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INTRODUCTION

"Notwithstanding the Ottoman Empire is an European government, and is not farther from the center of Europe than St. Petersburg is, still but little is known respecting it to general readers. It has, heretofore, been regarded as a barbarous government, and as containing a people almost beyond the bounds of civilized life. Less correct information is therefore, possessed by Europeans, on the subject of Turkey, than of any other country in Europe; - and many of the numerous books which yearly appear on Turkey and the Turks, are written for sale, and not for the purpose of imparting facts respecting the government or the people. They are intended to amuse, and not to instruct; - to benefit the writer, and not the reader."

By John Porter Brown (March 24, 1852) "Notes on the Ottoman Empire," Scioto Gazette May 12, 1852.

Turkish-American relations began long before the signing of the commercial treaty, in 1832. Merchants, in ships, had been trading at Mocca, Smyrna, and in the Archipelago, but American merchants, in general, had no particular interest in the Levant. American manufacturers were still concerned with supplying the home market, rather than competing with England for that of the world. It was the government’s intention to gather trade reports and establish diplomatic connections with many nations, in order to cultivate the American image, and be prepared for the eventual expansion of American trade. Thus, without the expectation of immediate results, the United States planted a legation in Constantinople, through which a multitude of consulates were established.

Whereas American industry was not prepared for the outward thrust, American missionaries were. The American Board of Commis-
sioners for Foreign Missions, in Boston, although established early in the century, showed little reluctance in taking on an enormous task with small numbers of highly educated and dedicated people. In 1828, the Board sent the Reverends Bird and Goodell to Lebanon, with their families, for the purpose of carrying Christianity to the Moslems. The year was a bad one for missionary activities. Beset by internal revolt and viewing missionaries as foreign agents, Sultan Mahmud II ordered all missionaries out of the Empire. Although terminating British missionary activities in the Empire for thirty years, it had less effect on the Americans. Rev. Goodell withdrew to Malta and waited, until the fall of 1831, when he again entered the Empire. A fire having destroyed the Goodells' home and furnishings prior to their arrival in Constantinople, they became the house guests of Commodore Porter, first American representative at the Porte. Thus from the beginning, American missionary activities were closely tied to the American Legation.

In the early years, Legation business consisted of protecting missionaries and establishing consulates, the latter, often being for the purpose of protecting missionaries in remote areas of the Empire, where the Sultan's arm would reach, only with concerted effort.

The Ottoman Empire in the first stages of Westernization, was still much as it had been for centuries. Remnants of the once powerful Janissaries still threatened non-Moslem inhabitants with impunity. Life rigidly followed the dictates of tradition, inhibiting the introduction of modern methods and technology. Sultan Mahmud II, determined to reverse the Empire's decline, thereby returning it to
the rank of great power, sought the assistance of western nations. The great powers of Europe had long been interested in the Sultan's huge domain, due to its strategic location at the vortex of the East-West trade routes. England, France, Russia, and Austria jealously competing for favor at the Porte, tried to outrival each other, in supplying the Sultan with the assistance necessary for modernization. The Sultan, as with the leaders of emerging modern nations, found the path between sovereignty and assistance a dangerous one to tread. However, the strenuousness of the competition gave the Sultan greater flexibility than modern leaders might hope to possess.

The United States, under the leadership of Commodore Porter, entered the competition, to further its puny interests, and to elevate its prestige among the European powers. John Porter Brown, who joined his uncle, Commodore Porter, in February, 1832, added a third dimension to his country's goal, a sincere desire to see the Ottoman Empire strengthened through reform. The new Legation, with little instruction from its government, save the old warning of President Washington, not to get involved, developed its own procedures for operation and set about making friends. Porter found himself limited by financial insufficiency and poor health, but did his best with the assistance of his nephews.

John Porter Brown, more than any other individual, stands as the embodiment of Turkish-American relations. Connected with the American Legation, in Constantinople, for forty years and official intermediary for the two governments, during the last thirty-six, Brown was privy to all Legation business. But more important was his
personal relationship with members of the Porte and of the official
diplomatic community, for it was this that enabled American interests
to progress. Yet, Brown's influence was not limited to personal
contacts, through the medium of the press, he was able to provide the
readers of the western world with factual accounts of Ottoman life and
trade. His articles were filled with understanding as well as
interest.

The key to Brown's success was his facility for languages, and
his position as Dragoman of the American Legation. Being able to
read, write, and speak French, Spanish, Italian, Turkish, Persian, and
Arabic, he had no trouble making his way in international society; and
as Dragoman, he had no difficulty in making himself heard at the Porte.

The position of Dragoman was peculiar to the Ottoman Court.
The word "dragoman" is the corruption of the Turkish word "tergeman"
meaning "interpreter." In court parlance, the dragoman of a legation
was the translator officially recognized by the Porte, to transact all
business between it and the foreign government, to which he was
attached. Whereas all other governments had from three to ten
dragomans, who served as checks on the honesty of each other, the
United States had one. It was imperative that the dragoman and the
minister of the legation maintain a close working relationship, for
without it, the minister would become a cipher in a legation ruled by
the dragoman. Although the American Minister was totally dependant
upon the Dragoman, the latter, as an appointee of the President of
the United States, was independent of the Minister. The Dragoman
gauged the strength of the Minister's words and translated them as he
judged proper. As American Dragoman, Brown was bound by treaty to be present at all court trials involving American citizens, or persons protected by the American government. Adding to his general influence in the American community, he often served as legal council or referee, in such cases. As if this were not sufficient power for one lowly civil servant, he adopted, and later was granted, the title of Secretary of Legation. This gave him greater social status in the diplomatic community, and the duty to serve as head of legation in the absence of the Minister. Owing to the Government's inability to maintain a full staff at the Legation and Consulate, in Constantinople, Brown was called upon to serve as Consul and later as Consul General, in the absence of the appointed officials. In this capacity, he served as judge in criminal cases, and arbiter in civil cases, while issuing passports, and collecting commercial fees. The accumulation of positions and power tended to break down the relationship between the Minister and Dragoman, thus increasing the possibility of conflict between the two men.

