

Res. Asst. Dr.
Sedat KANATBingol University, Faculty of Arts and
Sciences, Department of History
sedat5825_kanat@yahoo.com.trORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8662-9069>

Eser Geçmişi / Article Past: 25 Mar 2019 / 30 Mar 2019

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21551/jhf.544365>

Orjinal Makale / Original Paper

In the 19th Century the Relations of the Foreign Ambassadors and Missioners with the Ottoman Empire' Management

19. yüzyılda Yabancı Büyükelçi ve Misyonerlerin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Yönetimiyle İlişkileri

Abstract

The Ottoman Empire, perhaps, was last strong example of the classical empires age. Sovereign, at the beginning, was most powerful person. But in time the power of Sultan come to be separated among different pivots. One of the these pivots has been Bâbiâlî. Its effect aura had started to spread out from the end of the 18th century. On the other side, foreign ambassadors and missioners have also obtained a big potency in the 19th century with modern diplomacy coming to gained gravity in the field of management.

Keywords: Bâbiâlî, Foreign Ambassadors, Missioners, Modern Diplomacy.

Öz

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, klasik imparatorluklar çağının belki de son güçlü örneğiydi. Hükümdar başlangıçta en güçlü kişiydi. Fakat onun gücü zamanla farklı eksenler arasında dağılmaya başladı. Bu eksenlerden birisi Bâbiâlî olmuştur. Onun etki alanı 18. yüzyıldan itibaren genişlemeye başlamıştı. Diğer taraftan yabancı büyükelçi ve misyonerler de, 19. yüzyılda modern diplomasinin yönetim alanında ağırlık kazanmaya başlamasıyla birlikte büyük bir güç elde etmişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bâbiâlî, Yabancı Büyükelçiler, Misyonerler, Modern Diploması.

ATIF: KANAT Sedat, "19. yüzyılda Yabancı Büyükelçi ve Misyonerlerin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Yönetimiyle İlişkileri" **Tarih ve Gelecek Dergisi**, 5/1 (Nisan-2019), s. (10-22)

CITE: KANAT Sedat, "In the 19th Century the Relations of the Foreign Ambassadors and Missioners with the Ottoman Empire' Management" **Journal of History and Future**, 5/1 (April-2019), pp. (10-22)

1. Introduction

1.1. Function of the Palace in the Ottoman Empire Management Comprehension

The Palace was institution which was represented of the traditional state comprehension as center of the Ottoman Empire.¹ The Sultan was being presented at the pinnacle of management system. His power had overlapped all of the balance elements, though this power has been constricted by the Sharia and rebel threats.² Besides, the some famous bureaucrats would ascend the throne of somebody who may be benefit for they. This case was same a election which made of the elite formal electors in the Palace.³ Since Murat II in the Palace, for example, an influential family was Çandarlıs. Fatih Sultan Conqueror was able to wipe out the their penetration into the state affairs after he took possession of the management.⁴

Most shining periods of the Ottoman Empire were lived in the of Yavuz Sultan Selim and Suleyman Magnificent's epochs. Most important successes of the first had realised the end of campaigns which his made for Egypt and Iran. This two fightings had opened the way for advance of Suleyman I into Rumelia, strengthening the Ottoman hegemony on the of Anatolia's east and south frontiers. On the other hand, Suleyman had found ready the leader status of all the muslims as soon as he acceded to the throne. According to some historians, Suleyman was magnificent and resembling for Henry VIII and François I.⁵

Murat IV was one of most "energetic" of the all Ottoman sultans, also. He gained the military achievements, especially, in the areas of the Caucasia and Mesopotamia. Although these all the successes, his energy was absorbed by riots of the soldiers in the some provinces of the Empire. Apart this, his alcohol addiction caused the he died in the early age.⁶

In the beginning of the 18th century was lived the "Tulip Period" in the of Ahmed III's reign between 1718 and 1730 which adressed the struggles of Empire for Westernization. But the struggles mentioned took quantative way more than qualitative. In this case, Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim Pasha was assumed the responsibility because of he has an aesthetic taste and talented for the Palace policy.⁷ The Sultan has "gentle and soft nature,"⁸ eventually, was obliged for dethrone through Patrona Halil Revolt (1730). In the end of this century started the sovereignty of Selim III, as one of reformer sultans. Selim III pursued classical Ottoman approaches on reform issue. Henceforth, he gave priority the innovation movements in the area of military. Here was point the intensified of cliché Ottoman approach on the reforms. In the military, for instance, he has done the new gunsmith corps by hand of Ömer Ağa. He was benefited from proficient names those Lafitte, St Remny, Monnier, Toussaint e.g. in the sphere of education, engineering and war art e.t.c. Of course, the Janissaries was most anguished for this applications. One on the side, the newness of

1 Emine Kıray, *Osmanlı'da Ekonomik Yapı ve Dış Borçlar*, İletişim, İstanbul, 2010, 161.

2 R. H. Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*, trans. Osman Akınhay, Agora, İstanbul, 2005, 10.

3 R. H. Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*, Saqi Books, Texas, 1990, 97; T. Z. Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, Bilgi University, İstanbul, 2010, 7.

4 Halil İnalçık, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ, 1300-1600*, trans. Ruşen Sezer, Yapı Kredi, İstanbul, 2008, 27-39; Faruk Sümer, "Karamanoğulları," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İstanbul, 2001, XXIV, 454-460.

