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INTRODUCTION

The effort of Mahmud II to institute reform in the Ottoman Empire was crystallized with Abdul Mejid's promulgation of the Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane in 1839. The Hatt was the beginning of a series of new experiences for the Turks. The 1839 edict and subsequent attempts toward reform changed the Ottoman Empire, though the changes were not always those expected. The Turks attempted reform for various reasons. One of these reasons was their desire to convince Europe that they could adopt Western institutions and end a decline which had begun in the seventeenth century. The Hatt-i-Humayun of 1856 granted sweeping civil and religious concessions to the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. The institution of this reform was speeded by the efforts of European Powers whose influence at the Porte had grown considerably since 1800. In 1854 the English banking house of Palmer, Mackillop, Dent and Company granted the Turks a loan.¹ English financial influence and investment grew rapidly after this first loan.

In attempting to gain insight into the reasons for the increase of English financial activity in the Ottoman

Empire it might be useful to investigate some English impressions of the Turks and whence the information arose. The majority of Englishmen had little idea of the life led by the Turks, or of the structure of the institutions under the domination of the Turks, save through what they read of the country. In the period from 1850 to 1870 a number of English men and women travelled through the Ottoman Empire. Many of them, it seems, were inclined by the end of the voyage to consider themselves experts concerning the Turks and their country. These self-styled experts often wrote books elaborating their impressions. Their purpose in doing so was ostensibly to aid the English public in becoming better informed of the problems faced by a decaying Empire attempting to institute reforms. The writings of these men and women travelling in the Ottoman Empire are the topic for this investigation. These books were published by some of the better publishing houses of England, enjoyed considerable circulation, and influenced the British reading public in the formulation of its concept of the Turkish situation.

By examining and analyzing the books of the twelve travellers here considered, an insight may be gained with respect to what the English were reading regarding the Turks from 1850 to 1870. The problems of reform and finance interested the travellers greatly, undoubtedly
because British investors, bankers, political leaders, diplomats, idealists, merchants, industrialists, and the widening middle class were aware, sometimes only subconsciously, of the importance of these Turkish developments to England. This study does not purport to investigate Turkish reform and finance in the period under consideration since others have already studied and published the facts. The aim of this thesis is to examine the views expressed by the travellers in order to understand more fully British attitudes toward these Turkish affairs.
CHAPTER I

THE TRAVELLERS

The books under consideration were published between 1853 and 1877. The fact that the Empire relied upon Europe financially during this period was recognized by the majority of the travellers. They were aware not only of the financial difficulties, but also of the myriad of other problems plaguing the Empire. Some exercised keen insight in examining the plight of the Turks while some barely scratched the surface. Many travellers felt that knowledge of the spoken language was necessary to understand properly the Turkish character. They explained that the dragoman (or interpreter) would often be Greek, Armenian, or a Levantine and would not always report the conversation as it actually transpired. Some travellers deemed it desirable to live among the Turks for a period of more than a year, as this residence better prepared the traveller to write an appraisal of Turkish institutions. Yet other travellers argued that a trip of only a few months duration allowed one to judge the Turks more shrewdly, without the danger of the bias acquired through residence and attachment to the Turks. The group of travellers who held that a short stay was sufficient were always those who had been able to remain only a short while.
Many of the volumes had, as a specific purpose, the encouragement or discouragement of English investment in the Ottoman Empire. Some assured the reader that conditions were ripe for investment while others decried the lack of progress. The writers hoped that their message would be accepted by the English reading public.

One of the most valid books considered was M. A. Ubicini's *Letters on Turkey*, translated into the English by Lady Elizabeth Easthope.1 Though written by a Frenchman in 1851, the work was published in a two volume English translation in 1856. Volume II of the translation included a lengthy preface by the translator summing up her views of the Turkish situation. Lady Easthope was the second wife of Sir John Easthope, a politician and journalist, who owned the *Morning Chronicle*.2 Ubicini was a historian and French publicist who took a leave from teaching in 1846 and 1847 to travel to Turkey.3 The result of his travails was a volume written in a style with much popular appeal. Instead of utilizing the narrative method of describing the findings of his journey, he dealt, topic by topic with

---


problems about which he thought the public wanted to know. He included specific data with each chapter when applicable. Thus the reader of Ubicini's volumes found statistics dealing with the condition of Turkish finance, agriculture and commerce. The volume probably enjoyed wide circulation because of its facile presentation of information. It is significant that a second edition was issued.

Edward H. Michelsen's work *The Ottoman Empire and Its Resources* contained many statistics taken from Ubicini's two volumes. There was a duplication of data in the works, with the Ubicini work being the primary source. Michelsen's statistical section is very concise and arranged so it may be easily understood. The first section of his book is a history of Turkey from the accession of Mahmud II to 1850. He gave the reader a background of the reforms.

J.R. Morell's *Turkey, Past and Present* was a rather dull work. He was most vehement in his conclusions and left little room for the reader to question his views. The author, an editor and translator, felt that the Ottoman Empire had to be examined from within and therefore, travelled to Turkey. In attempting to discern the roots

---


of trouble, Morell presented numerous statistics which must have impressed the English reader. However, Morell often did not attempt to perceive what part of the information he gathered was truth and what part fiction. He often included hearsay in his volume and commented that it was likely to be true. He seemed rather gullible to stories told him by the Turks.

Eustace Clair Grenville Murray was the son of the second Duke of Buckingham. He was a member of the Foreign Office staff and held positions at Odessa and Tehran, and spent some time travelling through various portions of the Ottoman Empire. However, he was dismissed from the Foreign Service in 1866 because of his criticisms of Foreign Office policy. 6 His book7 reflected his bitterness toward the Foreign Office. He sometimes wandered from the problem he was discussing to discourse on a blunder made by the British diplomatic corps, or to outline the plan he felt should have been followed by the Foreign Office in a particular situation. Nevertheless, Murray's work portrayed, often keenly, the dilemma faced by the Porte, though he tended usually to reflect only anti-Turkish views in his discourse. He was an accomplished journalist having written for the

---

6D.M.B., XIII, p. 1263.

7Eustace C.G. Murray, Turkey Being Sketches From Life By the Roving Englishman, (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1877).
Daily News and Pall Mall as well as having several other books published. Therefore, this volume was probably in wide circulation.

The travellers naturally compared Turkey to Europe. Some did not realize that the Turk was more an Oriental than a European and had no reason to be anxious to accept European-styled reforms. Turkish religion, language, and government were not patterned along the lines of which the travellers were familiar. Mrs. William Grey, who toured the East in the suite of the Prince and Princess of Wales in 1869, tended to judge Turkey and the Turks by European standards. She was more impressed with Egypt than with Turkey because she found Egypt so European. Mrs. Grey was so preoccupied with the dinners and balls given in honor of the suite that her volume was little concerned with contemporary problems. Nevertheless, since the book was a report of the voyage of the Prince and Princess, it was widely read, for the royal couple were very popular with the public.

---

8Mrs. William Grey, Journal of a Visit to Egypt, Constantinople, the Crimea, Greece, etc. in the Suite of the Prince and Princess of Wales, (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1870).

9William H. Russell also wrote an account of the voyage entitled, A Diary in the East, (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1869). The volume held little comment concerning Turkey.
The work of one other woman author was examined.
Lady Emelia Bithynia Hornby wrote *Constantinople During the Crimean War*.\(^{10}\) Her volume was published from the series of letters which she had written to her friends in England during her Eastern travel. She accompanied her husband to Turkey while he arranged one of the Turkish loans. Her book was largely composed of comments concerning the mode of dress, the weather, and living conditions in the Empire. It was probably enjoyed by English ladies in their drawing rooms.

Sir Warington Wilkinson Smyth\(^{11}\) was primarily a lecturer in geology and mineralogy. He stated in the preface of his volume that he desired to dispel prevalent misconceptions existing in England with regard to Turkey. His attempt at doing so was admirable, for he was a careful observer and was generally unbiased. His acquaintance with Turkey was of short duration, only four months.\(^{12}\) This rather brief visit and the handicap of not being familiar with the language did not help his account. Yet, the main function of Smyth's volume was to point out the tremendous amount of natural resources available for exploitation.


\(^{11}\)Sir Warington W. Smyth, *A Year with the Turks*, (London: J.W. Parker & Son, 1854).