The biography of John Porter Brown is at once the study of a man, his efforts to strengthen Turkish-American relations, and his personal struggle with the officials of the government to which he was attached.
"It is always of immense utility to the stranger in the East to know the language of the people; without it all is a sealed book to him, and he at every step tramples on their prejudices and religious superstitions." By John Porter Brown (April 14, 1842) from the Scioto Gazette, October 6, 1842.

John Porter Brown, the only child of Samuel and Mary Porter Brown, was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, on August 17, 1814. His parents were not pioneers of the first wave. They were among those who came later to populate the towns and provide the settlers with badly needed supplies. The elder Mr. Brown was already engaged in business with his brothers (Joseph and George), when he met Miss Mary Porter on a ship traveling from New Orleans to New York City. Their brief courtship resulted in marriage and a honeymoon trip to Chillicothe, Ohio.1

The small saddle shop operated by the Brown brothers, in Chillicothe, was unable to support three growing families, thus Joseph moved north to Circleville where George later joined him.2 Samuel Brown remained in the saddle shop and expanded the enterprise by purchasing Adam Turner's tan yard. It appears he was interested in

creating a leather monopoly in Ohio's burgeoning capitol. But such an undertaking was too ambitious for a man of moderate means. The War of 1812 was gravely inflating prices as can be seen in the value of the tannery. The large tract of land on South Paint Street, which sold for $700, in 1811, was sold to Samuel Brown two years later for $5000. The sale was made on land contract with payment over a five year period.3

The war's inflation gave way to an economic depression that carried Brown's hopes with it. Debts forced the family to sell one town lot after another, until only the tannery remained. Adam Turner, having received only half of the contract price, charged Brown with trespass.4 The judgment went against Brown, but he was able to keep it in abeyance, from December, 1820, until July, 1828, when the property was sold at sheriff's sale, to Adam Turner, for $985.68.5 Samuel Brown died before Turner took possession of the property.

The widow Brown and her son were destitute, but not without friends. Dubious memorabilia credits Miss Mary Davenport with rescuing the two remaining Browns. She was a childhood friend of Mrs. Brown and a relative of Key Bond, who later became a member of

3Land contract, Adam Turner to Samuel Brown, July 17, 1813, Recorder's Office, Ross County Courthouse, Chillicothe, Ohio.
5Property transfer, Samuel Brown by Sheriff to Adam Turner, Deed Record Book Vol. XXIII, p. 18, Recorder's Office, Ross County Courthouse, Chillicothe, Ohio.
Congress. Both Miss Davenport and Mr. Bond provided references for John Porter Brown, in the 1850's. Mr. Bond also may have served as Brown's investment counselor, in later years, while his son-in-law Henry Stanbery served as Brown's leading defender in the Johnson cabinet.

Brown and his mother were given passage to Maryland, where Mrs. Brown's relatives provided for them. Little is known of Brown's early childhood other than his fondness for hunting in the wooded countryside that surrounded Chillicothe. His keen interest in observing nature and stalking game never waned. As a member of the American Legation in Constantinople, he was given free reign to hunt throughout the Ottoman Empire. Commodore Porter said of hunting, "(for) myself and others of the Legation (there is) scarcely any other means of amusement and exercise for health excepting that which is afforded by the chase . . ." Accounts of Brown's hunting expeditions were published in the Scioto Gazette, of Chillicothe, Ohio, and some government officials even received boars tusks as gifts.

Brown's education is a matter for conjecture, but given his father's ambition and his mother's relationship to Commodore Porter,
one can assume that he attended The Academy, an early school in Chillicothe, located directly across the street from the Brown home. One may seriously question the benefit of this early education, since Brown's sentence structure and grammar remained unperfected to his dying day. The same also was true of Commodore Porter. Both men were products of their time and American English was not standardized until well into the century.

The Brown's left Ohio without a definite destination in mind. They were simply going east to be with relatives. For the fourteen year old boy, the trip must have held considerable excitement. He was to see his mother's relatives for the first time. They were all coastal people with sea linked lives. For generations the Porter men had sailed oceans in search of trade and in time of war their nation's enemies. The most illustrious was, Commodore David Porter, his mother's brother. His exploits were legendary. He was the equal of Decatur, Perry, or Jones, with the fiery spirit of Andrew Jackson. As Brown was preparing to leave Ohio, Commodore Porter was in the process of relinquishing his command of the Mexican navy, in order to accept an American diplomatic post. It would be four years before the two would meet and in the meantime, another relative, Dr. Samuel Davies Heap, would provide the Browns with a home.

Dr. Heap was the husband of Margaret Porter Heap, Mrs. Brown's sister. The Doctor's home was near Philadelphia, but for years the family had lived abroad. As a navy surgeon, Dr. Heap had served many years with the American fleet in the Mediterranean. In 1825, he resigned from the navy and received an appointment as Consul to Tunis.
Fortunately for the Heaps and their five children, this was one of the paid consular posts. Records are limited for this period of Brown's life, but enough is known to draw definite pictures.

John Porter Brown arrived in Tunis, in 1829, possibly as an acting midshipman in the U. S. Navy. Navy Department records, however, do not sustain this even though it was claimed by Admiral David Dixon Porter in later years. Brown, in the course of a year, moved from his home in frontier America, across the Atlantic Ocean, and through the Mediterranean Sea to North Africa (Tunis), where he found himself in a totally European culture. He immediately was placed in a school with his cousins, where he studied French, Italian, and Arabic. Languages were essential, if Tunis were to be his home; and as late as 1831, there was no indication to the contrary. His invitation to Constantinople was the result of unexpected events. Young men usually followed in the business or profession of their fathers, but Brown's future was not subject to that limitation.

In 1830, President Jackson appointed Commodore Porter, Consul General of the Barbary States, with headquarters in Algeria. Before reaching his destination, the French invaded Algeria placing all foreign representatives under French control. Porter refused to serve under the French and asked for another post. President Jackson, embarrassed by the affair, sent him as Charge d'Affairs to


11 Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, Jan. 4, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
Constantinople, where final arrangements were being made for a commercial treaty between the United States and the Ottoman Empire.

