkish government had passed a law restricting permits allowing Bosnia-Herzegovina migrants to the Turkish Empire.⁷⁹ However, the migration process continued after Austria-Hungary officially took Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 and after the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 between Turkey and Serbia's alliance, Bulgaria Montenegro. The Turkish government could not prevent the migration of thousands of Bosnia and Herzegovina people to other territories in the Turkey Empire for protection.⁸⁰

⁷¹ FO 7/1345, Surat Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 30 November 1903.

⁷² Yavuz & Sluglett (2011), *War & Diplomacy*, p. 198.

⁷³ Leyla Azmi Erdogdular (2013), "Afterlife of Empire: Muslim-Ottoman Relations in Habsburg Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878-1914," PhD thesis, Columbia University, p. 89.

⁷⁴ Dževada Šuško (2014), "Bosniaks & Loyalty: Responses to the Conscription Law in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1881/82," *Hungarian Historical Review*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 529.

⁷⁵ Mehtap Nasiroğlu Aydın (2012), "Bosnia-Herzegovina Refugees In The 19th and 20th Centuries In the Light of Ottoman Documents," The 2nd International Balkan Annual Conference, 10-12 October 2012, Tiran, p. 529.

⁷⁶ Kemal Karpat (2002), *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, Leiden: Brill, p. 529.

⁷⁷ Erdogdular (2013), "Afterlife of Empire," p. 89.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Jared Manasek (2013), "Empire Displaced: Ottoman-Habsburg Forced Migration and the Near Eastern Crisis, 1875-1878," PhD thesis, Columbia University, p. 284.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 285.

When the major powers saw too much emigration, the major powers urged Austria-Hungary to enact laws to prevent more people from leaving Bosnia-Herzegovina. In addition, the major powers also demanded that Austria-Hungary treat fairly and not punish the Muslims upon their return to Bosnia-Herzegovina. The issue of migration is not a problem of the Turkish government but a problem in the Austrian-Hungarian system. Violence against Muslims by the Austrian-Hungarian government only forced them to emigrate. Migration was an ethnic cleansing method used by Austria-Hungary to dismantle the Turkish empire in Europe, especially in the Balkans. Austria-Hungary aspired to emerge as a hegemonic power by forming a nation-state with a hegemonic demographic.

Through the Berlin Agreement of 1878, Austria-Hungary was required to demonstrate its ability to maintain peace and maintain multi-ethnic groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina.⁸¹ Austria-Hungary acted to control population migration by encouraging multi-ethnic migration from the Austro-Hungarian empire to obscure the great powers.⁸² For Austria-Hungary, they also have an interest in maintaining the Muslim population in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Preserving the Muslim population is essential to the Austria-Hungary administration, demonstrating its ability to govern and maintain and maintain the elite in the Bosnian-Herzegovina province.⁸³ Through a census conducted in 1910, out of a total of 1,898,044 people in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the census showed that 32 percent of the population in Sarajevo was Jewish and Catholic.⁸⁴ They came from various provinces of the Habsburg (Austria-Hungary) empire to Sarajevo and worked as government officials, merchants and other jobs.⁸⁵ The migration of Jews and Catholic Christians in Sarajevo increased compared to the current Turkish government, with only 19.4 percent of Catholic Christians throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina and about 3.6 percent following the Turkish government's census 1876. The Austrian-Hungarian administration drew Jewish and Catholic Christians from the empire to emigrate and settle in Bosnia-Herzegovina, particularly Sarajevo, to offset the number of multiethnicity found in Bosnia-Herzegovina to replace the Muslim population migrating abroad.