\(^{12}\)D.N.B., XVIII, p. 598.
Nassau W. Senior's *Journal in Turkey and Greece* was a potpourri of information about the Near East collected during the author's 1857-58 travels. Mr. Senior, in describing his journey, faithfully reported to his reader the opinions of many English nationals residing in Turkey. Hence, the reader gained not only the opinions of Senior, but also the opinions of other Englishmen, some of whom had long been a member of the English colony of Constantinople. Senior was a well-known political economist and held the first professorship of political economy at Oxford (1825). Because of his position and reputation it would seem likely that the work was widely read. He disliked dwelling upon painful topics; perhaps that was why he did not deign to comment upon the more controversial matters. He did, however, insert frequently the comments of others on these matters.

One of the most helpful works, statistically speaking, was *The Resources of Turkey* by James Lewis Farley. Farley was a recognized writer on Eastern affairs. His opinion was respected in English circles. He was, for a

---


14*D.N.B.*, XVII, p. 1183.

time, chief accountant of the Ottoman Bank at Beirut. In 1860 he became accountant-general of the state bank of Turkey at Constantinople. He was a student of Turkish affairs, especially Turkish trade and finance. The Resources of Turkey included pages of statistics proving to the reader that the Ottoman Empire was a worthy place of their capital. He wrote various works concerning conditions in Turkey, all favorably inclined toward English loans until he foresaw, about 1875, the danger of English bondholders losing their capital. He then issued a volume entitled, The Decline of Turkey Financially and Politically, which warned Turkish bondholders of the impending danger.\footnote{\textit{D.N.B.}, VI, p. 1073.}

Charles MacFarlane was a writer of miscellany who enjoyed travel. He lived in Turkey for sixteen months after his arrival in January 1827, and returned to Turkey again in 1847. Both times he wrote a book concerning the plight of Turkey. His later book titled \textit{Kismet, or the Doom of Turkey} disclosed the tone of the volume. MacFarlane had been greatly disappointed when he returned to Turkey in 1847 and found little evident change. This disappointment led to a scathing rebuke of the Turkish administration in his \textit{Kismet}. MacFarlane's writing was\footnote{Charles MacFarlane, \textit{Kismet, or the Doom of Turkey}, (London: Thomas Bosworth, 1853).}
aptly described in the Athenæum, a contemporary English periodical, as being voluminous not luminous. He wrote several histories and historical novels, but they were all said to suffer from the poor style evident in his Kismet.  

John Mason's volume Three Years in Turkey was written to advance the cause of medical missions. It was also intended to awaken a livelier interest on behalf of missions to convert the Jew in Turkey to Christianity. From the stated purposes of the book, it obviously appealed to a smaller audience than the majority of the books under consideration. For that reason and because much of the book was merely a tirade against all non-Christians, only small portions of the work have been used in this study.

The final book under consideration, A Residence in Bulgaria, was written by two men, G.B. St.Clair and Charles Brophy. One of the authors live in Bulgaria for three years and the other resided there for 18 months. This work was examined in order to illustrate the feelings and problems of the subject nationalities of the Porte. Messrs. Brophy and St. Clair are biased, not in favor of the Christians as were the other travellers, but in favor of the Muslims.

---

18 D.N.B., XII, p. 516.
residing in the small villages of the Empire. The work was unique and important because it gave the English reader an insight into the life of the Muslims while the other books considered dealt with the plight of the Christians in Constantinople and other more Turkish districts of the Empire. Both men were most emphatic in pointing out the injustices heaped upon the Muslim by the government.

Since the twelve travellers all journeyed through the Empire within a span of twenty years, seven of them between 1850 and 1859, they generally underwent similar experiences and heard the same type of complaints concerning the reforms. Many mention the same hotel and remark about similar inconveniences to which they were subjected. It is interesting to note that the similarity of their volumes end with generalizations about the climate, travel conditions, and dress. The travellers colored the picture of actual conditions in the Empire to suit their ends -- either promoting investment in the Empire or advising against it on the grounds that it was too sick to survive the efforts being made to revive it. The disagreements among the travellers will be examined in chapters three, four and five.
CHAPTER II

TURKISH REFORMS AND FINANCE

Before examining the writings of the travellers it would be well to review briefly the conditions of the Empire in the period under consideration.

G. F. Abbott has stated that until about 1790 England played the role of an honest broker in the relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe.¹ English ambassadors often offered the Porte their service as mediators in disputes which arose between the Turks and their various provinces, or European powers. Examples of such mediation are many: one of the first was Lord Paget's successful role in concluding the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699; another was the St. Petersburg Protocol of 1826 concerning the Greek Revolution; and a third was the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829 in which Russia was appeased in time to save Constantinople. One of the reasons the English were so friendly to the Turks was their realization that English-Turkish friendship would assure England of clear passage through the Empire to India.² Another reason was the desire of England to maintain Turkey against Russian

²The best source on this subject is Halford L. Hoskins, British Routes to India, (New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1928).
designs. Abbott felt that,

"...the whole trend of England's policy from the beginning of the 19th century onwards was consistently pro-Turkish. The maintenance of the Ottoman Empire came to be regarded as a dogma equivalent to the maintenance of British interests in the East."³

English dealings with the Ottoman Empire in the media of commerce originated with the well-known Levant Company which was established under James I for the purpose of trade with the East.⁴ After 1800 political maneuvers became increasingly important as evidenced by the Straits Convention of 1840-41.

The death of Mahmud II in 1839 brought his young son, Abdul Mejid to the throne. Abdul Mejid's uncertainty and instability permitted the influence of the ambassadors at the Porte to grow stronger. This was especially true of the English ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning. Abdul Mejid, urged by his powerful foreign minister, Rashid Pasha, promulgated the famous Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane. The text of the Hatt promised fundamental changes in the conduct of the courts, the assessment and collection of taxes by the government a limitation to the periods of military service for Ottoman subjects.⁵ These reforms were never

³Abbott, p. 152.
⁴Ubicini, I, p. 353.
wholly executed. The Hatt-i-Humayun of 1856 promised the execution of the reforms enumerated in the 1839 proclamation and it also declared equality and complete religious liberty for all non-Muslim subjects. The Hatt-i-Humayun was more extensive in scope than the Hatt-i-Sharif. The 1856 proclamation listed the steps that were to be taken to reform the monetary and financial system of the empire. A program of public works was to be instituted, schools were to be built, and commerce and agriculture were to be encouraged. After hearing the provisions of the Hatt-i-Humayun the peoples of the Empire and Europe were once again optimistic about reform. The Hatt was considered to be a blueprint for the revival of the Empire. But because of the lack of strong Turkish leaders the Hatt-i-Humayun was no more effective than the Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane. Hurewitz holds, however, that the two reform measures did set the spark which culminated in the promulgation of a constitution in 1876, which "...represented a landmark in the Ottoman Westernization movement of the nineteenth century."  

The attitude of the Turks toward finance was far different from that of the European nations. Before 1839 there was no Minister of Finance in the Ottoman Empire.

---

6Ibid., pp. 149-153.

7Ibid., p. 113.
The Grand Treasurer (defterdar) had been the guardian of state funds. He was not charged, however, with the administration of revenue and expenditure. The sultan was permitted to spend huge sums of money as he wished for no one had the authority to overrule him. Indeed the civil list of the sultan was not the property of the State. The bureaucracy of the Ottoman Empire did not worry over problems of the budget -- in fact there was no formal budget. Some of the ministers of the provinces possessed special revenues which they did not report to the Minister of Finance, hence there was no way in which to estimate the total expenses of the state or to balance revenue against disbursement.

With the institution of the Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane, government officials were sent out to collect taxes directly. This direct collection was to replace the farming-out of tax collection which led to corruption. But the officials proved so incompetent that the peasants clamored for the return of the tax-farmer, feeling that he was the lesser of two evils.