Commodore Porter had no anticipation of supporting the Browns. They were being well cared for in Tunis; besides he was already supporting two families, his and his sister Ann's. Porter was the father of ten children, seven of whom were living. The five boys were being groomed for military careers, and of the two daughters, one died while her father was in Constantinople and the second later married one of the Heap cousins. Ann Porter first married her cousin William Porter and had four sons and a daughter (who became the wife of John Porter Brown in 1840). Following her husband's death, Ann Porter married Alexander Boulden. This union produced one son, who became a physician in the Baltimore area and a correspondent for the Baltimore Sun. When Mr. Boulden died, a few years later, the Commodore placed Ann's three eldest sons in the navy. All three died within a couple of years. David Henry Porter, the oldest, served at the age of twenty-one as second in command of the Mexican navy. His death entitled Ann Boulden to a pension of $70,000 from the Mexican government.

A settlement was not made until the 1850's, when each of the three remaining children received payment. The Commodore had hoped to support his sister by providing her sons with jobs.

---


13 American Watchman and Delaware Advertiser (Wilmington) June 15, 1824, p. 3.

14 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, Feb. 24, 1836, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VIII).
After failing with the first three, he decided to place the fourth in a diplomatic career. George Porter accompanied his uncle to the Mediterranean, in 1831, to serve as his personal secretary. The death of Consul John Mullonney provided the Commodore with the opportunity for promoting his nephew's career. But appointing him acting Consul to Morocco, at Tangiers, left the Commodore without a secretary. Thus, John Porter Brown was invited to fill the vacancy.

Brown's voyage from Tunis to Constantinople was long, but not uneventful. While aboard ship he became familiar with the secretary to His Highness Halil Pasha, who was Sultan Mahmoud's son-in-law and the adopted son of the Capudan Pasha (Commander of the Ottoman Navy). This was the first of many associations that he would form with high Ottoman officials. The Commodore anxiously awaited his nephew's arrival. The Legation's correspondence was mounting with only the Commodore to wield the pen. Brown was given no time to shake the wrinkles from his clothes. He was immediately put to work transcribing his uncle's letters. Commodore Porter, though pleased to receive Brown's assistance, could clearly see that this nephew was not the scribe George Porter was. Brown's script was thin, wispy, and pale, as though written by one with better things to attend. It was no wonder Brown served only from February to September, 1832, at which

---

15 Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Feb. 16, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).


17 Letter, John Glidden to David Porter, Feb. 16, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).
time George Porter arrived from Tangiers. Porter wrote with a bold, clear hand, perfect for public record keeping.

The Commodore was compelled to prepare Brown for a career other than copyist. It was important for Brown to make himself diplomatically indispensable, in order to obtain job security and language was the key. The Commodore, not wishing to limit his nephews' potential found a tutor, to instruct them in Turkish. His choice for a teacher was Halim Effendi, the head of a large Moslem school in Constantinople. Halim probably was recommended by Rev. Goodell, an American missionary, with whom he was closely associated in efforts to establish lancastrian schools in the Empire. For six years Halim and Brown were inseparable companions. Their frequent excursions into Ottoman society and Moslem life gave Brown a deeper understanding of Turkish culture and people. They also provided Brown with adventures to entertain his friends in Chillicothe, via the pages of the Scioto Gazette. After 1839, Halim disappeared from Brown's letters, but the fascinating commentary continued until January, 1872.

George Porter failed to learn the written Turkish, although, he could converse in the medium. He knew English and possibly French, the languages of the letterbooks. Whereas secretarial duties had cut short his Turkish education, Brown's was not constrained by official activities; even his later consular duties were so light

---

18 Edward Dorr Griffin Prime, Forty Years in the Turkish Empire (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1876), p. 137.

19 Letter, George Porter to Mr. Darman, March 8, 1836, USCC (Constantinople, Vol. I).
that his education was in no way inhibited.

The arrival of Mrs. Brown, in 1834, gave further impetus to Brown's advancement. She entered the Porter residence as a visitor with the Heap family, but remained as mistress of the American Legation. The Commodore's wife had remained in the United States to care for the children and a widowed mother. The Commodore's sister thus held full sway in Constantinople. She actively supported missionary work, assisted with secretarial duties, and generally pressed for her son's advancement. When the Commodore died, in 1843, she contested his will alleging his desire for her and her son to have the commodious residence at San Stephano. Dr. Heap as administrator of the estate, ruled in favor of the Commodore's daughter, who happened to be married to the Doctor's son.

During the Porter ministry (1831-1843), Brown prepared himself for the future. He took language study seriously, while observing Ottoman culture and customs. He also attended all important official functions, where he would come in contact with Ottoman officials and American notables. His perfect manners and affable style won him recognition and his willingness to assist the American tourists in their pursuit of the exotic won him applause. Brown accepted praise as acknowledgement of his ability and was gratified to be of service. This seemed to be sufficient reward for a young man seeking


recognition from a demanding uncle, and perhaps it was, for a while. Brown never ceased to oblige those who appreciated his talents, but did not remain satisfied, for long, with such simple rewards. His ambitions, in excess of family expectations, were keyed to a culture other than his own. It would be his misfortune to reach the top too soon and have to wait a lifetime for a title that would never be granted. His achievements were not from the pages of Horacio Alger, they were from the tales of the Orient. Transported from the tanner's yard to the Sultan's court, Brown made the transition with ease, only to find that American tanners do not become diplomats by diplomatic ability alone. He was in the East where such things happened, but subject to rules where they did not. His entire life was a struggle to bridge the gap between East and West which in reality was the difference between Charge' and Minister.

Brown's first opponent was William Hodgson, a thirty year old consular student who had learned Arabic in North Africa and Paris. He was a remnant of the consular student program devised by President John Quincy Adams for the creation of a professional diplomatic corps. The fact that President Jackson had abolished the program did not bother him. His "high placed friends" in the State Department would attend to his prosperity. He was a bright, aggressive, dandy who expected a glamorous future in the diplomatic service. Commodore Porter learning of his linguistic ability and being unaware of the difference between Arabic and Turkish, asked for his assistance in Constantinople. Hodgson accompanied Porter to the city, where they waited until the treaty was ready for the United States' approval.
Early in the fall, 1831, Hodgson took a leave of absence to deliver the treaty to the President of the United States.

Shortly after Hodgson's departure for America, Porter fired Mr. Navoni, the translator, who had served as Charge prior to Porter's arrival. The Commodore, attempted to serve as translator using French, but discovered that all requests sent to the Porte had to be written in Turkish. Porter unwittingly requested the Department to send Hodgson back to him and the latter foolishly accepted the resultant appointment.