Conclusion

The arrival of Austria-Hungary to Bosnia-Herzegovina, as agreed by the major powers in the Treaty of Berlin 1878, was to restore peace in the region. Thus, the Austrian-Hungarian government sought to introduce reforms in administration, including politics, economy, society, education, and religion. However, its reform failed to bring peace and prosperity to Bosnia-Herzegovina. It also indirectly illustrates that the administration introduced by the Austrian-Hungarian government failed to meet the expectations of the great powers to provide peace to Bosnia-Herzegovina as entrusted to it under the Treaty of Berlin 1878. One of the apparent consequences of the Austrian-Hungarian occupation was the mass migration of Muslim communities from Bosnia-Herzegovina. The migration was one of several forms of protest by the Muslim community over the Austrian-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. They do not like being ruled by the Christian government. This has led to their migration to other Islamic countries such as Turkey and Asia Minor. Most of them consist of merchants, landlords and ordinary people. As a result of this emigration, they have abandoned their interests such as property and position in society. This is also driven by their belief in the teachings of Islam, which prohibits its people from being under the leadership of the Christian religion.

Among the main factors of the Muslim resistance to the Austrian-Hungarian administration was the government's eagerness to introduce the European culture and administrative systems before locals were ready to accept it. Those who have been under the rule of the Turkish government are unable to adapt to the Western reforms introduced by the government. Furthermore, the government's policy on religious issues has sparked protests in the state. The Muslims have never liked the government's steps in overseeing all their religious affairs and activities. The government's oversight of the waqf system has created opposition among Muslims. The government's move to control the finances and funds of mosques or churches has also brought opposition among the Muslim community and the Orthodox Christians. In addition, the privileges enjoyed by the Muslims before the arrival of Austria-Hungary were now abolished, such as the right to arms and changes in the agrarian system that greatly

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 283.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 283.

⁸⁴ Mariana Lukic Tanovic (2014), "Demographic development of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Ottoman period till 1991 and the modern demographic problems," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 120, pp. 241.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

affected the landlords. The laws of the Al-Quran and the Sunnah have long governed Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina. They cannot accept anything contrary to Islamic teachings. They feel that their Christian friends have taken their rights. What the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina wanted was to remain under the control of the Sultan. This led to the emigration of Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina to seek protection from the Sultan of the Turkish Empire.

The Berlin Agreement of 1878 did not bring about changes to better administration and management of the people of Bosnia Herzegovina as they claimed. In addition to the mass exodus of Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina, an anti-Austro-Hungarian movement emerged in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The agreement did not solve the problem in Bosnia Herzegovina but only postponed the conflict for a while. This is because the decision made in Berlin was not with the will of the local people but with the consent of the great powers. Thus, a series of uprisings continued against the Austro-Hungarian government in Bosnia-Herzegovina, even intensified by anti-Assyrian-Hungarian groups with the help of their brothers from Serbia. The series of anti-Austro-Hungarian protests could not be stopped, leading to the assassination of the Austro-Hungarian Crown Prince and his queen in Sarajevo in 1914, which triggered the First World War.

Acknowledgement

This research is funded by Ministry of Higher Education under the FRGS grant: FRGS/1/2021/SSI0/UKM/02/1.

References

“Letter of Consul Holmes to Sir H. Elliot, Doc.86, Mostar, 10 September 1875,” in. D. Gillard (ed.), *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, Britain: University Publications of America, Part 1, Vol. 2.

Anderson, M. S. (1966), *The Eastern Question 1774-1923*, New York: Macmillan St. Martin’s Press.

Azlizan Mat Enh (2010), “Malaysia’s foreign policy towards Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992-1995,” *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 311-320.

Azlizan Mat Enh (2010), “World War 1: Who Was to Blame?,” *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. XIII, No. 3, 45-88.

Azlizan Mat Enh (2014), “The First Balkan War, 1912-1913: An Analysis from British Records,” *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, 109-140.

Azlizan Mat Enh (2016), “Balkan War 2 In 1913 And The Diplomacy Of The Great Powers: Analysis From The British Documents,” *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 95-138.

Babuna, A. (2011), “The Berlin Treaty, Bosnian Muslims, and Nationalism,” in M. Hakan Yavuz & Peter Sluglett (eds.), *War & Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, Utah: The University of Utah Press.