The problem of finance became progressively worse. The rising debt caused the Turks to realize that stringent

---


9Ibid., p. 15.
financial measures were necessary yet they made further financial error by debasing the value of the specie in circulation and issuing large amounts of paper money with no reserve. 10 By 1854 the Turks were in dire need of financial assistance as a result of the heavy expenses of the Crimean War. The Europeans rendered this needed assistance by granting loans to help the Empire balance her budget. The first loan was negotiated in 1854 and the Empire guaranteed repayment by virtue of the Egyptian tribute. Reliance upon European money markets became almost a yearly occurance, with custom duties or taxes of one sort or another pledged as security. The Turks were not prompt in meeting the due dates on the notes, for their revenues had fallen behind. Yet as the debt mounted the Turks did not become concerned, for they found they could borrow money easily. The English, enjoying great prosperity, were searching for investment opportunities. Even after 1860 when the Ottoman Government had begun to falter on its financial obligations there were still thousands of Englishmen willing to invest in Ottoman securities. Either they did not see or they did not heed the danger signs. With these facts in mind it is not startling to discover that, while the borrowing began in 1854 with a loan of three million pounds sterling at six percent interest, the

10 Ibid., p. 16.
Ottoman indebtedness to Europe had risen to two hundred million pounds sterling by 1874.\textsuperscript{11} Blaisdell portrays the period as one of wildest speculation. He explains that,

"The early material guarantee of the French and British Governments, the subsequent favor of the latter, the skill of the Porte's ministers in playing off rival financiers against one another, its published series of proposed reforms, and the false sense of security created by institutions like the Ottoman Bank, were sufficient to send good money after bad. The tales of Turkey's wealth, of her inexhaustible resources and of the ease with which reform would produce handsome dividends on corporate investments, were met with equally sincere contentions that undeveloped wealth would never pay dividends, that the people of the country were already overtaxed, and that reform, if successful at all, would come only after a long period of time."\textsuperscript{12}

The debt rose to suce heights because "Potential resources existed within her borders but Turkey lacked the technical skill and capital for their development."\textsuperscript{13}

When the capital was borrowed, it went to discharge more pressing debts such as payments to the military and to administrative departments, requirements of the Sultan and charges on the debts. For example, Sultan Abdul-Aziz, 1861-1876, fell madly in love with a Circassian beauty, described as having "blue eyes, fair hair, luscious lips and extreme grace." He could deny her nothing and in one

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 28 and 74.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 70.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 75.
year showered upon her £ 1,000,000 in "jewels and costly toys."\footnote{14} Hence with such prodigalities, Turkey finally became bogged down and was unable even to meet the interest charges on her foreign debt. It was only at this time that the English investor realized the precarious position of his investment.

Turning from the problem of finance, it would be well to note the progress made toward reform. Rashid Pasha, the foreign minister who contributed to the institution of the Hatt-i-Sharif, fell from office in 1841 because of his liberal views regarding the new Commercial Code. From 1841 until Rashid returned to power in 1845, little progress was made toward carrying out the reforms. Rashid became grand vizir in 1846, and attempted to accomplish further reform.

Education was one of the first institutions to be effected by the program. The University at Istanbul was established in 1846 and coordinated the various colleges which had begun under Mahmud II. An educational council studied the needs of secondary education. But by 1851 only six schools of this type were operating and further advancement was curbed because of lack of funds and the return of reactionary leaders to office. Nevertheless,

\footnote{14}{William S. Davis, A Short History of the Near East from the Founding of Constantinople (330 A.D. to 1922), (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933) p. 320.}
the spark of education was taking hold and instilling the younger generation with new ideas. The Crimean War brought many Europeans to Turkey. Newspapers and periodicals increased in number as a result of European demand. But Temperley remarks that there was no genuine organ of Turkish opinion until 1860; all the periodicals were under the editorship of foreigners or Rayahs. 15

The Turkish reform movement had almost no encouragement from the populace. Rashid had to institute the reform without much support, for the European educated class was too small to assist him in the program. His only aid came from politicians; but they deserted him when reforms did not take effect as expected. 16

Sir Stratford Canning was the influence behind Rashid. By 1851 he had decided that all hope for reform in Turkey was abandoned, for even Rashid had succumbed to corruption. When Sir Stratford left Turkey in the fall of that year, he remarked, "No further stimulus to reform could come from personalities; it could come only from events." 17


16 Temperley, p. 245.

17 Ibid., p. 247.
event which led to the Hatt-i-Humayun was the Crimean War.

Midhat Pasha, one of a small group of forward-looking Turks, took the place of Rashid Pasha as a reformer. In 1864 he helped draw up a new law for the provinces providing for mixed tribunals for cases involving Christian and Muslim subjects of the sultan. While Midhat was governor of Bulgaria he undertook an extensive program of public works and attempted to improve agriculture and schools. Thus, although reform of the Ottoman government was a possibility and was much discussed in the restricted circles of Constantinople where foreign travellers were entertained, only rarely was reform practiced and then by such enlightened individuals as Midhat Pasha. The more usual development was the general neglecting of the reform almost as soon as the initial applause for the pronouncement had ceased.

While a thorough analysis of the fundamental reasons for the "backwardness" of Ottoman society and government would ferret out many basic ills, perhaps one which was particularly pertinent in the period under investigation stemmed from the impact of European industrial production upon the economy of the Middle East, including Turkey. The villages of the Ottoman Empire were hard pressed by the importation of manufactured goods from Europe. The handi-
craft industry of the Empire could not compete with the machine-made products imported from the West and the goods of the Western nations did not encounter a trade barrier in the Ottoman Empire. Limitations upon import duties were incorporated in the numerous Treaties of Capitulations concluded with most of the trading nations of the world, these limitations being only one of the many advantages enjoyed by the European powers within the Ottoman Empire. Since the sultan and his ministers proved incapable of meeting the new forces in the world or of adopting many of them for their land, Turkey experienced a period of economic turmoil and social and political stress. Under these mixed and confusing conditions, Turkish reform and the solution of Ottoman financial problems were fascinating topics for Englishmen, perhaps because British reform and finances were subjects much debated and discussed in England.
CHAPTER III

THE ADVISABILITY OF INVESTMENT

From the late 1840's to 1876 the recurring problems of the sultan's finances and the eternal question of reform in the Ottoman Empire marked those decades as crucial, literally so, for in some years it seemed that the survival of the Empire hung in the balance. Also it was during this period that Englishmen with surplus capital were seeking potential loan markets. Many Englishmen were curious as to the loan climate in the Ottoman Empire. They were concerned over the risk involved in investment, for many reports had been circulated concerning the ineffectiveness of the the Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane. Whether the Empire was actually benefiting from the reforms promulgated in the Hatt was a moot question. When the Hatt-i-Humayun was proclaimed in 1856, "...western money markets were electrified by the news..."¹ Potential investors were anxious to lend their capital to a country instituting what was thought to be far-reaching reforms. But after 1856 there was some doubt in the minds of the English public as to how effective the new reform measure would be, for they remembered that the reforms promised in the Hatt-i-Sharif had not materialized.

¹Jenks, p. 297.
The writings of the English travellers played an important part in helping the investor to determine his course of action. They were his source of information as to what conditions actually existed in the Empire.

Throughout their travels the Englishmen observed the amount of change resulting from either the Hatt-i-Sharif of Gulhane and the Hatt-i-Humayun, depending on whether the traveller's book was published before or after 1856. Their works disclosed that each had formulated opinions as to whether the reforms had created a climate favorable to English loans. The factors influencing the travellers' decision for or against the advisability of loans were varied. The arguments of some sounded more plausible than others. The majority of the travellers had formulated the opinion, even before visiting Turkey, that the reforms under Sultans Mahmud and Abdul Mejid had completely revivified the state. Upon arrival and during their journeys, however, the travellers did not always find the expected reforms of which they had been told. Nor did they find evidence that the officials planned to enforce the reforms which had been promulgated. This led to disillusionment on the part of some of the voyagers and to their conclusion that the Empire was a poor investment potential because of evident corruption and administrative laxity.
Many travellers were of the opinion that the two reform measures had been promulgated to institute an entirely new political and administrative organization. This was a misconception of the aims of the measures, for their purpose was actually to purify the existing institutions in a return to the ancient system. Hence, reform was to be installed, but only as a reform that cleansed existing institutions of the evils which had corrupted the old system. Some of the travellers were aware of what the Ottoman officials had attempted to do, while others were oblivious to these aims. Some of the voyagers who were disappointed in the state of Turkey were unable to decide what turn the state of affairs of the Empire would take, but the majority of them at least expressed their opinion—an opinion which foresaw no hope for the rebirth of the Empire.

Michelsen reflected indecision when he remarked, "The Turkish Government is now making strenuous efforts to shape the Empire into a state: it is a period of transition, the result of which it is impossible to predict." Brophy and St. Clair wrote:

"A social and liberal revolution effected by an absolute government can bear no fruits, for the good and simple reason that it is against the grain of the people, that  

\[\text{2Michelsen, p138.}\]
reforms the most liberal in appearance being without a reason for their existence can serve no useful purpose, and not being appreciated by the people are put to uses far different from those for which they were intended. Liberty in the abstract is beautiful and wonderful, but in order that liberty may be valued it must have been won by a people who have felt the need of it, its worth...to give liberty and civil rights to those who are not ready for it is to throw pearls before the swine."