In the interim, Porter hired Joseph Askeroglou to serve as Dragoman. Asker, as he is referred to in the official records, was an Armenian recommended by the missionaries, for his mastery of court Ottoman and his thorough reliability. When Hodgson returned a year later, Asker was well established as Dragoman, but Hodgson held the title and received the salary. The situation remained unchanged due to Hodgson's inability to serve. He spent his time studying Turkish, while Asker attended the duties of office at extra expense to the Legation. The Commodore, whose financial situation was already pinched, began to view Hodgson as a parasite; but having requested his

---

22Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, June 21, 1833, USDD (Turkey, Vol. III).


appointment, found it awkward to ask for his removal. Thus, he began to see fault in Hodgson's every action, and Hodgson in return cautiously criticised Porter's often clumsy and careless administration of the Legation. Porter became obsessed with Hodgson's presence as though he were a threat to Ottoman-American relations. As Porter's feelings toward Hodgson intensified, the latter focused his resentment upon the Commodore's two nephews and especially Brown. He was afraid of the Commodore's influence in Washington so his charges were directed through the nephew's.

Porter's plans for his nephews were not secret or unusual, but Hodgson seemed to stand in the way of their consumation. In 1831, Porter had relied considerably upon Hodgson's assistance, but by late, 1832, confidence had been transferred to the nephews who lived in the Commodore's household. Hodgson was unable to enter the charmed circle simply because he was not involved in the business of the Legation. Hodgson claimed that he was not only Dragoman, but also Secretary of Legation. The latter position would have been sufficient to stem his feeling uselessness, however Porter made it quite clear that he was not needed in any capacity. The nephews were otherwise unemployed and their devotion reduced the possibility of a security leak. As if all this were not enough, Brown was rapidly progressing in the study of Turkish, the language which Hodgson hoped would

---


rectify his own position. Porter's letter to Secretary of State Edward Livingston, dated November 11, 1832, justified Hodgson's fears.

"I directed him, (George Porter) on the arrival of his successor (as Consul of Morocco), to come to this place in the hope that I should be able to provide for him, or otherwise he would have been thrown destitute on the world. His service, in addition to those of Mr. Brown, are very necessary to me, and I shall make to him a small allowance, for his services as I do to the latter gentleman, out of the contingent fund. . . . It is my intention that both these young gentlemen shall devote their whole attention to the acquirement of a knowledge of the languages; of the Turkish character, and manner of doing business, and of the customs and usages, of diplomacy for which there is no better school than Constantinople."28

In the same letter, Porter requested the consular post, in Constantinople, for one of his nephews. Mr. Bunker an American merchant was consul, but had returned to the United States leaving his English business partner, William Churchill, as vice consul. Bunker had no intention of returning and Porter felt that an Englishman should not be in charge of the American Consulate, in Constantinople. The English were opposed to the American presence, and an Englishman in even the most insignificant American post in the Ottoman capital, might lead to trouble. The Consulate in Constantinople was unimportant with the Legation in the same city, in fact, the Porte did not even recognize consulates in the capital. Porter was quite right in believing that the consulate would be a good training ground for his nephew. "Besides affording a small amount for his support, it will throw him in the way of the Turkish

28Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Nov. 11, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. III).
language, render business familiar to him, make him acquainted with
the officers of the Porte, of the secondary and lower orders, and
hasten his qualification for more important employment."

This unintentionally struck the already sensitive Hodgson as
another affront to his prestige. At thirty years of age he did not
wish to be equated with the Commodore's nineteen year old nephews,
but as a dragoman dependent upon Mr. Asker, he would be placed in that
situation. In desperation, Hodgson wrote to Edward Livingston, on
December 1, 1832, denouncing "the nephews" out of feigned concern for
the quality of the diplomatic corps.

"... it must be said, that they (nephews) have no
capacity for that which he now designs. They have no
classical and but an imperfect English education. Without
early discipline in the Latin and Greek languages, no man can
attain a competent knowledge of Turkish. The only dictionary
of this language is in Latin. Our universities furnish young
men as highly educated as the jeunes de langue sent here by
European governments; and unless such be sent by ours we shall
never have qualified Dragomans. From the oriental schools of
Paris, Vienna, and Petersburg, - jeunes de langue are sent to
Constantinople after three years study and three years more
are hardly sufficient to prepare them for the Dragomatic
office. Arabic and Persian must be studied contemporaneously
with Turkish, for two-thirds of it, are composed of those
languages. In addition to these, an interpreter must be able
to read and write French, Italian, and Greek."

However, the same letter leaves no doubt as to Hodgson's true concern.

"The duties of Secretary of Legation Sir, were
confided by you to myself. These are exclusively performed
by the Charge's nephews. They do not demand any additional
assistance, and are indifferently executed by their inter­
vention.

The double office of Consul is asked for a nephew of
nineteen. I will merely remark, Sir not referring to other


29 Ibid.

30 Letter, William Hodgson to Edward Livingston, Dec. 1, 1832,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. VI).
objections, that he has no knowledge of commerce, its laws and usages and much less of the affairs of men."\textsuperscript{31}

If Brown were made Consul of Constantinople, Hodgson's position would become even more inferior. Six days later Hodgson wrote to Livingston again. This time he admitted there was no possible means of reconciling Porter and himself. He asked to be sent back to Algiers or to any of the Barbary consulates.\textsuperscript{32}

Communications were interminably slow and precarious. By the time orders were received, events made them obsolete, and on occasion detrimental to national interest. Hodgson's request was made, in December, 1832, the State Department responded, in September, 1833, and Hodgson received the order, in June, 1834.\textsuperscript{33} The Department ordered Hodgson to leave Constantinople and the position of Dragoman and proceed to Egypt on a commercial investigatory mission.\textsuperscript{34} This terminated two years of turmoil in the Constantinople Legation. Over eighty letters swelled the files and the animosity between Hodgson and the Commodore.

The intensity of the situation was heightened by Porter's declining health. As if, fighting to maintain himself physically, mentally, and socially was not enough, Hodgson felt compelled to

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Letter, William Hodgson to Edward Livingston, Dec. 7, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VI).}

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Letter, William Hodgson to Louis McLane, June 4, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VI).}

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Letter, Louis McLane to William Hodgson, Oct. 10, 1833, USDI (Special Missions, Vol. I), p. 103-106.}
question his authority as Charge'. Both men were totally dedicated to advancing American interests in the Ottoman Empire, but could not integrate their roles and efforts. Each was interested in developing his own individual position and furthering United States relations on the basis of his own personal influence. On May 7, 1834, Porter placed much of the blame, for the Hodgson affair, on the State Department.