Erdogdular, L. A. (2013), “Afterlife of Empire: Muslim-Ottoman Relations in Habsburg Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878-1914,” PhD thesis, Columbia University.

FO 105/6, Captain Hewage to Foreign Secretary, Transmits alleged “Petition from 150 Christian Of Bosnia and the Herzegovina to Count Andrassy” praying for relief to the perishing refugees, and administration reforms, Belgrade, 2 April 1879.

FO 373/1/11, Bosnia-Herzegovina, handbook prepared under the direction of the historical section of foreign office No.10, Foreign Office, London, 1919.

FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 19 February 1879.

The Treaty of Berlin 1878: Implications for Muslims Migration in Bosnia-Herzegovina before World War I
FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 1 July 1879.

FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 3 July 1879.

FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 20 September 1880.

FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 25 September 1879.

FO 7/1005, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 28 October 1879.

FO 7/1026, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Report On The Trade of Bosnia-Herzegovina For The Year 1880, 5 March 1881.

FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 7 June, 1882.

FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 16 June, 1882.

FO 7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 7 August, 1882.

FO 7/1057, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 26 June, 1883.

FO 7/1086, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 10 September 1885.

FO 7/1203 Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 22 November 1881.

FO 7/1203, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 22 November 1881.

FO 7/1263, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 23 March 1895.

FO 7/1290, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 27 November 1890.

FO 7/1304, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 28 November 1900.

FO 7/1304, Excerpt from the speech by Her Von Szell, Hungarian Prime Minister, in an answer to an interpellation in Hungarian Parliament on the Bosnian Administration, Sarajevo, 28 November 1900.

FO 7/1315, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 29 March 1901.

FO 7/1315, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 26 June 1901.

FO 7/1345, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 3 April 1903.

FO 7/1345, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 9 April 1903.

FO 7/1345, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 30 November 1903.

FO7/1041, Letter from Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report Sarajevo, 21 October, 1882.

FO7/1329, Consul Holmes Freeman to Foreign Secretary, Consul Report, Sarajevo, 20 March 1902.

Karpat, K. (2002), *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, Leiden: Brill.

Malcolm, N. (1994), *Bosnia A Short History*, London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Manasek, J. (2013), "Empire Displaced: Ottoman-Habsburg Forced Migration and the Near Eastern Crisis, 1875-1878," PhD thesis, Columbia University.

Mohd Irwan Syazli Saidin & O'Neill, J. R. M. (2021), "Book Review: Fred Halliday (2014): The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology," *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*. Vol. 16, No. 1, 195–196.

Nasiroglu, M. (2012), "Bosnia-Herzegovina Refugees in The 19th and 20th Centuries In the Light of Ottoman Documents," The 2nd International Balkan Annual Conference, 10-12 October 2012, Tiran.

Nur Ainul Basyirah Alias, Ermy Azziaty Rozali & Shamsul Azhar Yahya (2019), "Toleransi Agama Dan Keadilan Sosial Di Bosnia & Herzegovina Era Penguasaan Uthmaniyyah Abad Ke-15 Hingga Abad Ke-17M," *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 89–98.

Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani, Mat Zin Mat Kib & Azlizan Mohd Eah (2020), "Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation (1963-1966) and the Peace Talks for Restoration of Relationship," *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, Vol, 23, No. 3, 103-142.

Snyder, L. L. (1958), *Document of German History*, Britain: Greenwood Press.

Šuško, D. (2014), "Bosniaks & Loyalty: Responses to the Conscription Law in Bosnia and Hercegovina 1881/82," *Hungarian Historical Review*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 529-559.

Tanovic, M. L. (2014), "Demographic development of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Ottoman period till 1991 and the modern demographic problems," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 120, 238-247.

Yavuz, M. H. & Sluglett, P. (2011), *War & Diplomacy The Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, Utah: The University of Utah Press.