The concluded by observing that the reforms of the day had no national or popular foundation, but were merely copied from foreign powers. The result was failure because the principle of nationality cannot be imitated. Mrs. Hornby was far more severe concerning the failure of the reforms:

"The whole system is one of bribery and corruption, and a...[position] can only be kept by doing as others do. The most amusing thing is that the Turks boast of the fine code of laws, which they certainly possess, and which is about of as much use to the wretched people as the Queen's jewels in the Tower are to our village belles on May-day."

She pictured all institutions as corrupt and degraded; she felt the poor were the aristocracy of the country because

---

3Brophy and St. Clair, p. 363.
4Ibid., p. 372.
5Hornby, p. 98.
they were more dignified and honest. Smyth had a specific solution to the problem of Turkish regeneration. He felt that provincial government must be remodelled because it led to untold corruption, which had to be stopped in order to purify the country. The system by which the pashas held office certainly did not make for honest or efficient government, for the pashas did not know whether they would be in office a few weeks or several years, so they set out to make their fortunes while they had the opportunity. A comment of Nassau Senior, often quoted in contemporary works, supported Smyth's view.

"Turkey exists for two purposes. First, ... to prevent any Christian power from possessing [her] and secondly, for the benefit of some fifty or sixty bankers and usurers, and some thirty or forty pashas, who make fortunes out of its spoils."

Mrs. Hornby related that a Turkish gentleman came to visit her and they fell to discussing how the "Turkish Ministers were:

"...sunk in indolence and vice; how devoid they almost all are of the slightest feeling for their unhappy and despised country... how they only seek, their own interest and aggrandisment..."

She later informed her readers that the gentleman was a

---

6 Smyth, p. 98.
7 Senior, p. 84.
8 Hornby, p. 281.
known Turkish revolutionary. He was probably one among very few at that early date.

MacFarlane revealed why his book was such a bitter remonstrance against the Empire while explaining to his readers the further need for reform. He spoke of his journeying to Constantinople in 1828 and finding conditions rather depressing and remarked that he expected to discover a new Turkey on his 1847 journey because he was informed by many sources that the Constantinople of 1847 was certainly far different as, "...the corruption, tyranny, and grinding oppression on the part of the Pashas...had almost ceased since the accession of the present Sultan, Abdul Mejid..."9 MacFarlane, a bit of an idealist, did not find the sweeping change which he had expected and decided to inform his fellow Englishmen of the shocking conditions of the Empire as he saw it. He complains, "Turkey was in an incomparably worse condition than that in which she stood when I left her in 1828."10

The pashas, who were often reported in England as the epitome of corruption, gained a large share of their riches from the collection of taxes. Smyth told his readers that the system of taxation was shocking for "...The amount is arbitrary on the part of the government, and the people

9MacFarlane, p. 4.
10Ibid., p. 5.
never know how much they must expect to pay."\textsuperscript{11} He blamed
the corruption upon the farming out of tax collection for
"Everyone employed in tax collecting attempted to collect
a share of the spoil, and the peasant had to pay two or
three times the sum finally received by the government."\textsuperscript{12}

Faced with a picture such as was painted by Smyth
Hornby and MacFarlane, the English investor probably
wondered what would happen to his capital when handled
by a group of men as corrupt as those evidently thrive-
ing in Turkey. But not all the travellers were dis-
ilusioned by the conditions in Turkey. Four of the
twelve considered were more optimistic. They held that
while there was much corruption, the reforms, if given
time, would eliminate the problem. Ubicini felt that
the future promised a new era for Turkey, and that
it was to be built upon the law, or a modification of the
ancient law of the Koran. He observed that reforms were
better followed if the sultan took the initiative because,
"the Osmanli always considers success as the sentence of
God."\textsuperscript{13} Hence, Ubicini felt sure that the Turks would
accept the reforms offered by the sultan, who, as caliph,

\textsuperscript{11} Smyth, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 98.
\textsuperscript{13} Ubicini, I, p. 131.
was responsible for enforcing God's laws. Morell also felt that the Empire was making rapid strides toward revitalization. He was convinced that the words of the political testament of Sultan Mahmud, ordering protective equality to be extended to all races, struck at the root of the evil which had contributed to the decay of the empire.\textsuperscript{14}

Because of their feeling that the Ottoman Empire was benefiting from the reform program, Farley and Michelsen joined Ubicini and Morell in suggesting investment in Turkey. Their works painted a pleasant picture of Turkey, for they were convinced that English capital would strengthen the Ottoman Empire. They reasoned that as the country gained wealth, from the exploitation of its industries, it would be able to institute further progressive measures such as better schools and a program of public works. They backed up their arguments for investment by presenting pages of statistics pointing out the disposition of agriculture, the progress of public instruction, the growth of manufacturing, and the increase in foreign trade.

The motives of the aforementioned four travellers were not easily discerned. Farley, an officer of the state bank of Constantinople was convinced that the Empire offered a sound investment opportunity. Michelsen and Morell were prejudiced by their attachment to the country and their

\textsuperscript{14}Morell, p. 101.
desire for Englishmen to share in the exploitation of the tremendous resource potential. Morell and Michelsen were not concerned with the growing debt, or at least they did not seem so in their volumes. Ubicini, the most scholarly of the authors, attempted to present authentic information. He was thoroughly convinced that the reforms would lead to, "...the ultimate regeneration of the Ottoman Empire..." In speaking of the purpose of his volumes Ubicini states,

"The task I propose to myself is to explain this Tanzimat, or new organization of Turkey, considering successively, and in detail, its various branches -- policy, administration, government, national worship, public instruction, army, marine, finance, etc.; all of which points are little understood and imperfectly appreciated in Europe but which serve to show that the Turkish Empire which it has been proposed to drive back across the Bosphorus, is tending, on the contrary, ... to detach itself entirely from Asia, and to become an integral part of Europe, to the completion of which it is an essential element."16

The statistics and contents of these four works, presented with the stamp of sincerity, must have been most convincing to many Englishmen. Furthermore, since the English had large amounts of surplus capital, investment opportunities were in demand. When the potential investor read the encouraging words of authors, such as Farley and Ubicini, they needed no further persuasion.

15 Ubicini, I, p. 3.
16 Ibid., I, p. 9.
During the early years of the Ottoman loans a good return had been enjoyed from each investment, for the Empire had been able to pay the interest on its debts. Talk of corruption and decay seemed far removed.

The English reader was faced with divergent opinions. He could read books presenting the Turks as untrustworthy and corrupt -- as a race and an Empire for which there was not much hope. He also could find strong arguments in favor of the Turks explaining that they were on their way back up the ladder and would soon be a rejuvenated country. Investment in a country with unlimited potential was pictured as reaping pleasant benefits for the investor. Faced with the decision, Englishmen leaned toward investment because the writers of the latter group of volumes were more convincing; they were respected and better known and their works were more appealingly written.
CHAPTER IV

PROGRESS AS NOTED BY THE TRAVELLERS

Disagreement among the travellers as to progress made since the institution of the reforms waxed strong, as has been evidenced in the preceding chapter. Many of the wayfarers cited advancement in the educational fields as an indication of the rejuvenation of the institutions of the country. Morell refuted the often stated Western theory that Islam imposed chains on human intelligence. He argued that if the caliphs burned libraries, the same thing is recorded of a Christian cardinal.\(^1\) Reports more specifically favorable to the Turkish educational system were proffered in Ubicini, in the writings of John Mason, and those of Brophy and St. Clair.

Ubicini explained:

"When we accuse the Turks of loving ignorance let us be sure beforehand that we understand what we are talking of. It is true they are ignorant of many things which our children learn in school: history, geography, the classical languages, and the natural science--of these they have hitherto known and cared to know but little; but this does not prevent their having their own peculiar branches of learning; and most assuredly they employ in study more time than even we ourselves devote to it."\(^2\)

He reported that the population which could read was

\(^1\)Morell, p. 82.