"I take the liberty to remark, that I have doubts of the truth of what is asserted in Mr. Hodgson's note of the 19th of June 1833, and that I believe it was written solely for the purpose of obtaining a sight of my official dispatches of the 1st of April, of the purport of which, he had no doubt been apprized by some one in the department, a practice that I have too much reason to believe, has been the cause of much of the difficulty that has existed between Mr. Hodgson and myself, from the false constructions which he has placed on the suggestions of his private correspondent in the office, respecting his official duties, and the instructions issued to me, a practice which if it has existed, and does exist, is calculated to give much embarrassment to the representatives of the nation abroad, and to destroy all his confidence in the Secretary of Legation, who can be looked upon in no other light, than a licensed spy on all the actions of the Minister."\(^\text{35}\)

Although Porter made accusations against the Department, he never exonerated Hodgson from the charges of poltroonery, forgery, horse theft, ungentlemanly behavior, disrespect for his chief, and incompetence.\(^\text{36}\) Yet, when the Department ordered Porter to provide Hodgson with the Legation cypher and $500 from the contingent fund for

\(^{35}\)Letter, David Porter to Louis McLane, May 7, 1834, \textit{USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV)}, no. 206.

his mission to Egypt, Porter complied without question. He did express reluctance in parting with the money, but for him that was a natural reaction, unrelated to Hodgson. Later when rumor reached Constantinople that Hodgson would return, as United States Consul, Porter's response was open and direct. He would be completely willing to work with him as long as he maintained his place in the diplomatic hierarchy. If he attempted to assume more authority than he had a right to, he would be cut off from the Legation and the Porte. Fortunately for those involved, Hodgson did not return to Constantinople, but absence did not quell his animosity toward Brown.

Years later when Hodgson had accomplished diplomatic, social, linguistic, and economic success, Brown was still blamed for influencing the Commodore. This, as well as the charges against Hodgson, can not be sustained by recorded evidence.

Porter was to appoint all American consuls and agents in the Ottoman Empire, and consuls were given the responsibility of appointing their assistants. All of these were subject to confirmation by the State Department. Bunker's resignation, as Consul at Constantinople, created a vacancy, in April, 1834. Brown was immediately placed in charge of the consular records and assigned by

37Letter, David Porter to Louis McLane, July 9, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV), no. 227.
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39Letter, William Churchill to David Porter, April 21, 1834, USCC (Constantinople, Series 2, Vol. XIV).
his uncle to undertake the duties of the office. The office had no salary attached to it, thus Brown's only income was five dollars a month allowance, from his uncle, and small official fees. He took the position, to satisfy his uncle, yet hoped it would be temporary. He was not interested in being an unpaid consul, at a port where commercial fees were insufficient to support him and prestige was lacking. Brown wanted to make his own way in the world, leave the Commodore's home, and travel in other parts of the Empire.

Therefore, two totally different requests were sent to the Secretary of State. Commodore Porter asked that Brown be confirmed as acting consul or made consul with a salary. Brown not wanting the position wrote the following, on August 18, 1834.

"I have the honor to address you somewhat before I am officially empowered to do so by yourself, but as it is in a private way, through private interest, I hope to obtain your indulgence. I can scarcely venture to say I am in any way known to you, if not through Commodore Porter's communications, in which I may possibly be mentioned, first as his private secretary, and latterly as the individual in whose hands he was pleased to place the U. S. Consulate of this place. Under him I have looked for advancement in life, and was it not, for the peculiar moment of my letter, it might be accompanied by one from himself in my favor. Having for several years made languages my study, in lieu of a profession, it has become a favorite pursuit, and one in which I have made higher attainments than I could have expected. The French, Italian, and Spanish, are familiar to me, and for near three years past, the Turkish and Arabic

40 Letter, David Porter to J. P. Brown, April 21, 1834, USMCL (Turkey, Vol. 1831-1834), p. 211.
41 Letter, David Porter to Mr. Cunningham, May 1, 1835, USMCL (Turkey, Vol. 1834-1839), p. 103.
42 Letter, David Porter to Louis McLane, August 22, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV), no. 240.
have occupied my attention, so that for the study of languages I have a decided preference.

The first languages are not of much moment, but the latter to an American are of some value, and the knowledge I have of them, would serve me better had I but your honor's permission. But without being known to the government, it might perhaps be expected that I should prove my talent in their line, before receiving its patronage. At the present moment, when the administration has so wisely and commendably made a treaty with the Porte, others may be expected to be formed with Persia, and Egypt, . . . . I thus with much respect offer my services to go to either country, and prepare myself to forward any view the government may in a future have; the knowledge, I already have of Turkish and Arabic making the Persian require but a short study.

I know Sir, that others have requested similar favours, but my being a native American, with perhaps as good abilities to fulfill as them, I hope offers me as fair claims as theirs for your indulgence, and as bright hopes for success.

If it does not meet your approbation, I hope at least to be pardoned the presumption of addressing you, and should I have the honor of being continued and confirmed in the Consulate I now fill, as Acting Consul, it will still be my pride to continue the study of the eastern languages, with the hope that a momentary failure will not exclude me forever of making myself useful to the department over which you preside."^5

Brown grew impatient waiting for the government's decision. Time weighed on his hands with no money in his pockets. Secretary of State, John Forsyth, addressed Brown on March 31, 1835, announcing Brown's confirmation as Consul, but since the letter did not arrive in Constantinople, until July 3, Brown in his impatience had made other plans.4^4 On the first of May, he declared a total of twenty-one dollars in consular fees received for the previous year from the

---

^5Letter, J. P. Brown to Mr. Dayton, Aug. 18, 1834, Letters of Application and Recommendation during the Jackson Administration (National Archives Microfilm, M-639, Roll 3), frame 0450.