5 Alan Palmer, *Verfall und Untergang des Osmanischen Reiches*, Paul List Verlag, München, 1994, 20-21.

6 Palmer, *Verfall und Untergang des Osmanischen Reiches*, 24.

7 Palmer, *Verfall und Untergang des Osmanischen Reiches*, 59.

8 Johan Wilhelm Zinkeisen, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, trans. Nilüfer Epçeli, Yeditepe, İstanbul, 2011, V, 439.

Selim III was come to be remembered as “Nizam-ı Cedid” in a way which contained all the reforms made by the state.⁹ Selim III was overturned by a coup which was committed by Köse Musa Paşa and Şeyhülislam Topal Atallah.¹⁰

As for Mahmud II’s period was current the political weight of Grand Vizier and Sublime Porte. But weight mentioned passed again to the hand of Sultan from Grand Vizier after Alemdar Vak’ası.¹¹ The power rivals in the age of Mahmud II, according to one in view of, have got a feature which qualitativing the “structural tranformation” which had been launced since Mustafa II.¹² Besides, Ottoman Dynasty’s economical and political power was sustaining even if the sultanate and central state have being weakened.¹³ Apart from this, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha was perhaps only person who failed the Sultan.¹⁴

On the other side, Mahmud II was previously directed itself to the way to impede some wrongs which his ancestors made in the past and was the main cause of their dethrone. One of the their wrongs was themselves to leave open to thrusts of some cliques which have being negative affected from made reforms and have being maintaining themselves strong status. So, Mahmud II wiped firstly out the Janissaries which had been completely come in sight the their insufficient in the Mora Revolt, erected in front of reforms, had been become most dangerous group¹⁵ and trickery nest.¹⁶ Subsequent, queue came to vernacular lords. The collapse of the Janissaries provided to Mahmud II a reputation sovereign which has “reformer decisiveness and capacities”.¹⁷ But this condition in which his period started to change again in the end of the 19th century with the state reached to a central and bureaucratic structure.¹⁸

Abdülmeccid, following of Mahmud II, ascended the throne in the his seventeenth age.¹⁹ Mustafa Reşid Pasha was most important booster of his, who accomplished in proclaiming the Tanzimat Decree (1839). Among other persons whom emerged in the nearby of Sultan was also Rıza Pasha who Mahmud II’s Mâbeyn Müşiri (Mâbeyn Commander).²⁰

Abdülaziz after Abdülmeccid paid his attention in Mâbeyn-i Hümayûn (the Palace Management Unit) as soon as he acceded to the throne. Some staffs of in this institution had been appointed from Palace music unit, other some from else task areas. These staffs were immediately sent into their

9 Nicolae Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi, 1300-1451*, trans. Nilüfer Epeçli, Yeditepe, İstanbul, 2009, V, 101; Kemal Beydilli, “Selim III,” in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İstanbul, 2001, XXXVI, 422.

10 Beydilli, “Selim III,” 423.

11 Tunaya, *Türkiye’nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, 24.

12 Quoting from Rifa’at Abou-El-Haj Yunus Uğur, “Rifa’at Abou-El-Haj: Osmanlı Devlet ve Siyasi Yapısına Farklı Bir Bakış.” In *Hâkim Paradigmaların Ötesinde, Rifa’at Abou-El-Haj’a Armağan*, compiled by Donald Quataert-Baki Tezcan, trans. Aytek Sever, Tan, Ankara, 2012, 22.

13 Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005, 49.

14 Bernard Lewis, *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu*, trans. Babür Turna, Arkadaş, Ankara, 2009, 125.

15 C. V. Findley, “The Tanzimat,” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey I-IV*, Cambridge University Press, London, 2008, IV, 12.

16 Oral Sander, *Siyasi Tarih, İlkçağlardan 1918’e*, İmge, Ankara, 2012, 290.

17 E. P. Engelhardt, *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma Hareketleri, Tanzimat*, trans. Örgen Uğurlu, Nurer Uğurlu, Örgün, İstanbul, 2010, 75.

18 Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet, Siyaset*, İktidar ve Meşruiyet, 1876-1914, İletişim, İstanbul, 2011, 128.

19 Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vak’anüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi Tarihi*, ed. Yücel Demirel, Türk Tarih Kurumu, İstanbul, 1999, VI-VIII, 1006.

20 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi, 1300-1451*, V, 327.

themselves task areas.²¹ Besides, the almost ten years of Abdülaziz passed to alternately Grand Vizier of Ali and Fuad Pasha whom efforting to reclaim the Empire in a way to following the developments of political, judicial, economic etc. areas of Europe.²² Moreover, the pashas mentioned to get hold of government so hurry up that Grand Vizier Kırılı Mehmet Pasha was dismissed only in the six weeks after Abdülaziz ascended the throne, even though he had been promised to stay on his duty.²³ But this effort of the pashas neither was springing from Europe pressure nor from mode of age. They was primarily striving to what most good for future of the Empire.²⁴ On the other side, the respectability of Palace was reduced more and more by some reforms which have being done from the beginning of the Tanzimat period. The one of examples which brought about this condition was ‘Local Management Houses’. Presented in these houses both representatives of staffs and of subjects was positive for future of parliamentarism, but not for traditional state structure.²⁵