\(^2\)Ubicini, I, p. 191.
considerable, even though the various tongues they mastered were more difficult than English. This observation was upheld by John Mason's explanation of the study program of the secondary student. "...children pass through courses of Arabic, Persian and French languages, geography, history, arithmetic and geometry in the four preparatory classes."3

Brophy and St. Clair added that the Turkish peasants were well-educated, in general. They held that, thanks to excellent schools, half of the population was able to read and write a language that was perhaps five times as hard as English. "There are few Turks who cannot read the Koran and many are acquainted with arithmetic as far as the rule of three."4 Perhaps Brophy and St. Clair were overly anxious to impress the reader with the accomplishments of the peasants for most of the other sources did not portray the peasants, nor the upper-classes as so well-educated.

Ubicini reported that an Ottoman University was established in 1845 and that the system of public instruction was remodelled. He pointed out that the problem of educational reform was a difficult process. The Ulema had to be stripped of their power over education. Public instruction had to be secularized, and education by the State had to be

3Mason, p. 171.

4Brophy and St. Clair, p. 13.
substituted for education by the Mosque. The English reader was led to understand that in the re-organization, the Mektebs, or elementary schools, remained basically the same; but a secondary education program had to be created, as little secondary education had hitherto existed in Turkey. By the year 1851 the Mektebi Rushdii, or adolescent schools, were six in number and were attended by 870 pupils. These schools were maintained at the expense of the state.

The reader was informed that the Turks established some schools for specialized training. The schools often mentioned in the travellers works were: the College of the Valideh Sultanah, founded in 1850 to prepare young men for employment in various departments of the government; the Imperial Military College, established in 1830 by Sultan Mahmud for the purpose of training young officers; the Imperial College of Artillery and Engineers, founded by Selim III for the formation of military engineers; and the Agricultural School and the Veterinary School, both established in late 1850.

Ubicini gave a surprisingly accurate picture of the progress of the educational system. He was honest enough

---

5Ubicini, I, p. 192.
6Ibid., I, pp. 198-201.
7Ibid., I, pp. 204-208.
to report the breakdown of the system by 1851, for he told his readers that when he revisited Turkey in 1852, he found that educational progress had been checked considerably.

"The Government, after commencing with great vigour its reforms and reorganization of the public education, had withdrawn its attention elsewhere. The building of the new University (which had begun in 1847) was suspended, and the foundation of Secondary or Middle Schools in the provinces was given up."8

Especial reference was made to the Turkish Medical College in the writings of several of the travellers. Even Charles MacFarlane, whose volume was most unfriendly to the Ottoman Empire, commented favorably about the Medical College. He spent two mornings examining the school. He found the wooden building perilous and commented that a new stone edifice, which was to be the new home of the medical college, was nearly finished.9 He told the reader,

"No harsh criticism could apply to the liberality of the young Sultan in providing the sums necessary for stocking the establishment with implements, museums, cabinets and other means and facilities of study. All the last improved instruments of Paris, London, and Vienna were to be found in the Galata Serai."10

8Ibid., I, p. 209.
9MacFarlane's comments concerning the new building were made in 1848.
10MacFarlane, pp. 91-92.
John Mason described the visit of the sultan to the Medical College in August, 1860. Mason commented that this visit of the sultan, to award prizes to the top candidates receiving the degree of Doctor of Medicine, testified to the great interest taken by the sultan in the progress of public instruction in his empire. He further remarked that, "his majesty and all the ministers appeared perfectly satisfied with the real progress made in all the departments of the college... in the past year."\textsuperscript{11}

MacFarlane numbered the students enrolled in the medical college at nearly 400 in 1848.\textsuperscript{12} Mason wrote that there were 454 pupils in 1859.\textsuperscript{13} If the figures of the two men are true, there was very little increase in enrollment through the twelve year period. If the English reader had happened to read both the MacFarlane and the Mason volume, he might have noted the figures as evidence of lack of advancement. MacFarlane told his readers that the students of the medical school were from the poorer classes and that none of the Turks of the upper or middle classes ever sent a son to college.\textsuperscript{14} He finished his

\textsuperscript{11}Mason, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{12}MacFarlane, p. 93.
\textsuperscript{13}Mason, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{14}MacFarlane, p. 94.
discussion of the medical school by informing his readers that,

"A very considerable portion of the graduates gave up all thoughts of medicine as soon as they quit the college; some being taken by the government and employed in totally different service; and others of themselves renouncing a profession which was badly paid and led to no promotion."\(^{15}\)

Smyth, writing in 1854, had the following to say about education:

"Turkey is...more than any country in Europe in a transitional state, and has made greater strides, within a few years, towards improvement, though hideous corruption, and many a foul stain shared no less by Christians than by Moslems, remain to be cleared away. The monopoly of knowledge, till lately, among the Ulema, or professors of religion and law, has been a prime obstacle to more rapid change; but the establishment of military, medical, and other schools is already breaking in on the old routine."\(^{16}\)

So many of the travellers, in pointing out the advancement of education mentioned the medical school, but had no comment to make about the Mektebs or the Mektebi Rushdii. Perhaps this was because they could only find evidence of progress in the program of the medical school.

Ubicini had one note of good cheer to interject after pointing out the failings of the educational system. He explained that the Injemen-Danish, or Academy of Science

\(^{15}\)Tbid., p. 95.  
\(^{16}\)Smyth, p. 291.
and Literature had been established in the interim of his visits. But he censured the academy for having done, as yet, so little to promote education.

The difficulties encountered by the older generation in understanding the new educational concepts were illustrated by Smyth. He explained that the old school obstructed the utilization of the talents of young Turks who were educated abroad. The older men, not familiar with European institutions, were unable to grasp the significance of the advanced European methods, especially in regard to specialization. Perhaps this misunderstanding accounted for the circulation of the following anecdote. It seemed that two young Turks returned from a European capital, where they had been studying surgery. They were supposed, by an older official to be equally accomplished at the cutting and carving of cloth and silk, and were at once advanced to the post of inspectors in a manufactory of red fezes.17

Smyth appealed to a matter closer home in explaining to the reader that Ottoman reform efforts were in no worse condition than those of England. He said,

"It is objected that Sultan Mahmoud's attempted reforms have not met with the expected success. What shall we say of our own Reform Bill, of our educational efforts? Are we to despair of improvement because its growth is slow?"18

17 Ibid., p. 279.
18 Ibid., p. 279.
The facilities of the libraries of Constantinople were appraised by the travellers in a further attempt to illustrate reform. They also commented upon the number of periodicals and newspapers printed in Constantinople. They held that the advancement of the media of communication helped them conclude how far reforms had progressed in regard to education and general knowledge.

"Reformation in Turkey has not stopped at the improvement of public schools and colleges; it has promoted the extension of libraries, and by giving a new impulse to the press, and favouring the introduction of journalism and of a periodical press, has developed an intellectual movement in the heart of the nation, which is already beginning to exercise a powerful influence on the national character, and disposing it more and more to receive the impress of Western ideas and civilization."

With these encouraging words English citizens, no doubt, decided that the public library was becoming an important institution in Turkey. Ubicini numbered the public libraries in Constantinople at forty, in 1852. Mason told his readers he had counted thirty-six libraries in Constantinople in 1848. But Mason added that the scientific men of Europe were not permitted access to the libraries. If Mason's information was true, the restriction was evidently removed by 1852, for Ubicini's volume explained that, "visitors are permitted to make extracts,

19Ubicini, I, p. 213.
and even entire copies of any of the works the Library contains; but the removal of any volume is most strictly forbidden." All the libraries possessed ample funds for their preservation, and for the salaries of librarians and servants; but it did not appear that these funds were employed in adding to their contents, which remained nearly the same as when they were first founded, according to Ubicini. He further remarked that 1,000 private libraries, the property of the Imperial Mosques, were not open to Europeans probably because their works were not catalogued.

Michelsen reported that the art of printing was first introduced into Turkey by Saad Effendi in 1727, but that it was slow to take hold until the early 1840's. By then, the Government possessed three printing establishments that printed state papers and state gazettes in Oriental languages.

Morell informed the English reader that the first Constantinople newspaper was founded in 1831. The number of newspapers steadily grew and led Ubicini to observe that in 1855 there were thirteen newspapers published in Constantinople, either daily or weekly, in six languages.

---

20 Mason, p. 215.
21 Ubicini, I, p. 216.
22 Michelsen, p. 250.
23 Morell, p. 58.
24 Ubicini, I, p. 250.
Michelsen reported that thirty-four periodicals issued forth from Constantinople during the course of a month. Of the thirty-four, five were devoted to trade and navigation, two exclusively to law, one to medicine, and one to the sciences. A state almanac in the Turkish language, also appeared annually in Constantinople. Ubicini admitted that there was still much to be desired in the press, for the public journals often purposely avoided offending the Government. In the 1850's they received support and encouragement from the Government. Ubicini suggested that the press sometimes fostered illusions and tampered with the truth rather than point out necessary error or criticism.