^4Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, July 4, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VII), no. 327.
arrival of a single vessel. At the same time, he complained that a salary of three or four hundred dollars a year was needed to maintain the office. Living with his uncle at San Stephano meant that he had to walk a distance of twenty or thirty miles to fulfill his consular duties at Pera. Having reached the age of twenty-one, and being discouraged with his prospects, he resigned his post in a note to his uncle dated June 21, 1835.

"More than a year having elapsed since I had the honor to receive from you the Acting appointment of United States Consul for this place; and as no appropriation has been made by Congress for the support of the Consular corps, much as I feel honoured by the charge, the want of a support, and the desire I entertain of returning to my native land with the hope of improving my future prospects, render it necessary that I should return it to you." Brown departed for the United States in a matter of days after writing the note. Philadelphia was his destination and from there he wrote President Jackson, on September 28, asking to be made Dragoman.

Brown's request initiated another crisis for the Commodore, whose health, since his arrival in Constantinople, had been in a state of continual decline. On September 14, 1835, an attack of angina pectorus brought him near death. His doctors had been urging him to

---

travel, but he had refused to leave his post with Hodgson in the vicinity. With the latest attack came the realization that travel was imperative, yet he was too ill to do so. His first concern was to make the Legation secure during further disability or absence. His nephew, George Porter had taken charge of the consulate, on Brown's departure, and continued to assist the Commodore at the Legation. Neither of the Porters knew Turkish, nor could they operate the Legation without the assistance of an able Dragoman. Joseph Asker had been serving the Legation as second dragoman, since 1831, at a salary of sixty-seven Spanish dollars a month. This sum being insufficient to maintain himself in a respectable manner, left him susceptible to intrigue. In order to secure more faithful service, the Commodore raised Asker's salary to $100 a month with the following explanation.

"The critical state of my health makes it desirable that I should have those about me, who have an interest in serving faithfully, and in whom I can confide; by this increase in pay, I am more secure in both."50

Three days later, Brown applied for the position of Dragoman. Neither uncle or nephew knew what the other was doing, nor did they find out for several months.

Brown, who was lodging with friends in Philadelphia, once again grew tired of waiting for the President's reply. On January 20, 1836, he wrote to the Secretary of State explaining his situation.

49Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, June 23, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VII), no. 323.

"The kindness of my friends and relatives in this city has placed at my acceptance a desirable employment, which must immediately be filled. I cannot, however accept it before learning from you the intention of the President regarding my application for the office of Dragoman. Please, Sir, give me, as soon as convenient, an answer by which my movements may be regulated; for I do myself an injustice by not making such a request."

The Secretary's reply, on January 25, 1836, was not encouraging. However, Brown did not give up hope. "I have accepted the employment offered me by my friends, with however, the proviso, to leave it, should my application for the office of Dragoman ultimately meet with success." The President's hesitation was motivated by his desire to have a recommendation from Commodore Porter. This too is evidenced in Brown's letter of February 1.

"In the meantime, my leisure moments will be devoted to the increase of the knowledge which I already possess of languages, with the hope of obtaining the patronage of your Department; although the want of my uncle's immediate recommendation is apparent to me. If I could recall to your remembrance the events which have occurred in the United States Legation at Constantinople, and the letter addressed by you to Commodore Porter in consequence of them, disapproving of the misunderstanding which unfortunately took place between him and the former incumbent of the office, to obtain which I left Constantinople, my uncle, mother, and friends, and made application to the President, unbefriended; they would, I indulge the hope, explain why Commodore Porter could not recommend his nephew to the office of Dragoman."

Porter's letter written fourteen days later at San Stephano bears out Brown's explanation, although written in behalf of George Porter.

---

51 Letter, J. P. Brown to John Forsyth, Jan. 20, 1836, Letters of Application and Recommendation during the Jackson Administration (National Archives Microfilm, M-639, Roll 3), frame 0436.
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"I hope that I may be excused for thus bringing them to your notice, and asking you to draw the attention of the President to this communication, which scruples of delicacy have for many reasons prevented my making at an earlier period, lest by so doing I might give grounds for impressions which in fact were entirely unfounded, and which has up to this period prevented me from saying anything in favor of the character of any one related to me, leaving it altogether to the government to determine on their merits by their conduct, . . . ."53

Whether by conduct (a demonstration of his translating ability) or understanding on the part of the President,54 Brown was rewarded for his persistence with the position of Dragoman of the American Legation in Constantinople. The $2,500 a year salary provided Brown with the independence he sought.

"Whatever I may still be ignorant of (concerning the Turkish language), the salary of the office will enable me, by the purchase of books, to acquire. It will also place me in a position to do much good to my uncle, by relieving him of numerous expenses, one of which is, that of the support of my widowed mother, who now resides with him."55

He was also able to save $250 a year for "family exigencies" and provide $100 a year for his aunt, the widow of George Brown, in Ohio.56 Later, a similar sum was paid to her daughter.

Brown left New York, in late May, without making final provisions for his affairs in the United States. A letter, dated
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Paris, June 18, 1836, was sent to Rufus Anderson, President of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. It indicates a degree of familiarity with Anderson or a brash presumptiveness on the part of Brown. It may be the latter, in that Anderson made no special notice of Brown in his journal written during a visit to the East, in 1843. He only wrote, "He is an amiable man, much interested in the Turkish language, and was formerly dragoman to his uncle Porter, our late Minister Resident at the Porte." Whatever the case, Brown pledged himself to the service of the Board. The pledge might be viewed as a dedication of the American Legation to missionary interests, which the Commodore had initiated with Rev. Goodell.

"I am on my way to Constantinople where it will be in future my duty to reside. All my private letters from the U. S., I have taken the liberty of directing to be sent to you; and must add another to the already numerous favors which I have received from you. It is to ask you to open an account in your favor for my postages etc. which I will refund to Mr. Goodell at Constantinople. A friend in Chillicothe, Ohio will probably send you a small account, say $4 or $6 against me, which please pay to him - his name is Mr. Wm. Y. Strong. I am fully conscious of the trouble this will give you, and I can only make the offer to my services to your society in return."58

In May 1836, Brown's departure, from New York, for Constantinople, coincided with Commodore Porter's departure from the

57 Rufus Anderson, "Memorandums of discussions in meetings of missionaries during a visit to the Levant, 1843-1844" (unpublished journal in the papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions) Harvard University, Houghton Library, Vol. I, p. 82.