Abdülaziz had been widely free thanks to death of Fuad and Ali pashas in 1871, but this time also Young Ottomans had come to being influential on management. According to a viewpoint, Young Ottomans had consisted of elites who “utterly opening up the Empire lands for modernism” as apart from Christian missionaries.²⁶ Their theoretical infrastructure had been formed from juristic philosophy, policy and economy theories of Montesquieu, Rousseau, Smith and Ricardo.²⁷ Young Ottomans come to be boosted among the top level state staffs who their influence was being constricted.²⁸ Apart from this, they claimed that the Empire was being rolling towards bad economic status and frequently used this claim in their critics.²⁹ The first manifesto of formation mentioned was a letter which Mustafa Fazıl Pasha wrote from Egypt.³⁰ Issue be spoken was who would be the Mabeyn-i Hümayun Müşiri in the morning of Abdülaziz’s dethrone with a coup.³¹

According to a comment the 19th century had been a period which the Ottoman Empire split out from ‘gazilik ideali’ (veteranship ideal). So, the Empire protection task had been assumed on the shoulder of palace officers more than parts of the religious and military.³² On the other hand, towards end of the 19th century potency matter was swinging with between the status that the Sultan was strong and a system that potency expanded on public stratum.³³

21 Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, ed. Cavid Baysun, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1991, XIII-XX, 147.

22 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi, 1300-1451*, V, 353. Besides, it is efforted to use the economy concepts. But economic policies produced either was “stillborn” or “remaining on the stage of itself maintain”, even though goodwill and conscious ardors. C. V. Findley, *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbiâli, 1789-1922*, trans. Latif Boyacı-İzzet Akyol, İz, İstanbul, 1994, 137.

23 Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Reform, 1856-1876*, 115.

24 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi, 1300-1451*, V, 429.

25 C. V. Findley, *Kalemîyeden Mülkiyeye Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi*, trans. Gül Çağalı Güven, Tarih Vakfı, İstanbul, 2011, 91.

26 Bedri Gencer, *İslam’da Modernleşme, 1839-1939*, Doğubatu, Ankara, 2014, 262-263.

27 Lewis, *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu*, 235.

28 F. A. K. Yasamee, *Ottoman Diplomacy, Abdulhamid II and the Great Powers, 1878-1888*, Isis, İstanbul, 1996, 11.

29 Findley, *Kalemîyeden Mülkiyeye Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi*, 354.

30 Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *On Dokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2013, 225. Apart from this, see for a review on the paradigms of letter mentioned, Şerif Mardin, *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*, İletişim, İstanbul, 2010, 307-314.

31 Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, 40-Tetimme, 157.

32 Findley, *Kalemîyeden Mülkiyeye Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi*, 21.

33 François Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, trans. Ali Berktaş, Homer, İstanbul, 2006, 44.

At the beginning of Abdülhamid II's sovereignty was come to the definite management comprehension to sustain of Empire. From now on, the Palace put forth its most hard-core and final power as a result of that Sovereign made choice. The created of this complex management device³⁴ in a way of his desired realised almost in the fifteen years which it covered from his first years to middle of the 1890s.³⁵

1.2. Function of the Bâbîâlî in the Ottoman Empire Management Comprehension

The word "door" in the East civilization was to emphasize the state affairs and management because of was resolved problems of the public at the doors of Palace. The word, in Turks, have previously being used for sovereign's palaces, subsequently had been also launced to be used for Grand Vizier kiosques and pavilions. "Bâbîâlî" term had come to mean that both Grand Vizier has some places and the Ottoman administration has, towards end of the 18th century.³⁶ This word gained most explicit mean that contained the complex buildings and the main departments of government at the beginning of the 19th century.³⁷ Besides, on the formation of Bâbîâlî had been influential the Dâr-ı Şûra and Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye, also.³⁸

At the point of its bureaucratic structure in the Bâbîâlî have being found three authorities, who "Sadâret Kethüdâsı (delegate of Grand Vizier)", "Reisülküttab (once chief clerk, afterwards foreign minister)" and "Çavuşbaşı (chief sergeant)", and a lot of departments which under their command. Sadâret Kethüdâsı most very concerned with inner affairs, it has the supremacy and distinctively status among Bâbîâlî personnels. But afterwards its importance reduced as result of more and more development of bureaucracy.³⁹ As the Reisülküttaplık is taking care of country outside matters, among the Çavuşbaşılık's responsibilities were those to analyze and send the various petitions for needed departments, to provide security in person etc.⁴⁰ Reisülküttap was second persona in the Bâbîâlî due to increase of its weight in the foreign diplomacy.⁴¹

In other respects, amidst the Bâbîâlî's routine tasks were those to listen cases of public, to do necessary of Hatt-ı Hümâyûns (sovereign order) which have been sent from the Palace and written actual problems. Additionally, the foreign ambassadors also have frequently being visiting to the Bâbîâlî and delivering the many kinds of denunciations and warnings on behalf of their themselves countries. So, particularly, the matters of the non-Muslims became one of the most preoccupaying issues for Bâbîâlî.⁴² Sublime Porte, at the same time, took upon oneself a pushing function on the reforms which made as necessaries of the age. It put into practise, perhaps, most vital one of these functions on new minority constitutions, for minorities who living disaster in the middle of the century. So that, in 1862 and 1863 Orthodox Greek and Gregorian Armenian citizens of the Empire obtained their themselves statute books, in 1865 the Jews.⁴³ So, Bâbîâlî was source of reforms until from 1839 to 1876. In this session was occurred plenty of transformations from education to policy

34 Findley, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbîâlî, 1789-1922*, 6.

35 Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, 171.