In the light of social progress the reader could often discover an interesting bit of information resting in the pages of the book by Mrs. William Grey. Mrs. Grey described the following scene:

"At seven o'clock we went to dine with the Sultan at Dolma-Batchi. The palace is beautiful; but the dinner, though very good and well served, was rather a dull affair, which we can not be surprised when we are told that this was positively the first time the Sultan ever sat down to dinner with ladies, or, indeed, that any of his own ministers, except the Grand Vizier had ever been known to sit down in his presence...."

25 Michelsen, p. 171.
26 Grey, p. 163.
If Mrs. Grey's information was correct, then a step forward was achieved, for it had been the strict custom that the sultan dined alone, supposedly because no one was worthy of sharing his company. Hence Abdul Mejid made a precedent breaking move as evidenced by Mrs. Grey's subsequent description of the uneasiness of the Turks at the dinner party.

Smyth told his readers that they had no cause to expect a sudden and complete transformation. He again reminded them that while the reforms of Mahmud II and Abdul Mejid had not met with complete success, neither had the English Reform Bill of 1831. He cautioned the English that they should not be so quick to criticize.

"The licence of the Janissary system has been crushed, the army remodelled, polygamy checked, special schools established, bigotry softened down, commerce increased, and the portion of the Kayahs ameliorated. A great deal remains on paper only, which can only become the law of the land as the generation inveterately attached to old institutions gradually passes away."

The voyagers were most interested in pointing out to their readers the potentialities of progress in the Empire. For example, Murray observed that,

"...till very lately there was no national debt in Turkey; there are still no banks, no railroads, none of those enterprises on a grand scale which present an attractive

27Smyth, p. 279.
employment for private fortune; and if there were, the Turk would long look shyly on them."\textsuperscript{28}

Although this opinion sounded reminiscent of 1820, that was not the case, for Murray was referring to conditions as he saw them. But by 1869 progress had made apparent strides according to Brophy and St. Clair. They described the new railroad reaching from Varna to Ruschuk, saying that it was a great advantage to foreigners living in European Turkey, that contracts were already made for other railroads in Turkey, but that it would be some years before they were completed.\textsuperscript{29}

The lack of proper transportation facilities was mentioned time and again by the travellers. A sufficient number of roadways and railways would have helped the cause of progress for travel was limited and difficult within the Empire. Senior observed that, "no one moves about from place to place unless forced to do so."\textsuperscript{30} He also said that Mehmed Koprulu Pasha complained that there was not a single real road in Turkey, except one about five miles long made by the French. Koprulu felt that an operation as gigantic as road-building could not be undertaken because of the expense entailed.\textsuperscript{31} This view seemed indica-

\textsuperscript{28}Murray, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{29}Brophy and St. Clair, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{30}Senior, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p. 40.
tive of the general Turkish feeling during the period. Though progress was on everyone's lips, the majority of the travellers did not find the evidence of progression that they had hoped to discover. Therefore, they could only hope for the materialization of outlined plans at a future date. Some told their readers that progress would materialize from reforms and that one reform would lead to another.

The travellers were much concerned with the potential of the natural resources of the country. Smyth pointed out to his readers that mineral deposits were one of the most important sources of unused resources. He included in his book a list of twenty-four sites at which mineral wealth had previously been discovered. By examining the condition of the secondary strata he also had reason to believe that there were huge deposits of limestone and other minerals waiting to be mined. The Porte was not unaware of these minerals, but was unable to dispose of them without the advice and assistance of foreigners. Hence, the concessions were often turned over to Greeks or Europeans who determined how the mining operation should proceed. However, the Europeans were distrusted and subsequently dismissed. Dismissal of these men did not solve the problems still to be faced in the mining operations. Smyth cited the plight of a copper mine at Arghaneh Maden (a small village in Kurdistan, 125 miles from Trebizond) to

32 Smyth, pp. 296-300.
explain the problem to his readers. Austrian technicians had shaped the mine into an efficient unit, but when they were dismissed, the Turks in charge allowed the mine to fall into disrepair, and hence the output of the mine was negligible.\textsuperscript{33} Smyth suggested to the English that education of the Turk would be necessary before the potentialities of the resources of Turkey could be unleashed.\textsuperscript{34}

The possibilities of industry were extolled by the travellers. They admitted that at the time of their writing the actualities of industrial production were at a low point. In times past, manufacturing occupied a place of honor; products such as Damascus steel, loomed goods from Aleppo, and satins and silks from Brusa were world renowned. But by the era of which the travellers were writing, production of goods was nearly nil. Instead of manufacturing the finished goods, Turkey exported some raw materials to the West, where they were turned into finished goods and resold in the Empire. Ubicini keenly sensed the trouble when he listed two main reasons for the decline of manufacture. The first was the so-called "inveterate custom", i.e. always employing the same process of manufacturing; and the other was the change in the dress of the middle and upper classes to a more European style.\textsuperscript{35} Since

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 103-04.
\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{35}Ubicini, I, p. 341.
these garments could not be manufactured in Turkey as reasonably or as fashionably as in Europe, they were imported. Furthermore, even in such articles as cheap cotton sheeting, the mills of Lancashire produced better goods more cheaply than the native handicraft industry could turn out homespun. The relative higher price of native labor, therefore, and the low tariff on imported goods made clothes manufactured in Turkey more expensive.

Michelsen felt that industry was on the decrease and would soon vanish altogether unless steps were taken to restore it. He explained that industry was hindered by the custom-tariff which placed a twelve per-cent levy on exports, while only a five per-cent levy was placed on imports. Hence, European goods could be imported more cheaply than the same goods could be manufactured in Turkey, owing to the excessively high wages which were demanded by the Turks and their tendency to dawdle during working hours.\(^{36}\) Mason was more optimistic than the other travellers already mentioned. His writings praised the regeneration of agriculture and industry. He told the Englishmen of extensive manufactures which had been established by the government, which imported European labor.\(^{37}\) Perhaps in 1848, when Mason wrote his volume, the regenerative policy did look pro-

\(^{36}\)Michelsen, p. 189.

\(^{37}\)Mason, p. 230.
mising; but by 1860 the majority of the plans and policies had again fallen asunder due to misdirection and indolence.

The majority of the investigators into the Ottoman way of life decried the lack of proper use of the superb agricultural areas. They envisioned a rosy future for Turkey if the Turks would but make use of the land at their disposal. Michelsen's observations were typical of the majority of the travellers. He summed them up quite well in four points:

1) The general indolence of the country people and their reluctance to adopt any method of improving the soil;

2) The shortage of labor by reason of excessive army demands and the lure of the city;

3) The lack of ready money when needed by the farmer because of excessive taxes and the enormous rate of interest charged by the usurer from whom he was forced to borrow money for the upkeep of the farm until the crop matured;

and

4) Want of adequate means of communication or quick access to market.38

An English reader could readily see that faced with the above problems the Turkish agriculturist might tend to raise only enough to supply the wants of his family. This was what happened and with dire results to the price of food in Turkish cities.

Brophy and St. Clair suggested that the problem would be solved if the government employ both capital and

38Michelsen, pp. 164-88.
energy in revitalizing agriculture. But they told the reader that the government was far too busy enriching and developing the towns to be concerned with agriculture. The statistics offered by Farley did not agree with the contentions of Messrs. Brophy and St. Clair, nor with those of Michelsen. Farley's volume intended specifically to sell the Englishman on the idea of investing capital in the Empire, envisioned an agricultural scene more active than the one pictured by other authors. He spoke of the "...almost inexhaustible production...of those ordinary raw materials which form everywhere the real staples of food and manufacture."39 He listed products easily produced as: grain, wool, cotton, hemp, hides, tallow, and timber. Articles not quite as easily produced included drugs, dyes, gums, fruit, vegetable oils, silk, sugar, and tobacco. He said that Turkey had the climate to produce any and all of these articles. He backed up his statement with elaborate graphs and figures illustrating the exports to Great Britain and France from 1858 to 1860. For example, Turkey exported £427,529 worth of wool in 1860 to England and £148,511 worth of silk. She also exported 18,667,676 bales of tobacco in 1858.40 These figures, it would seem, could have encouraged potential investors.