Porter who believed that the Legation would be secure in his absence, later was disturbed to learn of Brown's appointment, knowing that Brown was unable to handle the office by himself. He was concerned about Joseph Asker's reaction. Would Asker remain faithful? On July 5, Asker addressed a complaint to Porter, who responded on the 15th, before receiving Asker's letter at Malta.

"I see by the reports of the proceedings of Congress that Mr. John P. Brown has been appointed Dragoman for the U. S. Legation at Constantinople. This measure arises I presume from the necessity that the office should be held by a citizen of the United States, it will not interfere with your pecuniary interests while you continue to give me satisfaction by a faithful discharge of the duties entrusted to you as second Dragoman."  

Asker's interest was as much job security as salary. He could not understand why he had been replaced as first dragoman. He solicited and received testimonials to his satisfactory service. These were forwarded, on July 27, to the Secretary of State with a request for an explanation. The following day George Porter notified Asker that his salary would be reduced in accordance with Department instructions to the former rate. This was in direct contradiction of Commodore Porter's wishes. Asker was upset, but continued with his dragomanic obligations, even to presenting Brown at the Porte. Commodore

Porter's letter, of August 5, probably added to Asker's bewilderment.

"I have this day received your letter of the 5th of July and notice what you say respecting the appointment of Mr. Brown as first Dragoman of the U. S. Legation near the Sublime Porte. Of this appointment I had no knowledge until I was informed of the nomination by the public prints, and which I find confirmed by the letters I have received from Constantinople.

The Government in giving this appointment to Mr. Brown has not been influenced by anything that I have said on the subject, nor have I had any occasion to be in any way dissatisfied with your conduct while you have been performing the duties, of which I have informed the Honorable Secretary of State.

I have received no instructions on the subject, and for the present can only repeat the assurances contained in my letter of the 15th ultimo; . . . ."

Asker legitimately was concerned. Not being an American citizen, he could be dispensed with, when no longer usefull. No one denied he was a faithful servant, whose duties were performed in the most satisfactory way. It must have been apparent to Asker that he was being used. Porter indirectly admitted it to Secretary of State Forsyth, in a letter dated Tunis, November 16, 1836.

"Your instructions respecting the reduction of the pay of Mr. Asker to what was formerly allowed has already been carried into effect, and Mr. Brown, to guard against any inconvenience arising from this measure, has made to him an allowance until my return out of his own salary to make it equal to what it was before. This arrangement will continue until my return to Constantinople when if necessary other measures will be resorted to that will secure the services of Mr. Asker until Mr. Brown shall be able to qualify himself in every respect for a satisfactory discharge of the duties."

Joseph Asker's continued complaints were not well received by

---
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Commodore Porter especially since they charged him with an "abuse of sincerity," in the treatment of one who had made many sacrifices in service to the United States. The Commodore wrote with aching conscience and concern for his legation, to George Porter, on January 17, 1837, "Complaints come with bad grace from one whom I have promoted from rank and pay of a domestic to that of a dragoman." His reluctance to rely on Brown as dragoman began to give away in the face of Asker's complaints. George Porter was directed to make all communications with the Porte through Brown if the situation with Asker became unbearable. Two days later he wrote to the State Department. "Brown will soon, I hope become sufficiently instructed in the Turkish language to enable me to dispense with (the services) of Mr. Asker altogether." It was over three years before Porter's hopes were realized.

Commodore Porter returned to his duties, on May 20, 1837. The Asker issue had been silenced. Brown proceeded with his studies and Asker did the work, just as was done during Hodgson's tenure in office. When the Commodore and his nephew, George, departed for the United States, in March 1838, Brown was left in charge of both the legation and the consulate. Asker continued as assistant dragoman, and there was harmony among the members of the legation for a year and
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a half. The Commodore's return, in August, 1839, brought the
dragomanship into issue again. Brown, deprived of his temporary
influence, assumed the duties of Dragoman and was even trusted with
the Legation seal (to facilitate transactions). Late in September,
a delay in one of the Commodore's requests resulted in a brisk note to
Brown. He directed Brown to turn the business over to Asker and only
supervise. The delay was blamed on Brown's "... want of familiarity
with the languages and usages of the East." Brown's reply was rapid
and consumately clear.

"I regret very much you should suppose a want of
familiarity with the languages and usages of the East on my
part might have occasioned the delay on the part of the
Mustediar of Foreign Affairs answering to your letter to him
of the 6th September last . . . .

I can, therefore, ascribe this delay, to no other
cause than his dilatoriness, which was complained of by the
Dragomans of all the Foreign Legations, - or to the embarrassed
condition of this government which now occupies the attention
of all its higher offices.

I am very desirous of giving you satisfaction, and of
serving you with utmost of my capability, which latter, from
my long and close application to acquire a knowledge, of the
languages and usages of this country, I now feel confident,
will enable me to transact any business of the Legation with
the Porte. The imputation contained in your letter of the
30th instant, is of too severe and serious a nature for me not
to answer it, for your favorable reception.

Porter was not convinced entirely, as may be seen in his letter to the
Secretary of State two days later. "Asker is to be kept until Brown

is familiar with the customs and manners of the Porte. Brown has used his time to learn only the language. Asker will soon teach him the customs and manners."³¹

One year passed during which time Asker continued to collect his $1200 a year salary, but absented himself from office for long periods.³² Early in September, Brown wrote to Forsyth, in order to remove Asker from office and prevent one of the Heap cousins, in Tunis, from filling the vacancy at a salary of $800 a year. This would not only make Brown the sole dragoman, but would also allow him to keep his entire salary. Brown's motives appear selfish at first, but closer scrutiny reveals that the legation's business did not necessitate an assistant dragoman, nor could the legation afford the luxury. Brown simply could not convince the Commodore that he was ready to assume all the dragomanic duties.

"That an assistant at an expense of $800 per annum should be retained I feel as a reproach to myself, and I now very respectfully, make this representation with no other object in view than a sense of duty to the Department and to myself. I would ask that the Commodore address you on the same subject did not the peculiar state of his mind render it necessary for me to act with the utmost conciliation and prudence towards him. As he has several times threatened to dismiss the Armenian on pretense that his place was a sinecure, I think that any intimation to that effect from you would immediately induce him to carry it into execution.