36 Tayyip Gökbilgin, "Bâbîâlî," in *Encyclopedia of Islam of Ministry of Education*, MEB, İstanbul, 1977, II, 175.

37 Findley, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbîâlî, 1789-1922*, 5, 30.

38 Mehmet İpşirli, "Bâbîâlî," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İstanbul, 1988, IV, 381.

39 Ali Akyıldız, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilatında Reform, 1836-1856*, Eren, İstanbul, 1993, 67.

40 İpşirli, "Bâbîâlî," 378.

41 Findley, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbîâlî, 1789-1922*, 157.

42 İpşirli, "Bâbîâlî," 383; Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*, 64.

43 Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*, 119.

life.⁴⁴ This epoch, that is, a period was that “to be founded modern centralism in the modern Turkey history”.⁴⁵ But this condition was not evidence of everything goes well and of confidence that this process occurred. The Bâbiâlî’s approach have being foregrounded for reforms sometimes central managing, another sometimes economic growing which leant government support and individually attempt.⁴⁶

Consequently, Bâbiâlî lived its most perfect period, perhaps, in the between 1839 and 1871 because of in the period mentioned performed of duty the ability pashas. On the other side, “bureaucratic leadership” came to the fore in the era of the these pashas. This the leadership substantially get held of management mechanism as negotiator of international aids in the assorted fields, at the point that Ottoman Empire has no longer a army for maintain its benefits.⁴⁷ This bout was lived as “Sublime Porte Century”⁴⁸ until Abdülhamid II succeed to the crown. Yıldız Palace gained its strong and heavy status in the Abdülhamid II’s day as the center of the policy producing.⁴⁹

2. The Development of Embassy Concept in the Ottoman Empire

Ambassadors had got diversified functions in the course of history, such as to sign treaty, to foster the fighting sides for resist, to offer astonishing proposals for persuade rival states.⁵⁰ Venice had established first permanent embassy in the Istanbul in 1454. Subsequently, else states had followed it. The Ottoman Empire had been become aware of outside affairs by ambassadors that appointed as temporary until end of the eighteenth century. This closeness was not problem when the Empire is powerful but this attitude was occurring a remarkable disadvantage in the period which the Empire came to fall of.⁵¹ Moreover, even the slowness in that to make the foreign ambassadors’ policy desires was causing to be strain of relations.⁵²

As for Ottoman’s first permanent embassies, they was opened in the period of Selim III. But this attempt encountered divers difficulties, especially because of not know the foreign languages and diplomatic relation rules. Besides, embassies have been started to be arranged, basically in the approved rules frame of Vienna Agreement in 1815.⁵³

The foreign embassies in the Empire have come to quite potent clique for future draft that made on behalf of the Empire when in the case of Ottoman’ weak condition in the nineteenth century. Such that, even they was trying the details of food goods.⁵⁴ In the century aforementioned the ambassadors in the Istanbul was treating as if they have an autonomous conduct realm. One of indicators of their increasing power was resemblance of their themselves caiques which they are given

44 C. V. Findley, *Modern Türkiye Tarihi, İslâm, Milliyetçilik ve Modernlik*, trans. Güneş Ayas, Timaş, İstanbul, 2011, 132.

45 İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Alkım, İstanbul, 2005, 89.

46 Kıray, *Osmanlı’da Ekonomik Yapı ve Dış Borçlar*, 161.

47 C. V. Findley, *Dünya Tarihinde Türkler*, trans. Aşşen Anadol, Timaş, İstanbul, 2012, 213.

48 Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, 27.

49 İpşirli, “Bâbiâlî,” 386. At this point it is what should be underlined the failure to form of mechanism which functioning in the frame of certain principles. Besides, it should be emphasized that political power’s weakness, too, after the death of Ali Pasha. Engin D. Akarlı, “II. Abdülhamid: Hayatı ve İktidarı,” in *Osmanlı*, Yeni Türkiye, Ankara, 1999, II, 254.

50 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, I, 249-250, 351.

51 Akyıldız, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilatında Reform, 1836-1856*, 72.

52 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, V, 347.

53 İpşirli, “Elçi,” in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İstanbul, 1988, XI, 14.