39Farley, p. 35.
40Ibid., pp. 29, 40, 42.
CHAPTER V

THE TRAVELLERS EXAMINE THE BUDGET

Some of the voyagers devoted many pages to the examination of the financial condition of the Ottoman Empire, while others made little or no mention of finance. The English reader was told that the problem of determining the receipts and expenditures of the Empire was difficult because of the scarcity of statistical information. Some of the travellers included information concerning the budget in their books. A portion of the statistics were, no doubt, authentic and some were manufactured. The importance of the statistics was whether they sounded authentic and thereby influenced the reader's opinion. Farley and Michelsen presented statistical information for their readers to examine. Michelsen's figures dealt with the budget of 1852, while Farley's dealt with the 1861-62 budget.

As has been mentioned earlier, corruption in the collection of taxes was recognized by many of the travellers as a main cause of financial trouble. But Farley was not alarmed about the condition of the Empire in 1862, as was illustrated by the following statement.

"...there is nothing in the financial condition of Turkey which need create alarm or distrust. When a country is overwhelmed with debt, with an enormous deficit in its budget, without power of retrenchment and with its resources exhausted, then, indeed, the statesman and financier, however great
their ability and skill, may well despair of being able to retrieve the public credit. But in a country whose debts do not exceed some three years' revenue, where large retrenchments may be made without injury to the public service, where taxation is only oppressive by its unequal distribution, and where immense resources abound on every side a temporary deficit in the budget, although it may be for the moment a source of considerable embarrassment to the Government, cannot afford a legitimate ground for anxiety or fear.  

Michelsen, writing a decade earlier, did not agree. He told his readers, "The finances of Turkey, during the last four years have been in a very low condition." If Michelsen had published his book in 1862 he would probably have held that conditions were even lower than in 1852. To substantiate his statement that finance was a growing problem he printed the receipts and disbursements of the Empire for 1852.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Piastres</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tithes</td>
<td>220,000,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Taxes</td>
<td>200,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll Tax</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>86,000,000</td>
<td>860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Taxes</td>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribute of Egypt</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Wallachia</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Moldavia</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Servia</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>731,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,310,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1Farley, p. 21.

2Michelsen, p. 173.

3Ibid., p. 173. Neither Farley nor Michelsen indicated whether their figures were quoted in Turkish pounds or English pounds. The British pound sign was always used. Michelsen was probably quoting Turkish pounds.
The expenditures for 1852 were listed as follows.4

| Civil list of the Sultan | 75,000,000 | 750,000 |
| Do. of the Sultana-Mother and the Princesses | 8,400,000 | 84,000 |
| Army | 300,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Navy | 37,500,000 | 375,000 |
| Ordnance | 30,000,000 | 300,000 |
| Pay of the functionaries | 195,000,000 | 1,950,000 |
| Foreign department | 10,000,000 | 100,000 |
| Public Works | 10,000,000 | 100,000 |
| Pious and Charitable Institutions | 12,500,000 | 125,000 |
| Interest of Treasury Bonds | 9,000,000 | 90,000 |
| Life Annuities | 4,000,000 | 40,000 |
| Do. of the former possessors of fiefs | 40,000,000 | 400,000 |

Total Expenditures | 731,400,000 | 7,314,000 |

Though the expenditures exceeded the budget by only £ 4,000, Michelsen explained that there was also the matter of the internal or home-debt, whose ramifications extended so far as frequently to require liquidation abroad.5 In 1852 the internal debt amounted to £ 8,960,000 in paper money and beshlik (metal money of low value).6 Needless to say European countries would not accept paper money of the Ottoman Empire in payment for exports to Turkey. Turkish exports to the West dwindled to such an extent that the problem became the need of a source to obtain European funds to pay for European goods received. When Turkey obtained her

---

4Michelsen, p. 176.
5Ibid., p. 181.
6Ibid., p. 182.
first loan from the West, she used the proceeds largely to settle the unfavorable trade balance. But no problem was being solved; on the contrary, the Empire was only sinking further into debt by reason of the interest payments on the European loan. Michelsen further pointed out that Public Works was budgeted only £100,000 in 1852. He commented, and aptly so, that this was a pitifully small sum. With funds of only £100,000 not much could be done toward roadbuilding, railways, harbors, canals, lighthouses, waterworks, telegraphs or any other projects so necessary if Turkey's economy was to blossom forth and prove fruitful for the investment of British capital. 7

Farley did not comment on such matters as the Public Works program in his examination of the 1861-62 budget, for he was attempting to encourage European capital into the area, not to criticize the reforms undertaken by the government. He incorporated into his book an Imperial Edict of the year 1861 which was a report by Fuad Pasha to Sultan Abdul Aziz. The Edict concerned the state of finance in the Empire. The document included a summary of receipts and expenditures for 1861-62, and also contained Fuad's explanation of the financial problems he encountered. This was probably the only Ottoman Edict concerning finance published for perusal by the English public. The British

7Ibid., p. 177.
reader was informed that a deficit first arose in 1854 because of the Crimean War and continued thereafter because of the expenses incurred by reason of precautionary measures taken against the further threat of war. The Edict placed the cause of financial problems upon Abdul Mejid, the previous Sultan. Fuad Pasha, the Grand Vizier, was portrayed as being most concerned with the problem of the Gaimes (paper money).

"The paper money is one of the most evident causes -- indeed, the real cause -- of our present difficulties and of the discredit of our finances.... It was used as a temporary means to remedy the delays in collecting the revenue, caused by important changes introduced at that period in the civil and financial administration of the empire."10

The Grand Vizier estimated that the losses paper money caused to the Imperial Treasury were two to three million annually. The government had almost removed paper money from circulation several times, but further liabilities necessitated reissuance of the Gaimes. Economy measures had reduced the liabilities to a floating debt of £9,142,440 in 1862.11 The British reader could note that the external debt resulting from the loans of the years 1854,

---

8Farley, p. 22.

9It is interesting to note that the cause of Abdul Mejid's death has been attributed to over-indulgence in alcohol.

10Farley, pp. 22-23.

11Ibid., p. 23.
1856, 1858 and 1860 amounted to £ 15,084,960 with the interest due in 1861 amounting to £ 571,400. The civil list (including pensions, presents sent to Mecca and "etc.") totaled £ 1,823,231. The final section of the budget listed debts incurred by the Ministerial departments amounting to £ 7,926,238. The British reader was reminded that the government derived income from direct taxes, indirect taxes, public establishments, special products, tributes, and special revenues that accrued from some of the Ministerial departments. The revenues of 1860-61 amounted to £ 11,164,552. Hence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stated expenses</td>
<td>£ 12,739,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole revenue</td>
<td>£ 11,164,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>£ 1,574,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the year of 1860-61.¹² Yet the total deficit amounted to £ 18,284,800 by reason of the circulation of GAIMES plus the requirements of the floating debt. Furthermore, Fuad was reported as asserting that it had been only recently that Turkey had experienced a deficiency of revenue, whereas to the contrary Senior had listed a debt of £ 14,940,000 already outstanding in 1857.¹³ Fuad saw no cause for alarm in the amount of the Ottoman debt; when he compared the debt of the Ottoman Empire with that of some of the Western States, he found Turkey's liability to be relatively small.

---

¹²Ibid., p. 25.

¹³Senior, p. 115.
He argued that England's interest on the public debt in 1850 was 6,292,000 purses, while Turkey's interest due in 1862 was only 334,498 purses, or £1,529,157. He was trying to illustrate that the Ottoman Empire was not in financial difficulty. The British reader may have wondered if this was a logical comparison for there was a great difference between England, the country which was becoming a commercial giant, and Turkey whose industries were minute in comparison.