54 Stefanos Yerasimos, *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye, Tanzimattan 1. Dünya Savaşı’na*, trans. Babür Kuzucu, Belge, İstanbul, 2007, II, 172.

as status symbol to caique of the Grand Vizier.⁵⁵ Foreign ambassadors had become the a pressure element until the Abdülhamid II, even if some of them are “careful, aristocrat and well-spoken”.⁵⁶ Moreover, they have tried to used the Turks governors like puppets. Once, these ambassadors had even offered a memorandum to be exerted that promises which had been given by 1856 Decree for minorities.⁵⁷ French ambassador was enforcing the Empire government to be internalized Code Napoléon in the period that it is considered the Mecelle (Ottoman code of civil law in the Islamic light).⁵⁸ At one occasion, Ottomans had asked permission from foreign embassies when they to apply the tax on the non-Muslims. The ferman which was prepared for resolve of Lebanon problem had been shuffled among the embassies.⁵⁹ The Meclis-i Tanzimat which had been established in 1854 had included into Meclis-i Ahkâm-ı Adliye at the recommendation of England ambassador in 1861.⁶⁰

As a result, the Ottoman Empire cannot very thing made against foreign ambassadors alongside 19th century, though the Empire sent in the distraction tactics. Empire’s talent was only containing this way.⁶¹

3. The Prominent Foreign Ambassadors in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century

The one of most famous foreign ambassadors was Stratford de Redcliffe Canning in the recent history of Ottoman Empire. He had fulfilled his task to embassy between 1808 and 1858 -according to it passed in a study firstly between 1825-1827 and secondly 1842-1858⁶²- and have being known as ‘iron roasted-chickpea’.⁶³ He had rudely reminded any day the sovereign England aids in the course of Crimea War (1853-1856), not dismounting when he sees the sovereign.⁶⁴ Stratford was forceful, principally, in the while was declared of 1856 Order. He had continued to negotiate and to prepare the a wide reform set with Thouvenel and Prokesch, who French and Austria ambassadors, during Januer of the 1856.⁶⁵ In these negotiates he was trying to demonstrate that be bad the some of the reforms for the Empire, of course in favor of his himself country.⁶⁶

England, basically, was dissident to found the constitutional regime in the Empire. Because this case would have meant that be shared of the sovereign’s powers with his subjects and thus, to difficult of make a decision for benefits of her herself country, because of it will made public to the parliament.⁶⁷ According to some, Canning was Turkish crony but in particular since middle of the 19th century intense Turk antinomy in the England media came to affect him and, he began to

55 Elif Süreyya Genç, *19. yüzyıl İstanbul’u, Bir İngiliz Seyyahın İzlenimleri*, Doğu, İstanbul, 2010, 75.

56 Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, *Maruzat*, ed. Yusuf Halaçoğlu, Bâbüâli Kültür, İstanbul, 2010, 123.

57 Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Reform, 1856-1876*, 85, 109.

58 Gencer, *İslam’da Modernleşme, 1839-1939*, 408. See for further information about Mecelle, Osman Kaşıkçı, “Osmanlı Medenî Kanunu: Mecelle,” ed. Halil İnalçık, Bülent Arı, Selim Aslantaş, *Adâlet Kitabı*, Kadim, Ankara, 2012, 308. See for things that happened of Cevdet Pasha who opposed to this coercion, Cevdet Paşa, *Maruzat*, 219.

59 Yerasimos, *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye, Tanzimattan 1. Dünya Savaşı’na*, 143, 167.

60 E. Z. Karal, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2011, VII, 145.

61 Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 110.

62 Caroline Finkel, *Rüyadan İmparatorluğa Osmanlı, 1300-1923*, trans. Zülal Kılıç, Timaş, İstanbul, 2007, 404.

63 Genç, *19. yüzyıl İstanbul’u, Bir İngiliz Seyyahın İzlenimleri*, 149, 152.

64 A. D. Mordtmann, *İstanbul ve Yeni Osmanlılar*, trans. Gertraude Habermann-Songu, Pera, İstanbul, 1999, 75.

65 Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Reform, 1856-1876*, 55, 73-4. However, It is not true to give a status which he is fulfilled of his any desire for Canning, even though the condition such. Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 98.

66 Findley, *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbüâli, 1789-1922*, 133.

67 Yerasimos, *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye, Tanzimattan 1. Dünya Savaşı’na*, 243.

consider that Turks be condemned, for example, in the area of literature to a vulgar superficiality.⁶⁸

Other England ambassador was Henry Elliot who be extremely dominant on Midhat Pasha. That man to wiliness so went too far that was trying to acquire the trust of Turks, not locking up of his home during nights.⁶⁹

Another effective person was Russian ambassador Nikolay Pavlovich Ignatyev. He oneself so devoted to intrigues that his name had converted the 'father of lies'. His aim was to drag the Empire into a separation in aim of his country's policy.⁷⁰ The Ignatyev's highest performance was established of a Bulgarian church in the Ottoman territory. Ignatyev, subsequently, will confess that bounded up with Panislavism of this church's be founded. On the other side, one of the Russian goals was removed Ottoman Ermenians from their national ideal for their Orthodoxization.⁷¹

The ambassadors have the maintaining right to twenty foreign persons, missionaries to ten foreign persons, consuls to between six and eight persons⁷², and the maintaining dealing Russians was doing with a license that called as 'patent'.¹¹⁹ Besides, these foreign officials, after Ermenian riots in 1895-96, interestingly, provided the workbench and imported yarn for Ermenian weavers in the Arapkir, Adana, Antep and Eğin.⁷³ They had also founded carpet ateliers in the Urla, Harput and Halep.⁷⁴ Missioners, meanwhile, did not also neglect the publishing of journals and newspapers who will be provide ground and atmosphere which they have being needed.⁷⁵

In the some cases it had been considered that the ambassadors' proposals will be useful. Ahmet Lütü Efendi, for instance, who one of historians of that days, was positively evaluated the England ambassador Ponsonby' suggestion for Ottoman's London Ambassador appointment, through taking into account the Egypt problem which have being lived at the same time.⁷⁶

4. The Missionary in the Recent Age of the Ottoman

Missionary was accounting the Islam the cause of backwardness, in contrast accounting the Christianity the cause of development. The Jesuits' missionary actions that realised by education had started in the 16th century, Capuchins' and French' actions in the 17th century, America's missionary activities in the 19th century. The Missionary schools in the end of the 19th century had been concentrated in the Ottoman territories which cannot be included to nationalism process or late be included.⁷⁷

From the beginning of the 18th century western missionaries and orientalisists have begun to describe the function of the Islam in the form of repair the degenerate Christianity. This approach, of course, has being meant the instrumentalization of the Islam in favor of West. Ali Süavi was first emphasizing person who missionaries have being made the christianize operation in the shape

68 Gencer, *İslam'da Modernleşme, 1839-1939*, 134.

69 Patrick, M. M., *Son Sultanların İstanbul'unda; Siyâset, Modernleşme, Yabancı Okullar*, trans. Ayşe Aksu, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2009, 128.

70 Patrick, *Son Sultanların İstanbul'unda; Siyâset, Modernleşme, Yabancı Okullar*, 129.

71 İsmail Kemal Bey, *The Memoirs of İsmail Kemal Bey*, ed. Sommerville Story, Constable and Company Ltd, London, 1920, 79, 258, 345.

72 Genç, *19. yüzyıl İstanbul'u, Bir İngiliz Seyyahın İzlenimleri*, 78.

73 Donald Quataert, *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü*, trans. Tansel Güney, İletişim, İstanbul, 2011), 151-2.

74 Quataert, *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü*, 167, 268.

75 Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, V, 456-7.

76 Ahmed Lütü Efendi, *Vak'anüvis Ahmed Lütü Efendi Tarihi*, VI-VIII, 988.

77 Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 21, 115, 188.

of civilization at that time.⁷⁸

The various minorities in the Ottoman Empire reached to behave in the comfort thanks to several statute books which will to design the their life. Because, from now on, their themselves ethos was obtaining the a legal character, as convenient to mentality ground of the 19th century which processing on the laws' basic. At this point, the missionary institution who found a bound its oneself between with imperialism interfered to emaciate and root out the Empire whom is struggling with hardships in the internal and abroad in the its weak posture.⁷⁹

Mehmet Ali Pasha had allowed in Mısır for established of missionary schools between 1810 and 1840. These schools was influential on the modernization of Egypt. Thus, Egypt was erected in front of Ottoman Empire as a modern state.⁸⁰ Again, if we will handle as a positive progress, thanks to printeries that expanded in the Syria and Lebanon with endeavors of the Protestan missionaries, have grown the 'Nahda Movement' who awakening action in the form of cultur and literature that its purpose was to execute a "Arabic renaissance" which it is boosted with West-Arab cultur syntesis. On the other side, the basic of this movement was rising on Arab civilization literature which had been written French.⁸¹

The American missionary in the Ottoman Empire had been prelude in the 1820s,⁸² before earlier than the commerce agreement that will be signed in 1830.⁸³ Missionary mentioned made in effort for pervade of the Evangelism who be preach for deliver the Bible into wide masses during the Tanzimat Period.⁸⁴

The condition of the Empire who its industrialization cannot realise was facilitating the missionaries' working. Catholic agitprops had begun to process from 1848, especially in the territories which have a key importance in terms of the economic as Istanbul, Edirne, Filibe, Beyrut, İzmir and Bursa, through to construct the education and health institutions, "for dominate on social life in the fastest way".⁸⁵ If we will take a glance at the size that these schools obtained, for example, in the end of the 19th century Salonika had fifty Jewish schools who is trained of nine thousand pupils per annum.⁸⁶ The amount of American schools in the Anatolia was two forty-four in 1875. This number, afterwards, will be four hundred and sixty-four in 1890.⁸⁷ But the missionary will cannot win its desire among the Muslims and only twenty Muslims will be Protestan in the course of from 1824 to 1861.⁸⁸

The Protestan missionary which in the control of England hegemony had firstly been be-

78 Gencer, *İslam'da Modernleşme*, 135, 189.

79 Orhan Koloğlu, *Abdülhamit ve Masonlar*, Pozitif, İstanbul, 2004, 112.

80 Gencer, *İslam'da Modernleşme*, 210.

81 Gencer, *İslam'da Modernleşme*, 545.

82 Seçil Akgün, "19. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyokültürel Etkilerin Amerika Boyutu," in *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Problemler, Araştırmalar, Tartışmalar, 24-26 Mayıs 1993-Ankara: Bildiriler*, ed. Hamdi Can Tuncer, Tarih Vakfı Yurt, Ankara, 1999, 44.

83 İsmail Cem, *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*, Türkiye İş Bankası, İstanbul, 2012 in 198 is to pass as 1829 the date of agreement.

84 Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*, 120.

85 Akgün, "19. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyokültürel Etkilerin Amerika Boyutu," 46.

86 Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, 169.

87 Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid, 273*; Findley, *Modern Türkiye Tarihi, İslâm, Milliyetçilik ve Modernlik*, 141.