Farley's text presented the Grand Vizier's suggestions for meeting the Empire's deficit and redeeming the Public Debt. Fuad's solution probably encouraged the English reader to feel conditions would improve with the institution of his plan. Fuad stated that taxes and loans would be increased. He felt this could be done because "In Turkey the amount of taxation paid by each individual is forty-five piastres, in England it is probably more than 300 piastres, and in France it exceeds 250." But Fuad did not mention that the system of tax collection milked the citizens of the Empire of far more than forty-five piastres, even though only forty-five were received by the Imperial Treasury. Evidently he realized the fact, for he stated that further revenue was to be gained by direct taxation instead of farming out the privilege, by government

\[14\] Farley, p. 28.
monopoly on salt and tobacco, and by an increase in the custom-house duties. All these changes were to amount to a total receipt increase of £ 3,268,408 per annum.\textsuperscript{15} This was perhaps an inadequate increase for Senior pointed out that in the midst of the financial difficulties the sultan was still spending £ 1,500,000 a year on frivolities, which said he was three times as much as the yearly budget of Victoria's entire household.\textsuperscript{16} Ubicini explained to his readers that the sultan was unaware of the financial conditions, because of his detachment from the problems of State. He knew only what the vizier wanted him to know.\textsuperscript{17}

Farley revealed plans to help the financial condition of Turkey. He felt that the answer to the problem was the establishment of a national bank. "[The establishment of a bank]...would afford a sufficient security and guarantee the government itself."\textsuperscript{18} He added that the exchange would not fluctuate, the government would have an official agency to represent it in purchases and sales of precious metals and bills. A large proportion of the specie in circulation could be absorbed by the bank, and bank notes could be disseminated throughout the Empire,

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Tbid.}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Senior}, p. 116.
\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ubicini, I}, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Farley}, p. 31.
thus money would become more abundant, the bank would force
the usurers out of business, and the "...moral influence
of the bank would hold in check extortion on the part of
the collectors of revenue..."\textsuperscript{19} Morell seemed favorably
disposed to the national bank as he felt it would regulate
the credit of the country and withdraw doubtful money from
circulation.\textsuperscript{20} Farley explained to the British reader that
they could assist Turkey financially by investing in Ottoman
bonds. He reasoned that as soon as the wealthy Turks saw
the riches produced from the wise investment of English
capital in the Empire they would also invest their capital
and "...convert the wilderness of waste into a productive
field."\textsuperscript{21}

Michelsen reminded his reader's that authentic data
of trade and commerce did not exist in the 1850's. He
set the value of exports for 1852 at £ 10,644,450 and the
value of imports at £ 11,823,300.\textsuperscript{22} He related that the
commerce of Hamburgh far exceeded that of Turkey and con-
cluded that Turkey was in a deplorable condition. But he
also interjected that the commerce of the country could be
developed under different auspices. This may have been a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 32.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Morell, p. 207.
\item \textsuperscript{21}Farley, p. 33.
\item \textsuperscript{22}Michelsen, p. 191.
\end{itemize}
suggestion for the British to employ a firmer hand in commercial affairs of the Empire. Michelsen explained that Ottoman commerce with England had assumed an important character, while relations with France had decreased owing to the high duty levied by France on Turkish imports. 23 France may have levied duties on Turkish goods but the seaport of Constantinople operated under free trade principles. This attractive point was faithfully reported by the travellers. Ubicini says, "...the Sultans for three centuries have gone ahead of the most progressive European economists in the application of their theories, and they have been the first in Europe to proclaim absolute freedom in trade." 24

Mrs. Hornby, whose husband was a member of a commission investigating the feasibility of a loan to the Empire, commented thusly as to the feeling of the Turks concerning finance:

"...there is a great feeling of anger among the Turks about the Commission; that they are bent (three or four of them especially, who are furious at the idea of not being able to finger some thousands for their own private purse) on getting the whole of the loan into their own hands; that they declare they will never consent to disgrace the Ottoman Government by asking foreign Commissioners to consent to their spending their own money...." 25

23 Ibd., p. 192.
24 Ubicini, I, p. 347.
25 Hornby, p. 91.
Here again was evidence that the Turks did not reason as they were expected to by men of the West. The Turks had not yet realized the intricacies of Western finance and it was not understandable to them that they should be told what to do with money that they borrowed. They were slow to grasp the significance of their financial crisis. The European countries kept furnishing them with more money to squander. Finally Turkey could no longer meet the obligations and on October 7, 1875 an announcement was made that only half the coupons on the bonds would be paid. Six years later, the decree of Mouharrem of 1881 permitted Europe to administer the financial institutions of the Empire.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It was natural that the twelve books would not agree upon the progress of reform and finance in the Ottoman Empire. The reaction of the travellers to Turkey differed because of the varied purposes of their trips. Some journeyed to Turkey to investigate, some to exploit, and some to scold. The travellers reacted to similar situations in a dissimilar manner, perhaps because of their training and background. For example, the interests of the two English ladies herein considered were quite different from those of John Mason the medical missionary or Sir W. W. Smyth the geologist. Their different interests usually accounted for different reactions. Often, people who had travelled through Turkey were considered to be authorities on the land. Unfortunately this assumption was not always correct as the writings of the voyagers sometimes showed. A traveller with little understanding of the intricacies of Turkish problems may have been influential in the formation of the reader's views of the Turkish situation.

The British were interested in the Ottoman Empire for various reasons. The books of the travellers helped to satisfy their curiosity about an area which had been rather obscure to the British public prior to the Crimean War. The trip of the Prince and Princess of Wales was followed
with interest in many English circles. Farley's volume was probably read by financiers who were anxious to discover what a banking official residing in Constantinople advised concerning British investment in Ottoman bonds. The books were, for the most part, vital and glowing accounts of the problems encountered by the officials of the Empire.

A group of the travellers argued that the regeneration of the Turks would soon be at hand and cited evidences of improvement which were to be found throughout the Empire. Some of the voyagers were convinced that there was little chance for Ottoman survival. A few felt there was a possibility that the Turks would be able to join the European community. All of the travellers, however, were consistent in one phase of their writing -- they realized Turkey could not stand alone but that she must have help if there was any chance of her revitalization. They de-viated in the appraisal of the type of help needed. Ubicini, Farley, Michelsen, and Morell felt that capital was the main requirement.

These men who advocated investment in the Empire may have been partly responsible for continued English investment. It is impossible to ascertain the actual influence of the books of the travellers, but they could have been one of the factors responsible for continued investment by reason of their convincing arguments concerning the potentialities of Turkey. Eight of the
travellers' works generally pictured the Empire as corrupt and not disposed to investment. They concluded that investment was unwise because they found no evidence of the changes which had been so heartily proclaimed. It is ironic that the majority of the travellers found Turkey unsuitable for investment, but that English investment continued. Farley must have felt that his early books advising investment in the Ottoman Empire had some influence or he would not have bothered publishing a book in 1874 advising English investors to withdraw their capital from Ottoman bonds.

The majority of the travellers were more interested in the condition of reform than that of finance. Brophy and St. Clair joined Mason and Morell in explaining the school system of the Turks. They cited evidence of educational reform but pointed out that phases of reform in the educational system were lagging because the government had not kept its promises in regard to such matters as charters for schools, or providing funds for buildings. Most of the travellers, including Smyth and even the pessimistic MacFarlane, felt that education had advanced since the promulgation of the Hatt-i-Sharif of Galhane. They informed their readers that the number of newspapers and periodicals was beginning to grow, libraries were being extended, and more Turks were attending Western schools and were better equipped to understand Western Society. The travell-
ers pointed out that the reform which they described was beginning to lag and little was being done to further progress. They explained that they found little evidence of progress in the public works program, in the development and utilization of natural resources or in the construction of a sound agricultural program. Yet they felt there was a good possibility that the Turks could overcome their lethargy and launch a far reaching program of reform even though two had already failed. Several of the writers developed elaborate programs of reform which they felt would revitalize the Empire. The majority of the travellers held that reform was vital to the preservation of the Empire, and with the sympathy and assistance of the British, it would be obtained.

Many in the British ruling circles believed that the preservation of the Ottoman Empire was a cardinal principle of British Eastern policy. British public opinion too, held that the Empire should be preserved, if only to save it from Russian aggression. But they felt that reform was necessary for her continued existence. The British public was strongly in favor of the Turks during the Crimean War for the Turks were allies of the English. The interim between the Crimean War and the late 1870's saw the Turks as perpetrators of many cruel deeds, such as the Bulgarian atrocities which prompted Gladstone's famous pamphlet. English opinion strongly censured the
"bloody Turks". Disraeli, however, was able to make the public aware of the fact that Britain must maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in order to guard the trade route to India. He held that the British should not allow the disintegration of the Empire because Russia could well threaten the route. The public sensed the situation, and by 1877 had largely forgotten the atrocities and regained its affinity for the Turks. The travellers were reflecting the opinion that was generally held in England, with the exception of a short period, this opinion being that British aid to the Turks would enable the Turks to maintain the Empire. In fact it would be hard to imagine that the travellers did not have some influence in abetting favorable opinion toward the Turks. They may even have augmented the British opinion with their writings, for the opinion of many of the British ran parallel to the travellers' ideas of reform.
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