88 Akgün, "19. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyokültürel Etkilerin Amerika Boyutu," 46.

gun by hand Stratford Canning in 1845, through to establish a Protestant temple in the Jerusalem, get permitting from Bâbiâlî.⁸⁹ Subsequently, British set up colleges in the Lebanon, Anatolia and Istanbul. These schools was generally efficient on the Ermenian community and the Protestantism have begun to accruing quickly among Ottoman Ermenians in the realms mentioned. So, England had also won the a society for claim the right of protection on the any minority of the Empire, like Russia and French.⁹⁰ Apart from this, in the 19th century started the Masonry movement, as if missionary is not enough to the Empire. Such that, this movement was even performing the designation ceremony for mason mastership in the England Embassy Building.⁹¹

The precautions that took of the Ottoman Empire against the well-rounded and planned negative actions could be implemented much later and remained extremely insufficient. One of these measures was worked up into province of Beirut in 1888. Thus, the city was achieved a better status at the point of control and steering. Of course, this decision was a lunge against French missionary that have being expanding in the district.⁹² What is more, it will be sent the religious officials as “Hanefi/Muslim missionaries” after 1892 to between Hedjaz Railway and southern regions of Syria.⁹³

In a way, it can be said that the Tanzimat reforms was beget of missionary activities.⁹⁴ This backcloth was an unique occasion in favor of Europe to create new religious diversities and to politicization previous diversities in the Empire. They have used this opportunity, especially by missionaries.⁹⁵ The rival which among missionaries came to the boil at the late of the 18th century.⁹⁶ But this scene didn't impede for their co-operation in the same settlements. In Lebanon, for example, both the American missionaries and French missionaries had located in the same village and they had together overcome of fire that occurred in the a monastery.⁹⁷ However, some vernacular congregations was blaming to trick them, even if the missionaries had been agreed amongst themselves.⁹⁸

On the other side, Germans had fallen behind on the missionary activity. They was operating in Syria and Beirut where assorted schools which managed of health worker nuns. But they haven't any Protestant missionary.⁹⁹

German schools that generally Jews had established in the Empire had lost their Deutch identity with transformation into Hebrew of these schools' education language from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century.¹⁰⁰ Besides, German missionary was more efficient in places like India. According to orientalist William Muir, German missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander where is working Northwest India had once won against several Muslim wises in the ambience of scientific discussion. Whereas, Rahmetullah Hindi, whom one of wises presented in the discussi-

89 Genç, *19. yüzyıl İstanbul'u, Bir İngiliz Seyyahın İzlenimleri*, 163. The Protestant community was officially recognized by Bâbiâlî in 1850. Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 117.

90 Karal, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi VIII*, 128-9.

91 Koloğlu, *Abdülhamit ve Masonlar*, 21, 35, 45.

92 Rula Jurdi Abisaab, “Şii Ulema, Medreseler ve Osmanlı'nın Geç Döneminde Eğitim Reformu,” *Hâkim Paradigmaların Ötesinde, Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj'a Armağan*, 218.

93 Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, 317; Findley, *Kalemiyeden Mülkiyeye Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi*, 180.

94 Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, 226.

95 Findley, “The Tanzimat,” 15.

96 Findley, *Modern Türkiye Tarihi; İslâm, Milliyetçilik ve Modernlik*, 65.

97 İsmail Kemal Bey, *The Memoirs of İsmail Kemal Bey*, 154.

98 Mordtmann, *İstanbul ve Yeni Osmanlılar*, 236.

99 Mordtmann, *İstanbul ve Yeni Osmanlılar*, 110, 271.

100 Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 189.

on mentioned, will subsequently vigorously criticize the Christianity in the his study that named Izharu'l-Haq.¹⁰¹

Conclusion

With the completely run to seed of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century it almost utterly lost the control on management in the many areas. The Palace, once, was center of conduct but now, it had a symbolic status. Bâbiâli had a firstly share for the Empire's this condition because it had become focus point of bureaucratization. Thus, the weight of the governance had slid from sovereign to Bâbiâli bureaucrats, decreasing the sultan's power. Subsequent, foreign representatives caught up a chance with fall out mentioned of the Palace to practise the their themselves aims in which fields of policy, economic, military, judicial etc.

At this point, Western states used to both ambassadors and missioners for these aims. The used of embassies by strong Western states was more salient than they used missioners. Because missionary comprehension had not improved in the Ottoman mentality. Embassies' actions was more explicit than missioners', due to embassies have open diplomatic definitions, have not missioners. The counterattacks of the Empire for these attempts, rightly, cannot efficient as much as Western states'.

References

Abisaab, Rula Jurdi. "Şii Ulema, Medreseler ve Osmanlı'nın Geç Döneminde Eğitim Reformu." *Hâkim Paradigmaların Ötesinde, Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj'a Armağan*, edited by Donald Quataert-Baki Tezcan, translated by Aytek Sever, 195-223, Ankara: Tan Kitabevi, 2012.

Ahmed Cevdet Paşa. *Tezâkir*. Edited by Cavid Baysun. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.

Ahmed Lütü Efendi. *Vak'anüvis Ahmed Lütü Efendi Tarihi*. Edited by Yücel Demirel, VI-VIII, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 1999.

Akarlı, Engin Deniz. "II. Abdülhamid: Hayatı ve İktidarı." *Osmanlı I-XII*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1999, 253-65.

Akgün, Seçil. "19. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyokültürel Etkilerin Amerika Boyutu." *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Problemler, Araştırmalar, Tartışmalar, 24-26 Mayıs 1993-Ankara: Bildiriler*. Ankara: Tarih Vakfı Yurt, 1999, 44-55.

Akyıldız, Ali. *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkezi z Teşkilatında Reform, 1836-1856*. İstanbul: Eren, 1993.

Beydilli, Kemal. "Selim III." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2001, 420-25.

Cem, İsmail. *Türkiye'de Geri Kalmışlığın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2012.

Davison, Roderic Hollett. *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*. Texas: Saqi Books, 1990.

------. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Reform, 1856-1876*. Translated by Osman Akınhay. İstanbul: Agora, 2005.

Engelhardt, Edouard-Philippe. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma Hareketleri, Tanzimat*. Translated by Örgen Uğurlu, Nurer Uğurlu. İstanbul: Örgün, 2010.

101 Gencer, *İslam'da Modernleşme*, 192-3.

Findley, Carter Vaughn. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bürokratik Reform, Bâbiâlî, 1789-1922*. Translated by Latif Boyacı-İzzet Akyol. İstanbul: İz, 1994.

----- . "The Tanzimat." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey I-IV*, London: Cambridge University Press, 2008, IV, 11-37.

----- . *Modern Türkiye Tarihi, İslâm, Milliyetçilik ve Modernlik*. Translated by Güneş Ayas. İstanbul: Timaş, 2011.

----- . *Kalemiyeden Mülkiyeye Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi*. Translated by Gül Çağalı Güven. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt, 2011.

----- . *Dünya Tarihinde Türkler*. Translated by Ayşen Anadol, İstanbul: Timaş, 2012.

Finkel, Caroline. *Rüyadan İmparatorluğa Osmanlı, 1300-1923*. Translated by Zülal Kılıç. İstanbul: Timaş, 2007.

Gencer, Bedri. *İslâm'da Modernleşme (1839-1939)*. Ankara: Doğubatu, 2014.

Genç, Elif Süreyya. *19. yüzyıl İstanbul'u, Bir İngiliz Seyyahın İzlenimleri*. İstanbul: Doğu Kitabevi, 2010.

Georgeon, François. *Sultan Abdülhamid*. Translated by Ali Berktaş. İstanbul: Homer, 2006.

Gökbilgin, Tayyip. "Bâbiâlî." In *Encyclopedia of Islam of Ministry of Education*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1977.

İnalcık, Halil. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ, 1300-1600*. Translated by Ruşen Sezer. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 2008.

İpşirli, Mehmet. "Elçi." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995, 3-15.

----- . "Bâbiâlî." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, IV, 378-386.

İsmail Kemal Bey. *The Memoirs of İsmail Kemal Bey*. Edited by Sommerville Story. London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1920.

Jorga, Nicolae. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi, 1300-1451*. Translated by Nilüfer Epçeli. İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2009.

Karal, Enver Ziya. *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi V-IX*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2011.

Kaşıkçı, Osman. "Osmanlı Medenî Kanunu: Mecelle." In *Adâlet Kitabı*, edited by Halil İnalcık, Bülent Arı, Selim Aslantaş, 301-329. Ankara: Kadim, 2012.

Kıray, Emine. *Osmanlı'da Ekonomik Yapı ve Dış Borçlar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2010.

Koloğlu, Orhan. *Abdülhamit ve Masonlar*. İstanbul: Pozitif, 2004.

Lewis, Bernard. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. Translated by Babür Turna. Ankara: Arkadaş, 2009.

Mardin, Şerif. *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2010.

Mordtmann, Andreas David. *İstanbul ve Yeni Osmanlılar*. Translated by Gertraude Habermann-Songu. İstanbul: Pera, 1999.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Alkım, 2005.

Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet, Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet, 1876-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2011.

Palmer, Alan. *Verfall und Untergang des Osmanischen Reiches*. München: List Verlag, 1994.

Patrick, Mary Mills. *Son Sultanların İstanbul'unda; Siyâset, Modernleşme, Yabancı Okullar*. Translated by Ayşe Aksu. İstanbul: Dergâh, 2009.

Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2005.

----- . *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü*. Translated by Tansel Güney. İstanbul: İletişim, 2011.

Sander, Oral. *Siyasi Tarih, İlkçağlardan 1918'e*. Ankara: İmge, 2012.

Sümer, Faruk. "Karamanoğulları." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2001, 454-460.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *On Dokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Dergâh, 2013.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer Tunaya. *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010.

Uğur, Yunus. "Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj: Osmanlı Devlet ve Siyasi Yapısına Farklı Bir Bakış." *Hâkim Paradigmaların Ötesinde, Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj'a Armağan*, edited by Donald Quataert-Baki Tezcan, translated by Aytek Sever, 13-29. Ankara: Tan Kitabevi, 2012.

Yasamee, Feroz Ahmed Khan. *Ottoman Diplomacy, Abdulhamid II and the Great Powers, 1878-1888*. İstanbul: Isis, 1996.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye, Tanzimattan 1. Dünya Savaşı'na*. Translated by Babür Kuzucu. İstanbul: Belge, 2007.

Zinkeisen, Johan Wilhelm. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*. Translated by Nilüfer Epçeli. İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2011.