Having no political communications to make to the Porte, the Turkish correspondence of the Legation is confined to a few Takrirs annually for vessels or travelers Firmans, and these I have invariably made myself since my uncle's


return from the United States, and attended to the smallest business of the legation for the purpose of learning whatever is necessary for me to know connected with the Turkish government. 73

By December, 1840, the Commodore was ready to leave the question of Joseph Asker to Brown's discretion. He was willing to shift the responsibility for Asker's dismissal, but assumed complete authority over the vacated salary, which he planned to give to George Porter.

"Finding from experience that the allowance made to Mr. G. A. Porter as secretary is insufficient for his decent support, and as he has in addition to his other duties to do that of 2nd Dragoman, for which I have no means of making him any allowance while Mr. Asker has to be paid out of the Contingent fund, I have therefore to request you to inform me whether the services of Mr. Asker, as second Dragoman can be altogether dispensed with by you, as his services are entirely useless to me, so that his pay, or part of it, may be added to the allowance given to Mr. Porter who is indispensable to the performance of my duties as secretary-interpreter and translator of foreign languages with which they are intermingled." 74

There was no hesitation on the part of Brown. Asker had outlasted his usefulness to the legation and could be dispensed with at no risk to business. Brown was able to attend all the duties of Dragoman and had been for sometime past.

"... I do not hesitate a moment embracing this opportunity to express the confidence which I feel in my capacity to discharge all the functions of my office, and to dispense entirely with the assistance of Mr. Asker. I have (sometime past) ceased calling upon him for assistance, from his frequent absence from the Capital, and also the repugnance
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that I felt to call upon another for what I could do myself. With the object constantly in view of qualifying myself to perform all the duties of my office and do away with the necessity of his employment, I have universally attended to the smallest business of the Legation, and sought to learn whatever it is necessary for me to know in my intercourse with the Turkish govt. I have given to the subject the reflection which its importance to myself requires, and I now take leave, respectfully, to say that not only as an interpreter, but as a translator from or into Turkish. I do not need the assistance of Mr. Asker; and that I am competent to take upon myself the responsibility of translating to the Porte all the communications which you may have to make to it in the Turkish language."

Positions in the American Legation or in the Consulates of the Empire were filled by foreigners only when native Americans were not available. Unfortunately, too many Americans were sometimes available, yet none were properly qualified. The latter fact was not always comforting.

On May 20, 1841, an article appeared in the Scioto Gazette of Chillicothe, Ohio, entitled "American Dragoman at Constantinople." The article quoted the Cincinnati Republican of May 10, the New York New World, and the Richmond Whig. The article stated that William B. Hodgson planned to get the dragoman's job back from J. P. Brown, because of President Harrison's death. The editor of the Gazette defended Brown with a parent's praise. The article proved partially incorrect. Hodgson was not interested in being dragoman at Constantinople. It appears he wanted revenge upon Brown and a consulate for himself. He was momentarily satisfied.

---


Secretary of State Daniel Webster notified Brown, in a letter dated September 22, 1841, that he was to be replaced as dragoman by Dr. Samuel Heap. Hodgson had been successful in perpetrating a brutal deceit. The Department of State was led to believe that Dr. Heap was familiar with Turkish and would be pleased to serve with his brother-in-law in Constantinople. This would allow Hodgson to become Consul to Tunis, a position held by Heap since 1824. It was evident, Brown held little weight with the Department.

Dr. Heap, not wishing to leave Tunis, quickly notified the Secretary of State of his inability to translate Turkish, but dutifully prepared for a trip to Constantinople. Brown, who was apprised of his uncle's action, directed a letter to Webster, stating his position. Ten years of Turkish study and service to the United States could not easily be put aside. He would willingly serve the legation until the government notified him of its corrective action. In order to cover all angles, he let Webster know that his appointment, by General Jackson, in 1836, was "... mostly at the recommendation of several friends in Ohio, ... who will ..., I hope again, intercede with you, and the President, in my behalf." His conclusion struck the heart of the matter.

"... I have ventured to make (these remarks) from a consciousness that this is a period in which depends all my future prospects; and that, without, by a simple statement of facts, which, more than probably, have been kept

---


78 Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, Jan. 4, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
from your knowledge, I succeed in interesting you in my behalf, the studies and occupations of several of the best years of my life will be totally lost to me. I have an aged mother, and a wife, dependant upon my exertions for a support, and I cannot now so readily relinquish what has become a profession to me, as I could a few years ago. 79

Commodore Porter's letter, to Webster, dated three days latter is one of pleading desperation. After suggesting Hodgson for the Consulate at Alexandria and the restoration of Dr. Heap to Tunis, he placed his case before the Secretary.

"In case Mr. Heap had accepted of the office of dragoman, the Legation would have been placed in an unprecedented condition of not being able to communicate with the officers and ministers of the Sublime Porte. I could not have permitted Mr. Brown, from a sense of propriety, and even had he been willing to present himself at the Porte in an inferior and degraded capacity, on the part of this Legation, nor would he have had influence there as such. He is I believe the only citizen of the United States who has devoted himself to the acquirement of the Turkish language, and a knowledge of the customs and the habits of the Turks, and I need scarcely mention to you that, that language in no means resembles the arabic, or any of the dialects of Europe." 80

John Porter Brown was essential to the operation of the legation, but the retention of his services depended upon the action of the President. On May 27, 1842, Commodore Porter notified Webster of Dr. Heap's arrival in Constantinople and the continued necessity for keeping Brown. He modified his earlier position that he could not ask Brown to stay. He merely neglected to notify the Porte of the change in the position of Dragoman.

79 Ibid.

80 Letter, David Porter to Daniel Webster, Jan. 7, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
"Mr. Brown, at my request, will continue to perform the duties of the Dragoman of the Legation until your instructions are received. To enable me, however, to avail myself, of Mr. Brown's services. I feel compelled to make to him an allowance from the contingent fund of the Legation, at the rate of P. 20,000 (§300) per annum and hope you will approve of my doing so. This sum I will continue to give him until receiving your further orders on this subject." 81

Brown was confident of his eventual reinstatement, but his real concern was the loss of salary for virtually no reason and the impression his temporary removal would make on the Ottoman government.

"As Commodore Porter has made no representation to the Porte regarding this change, I am yet known there as the Dragoman of the Legation; and the deprivation of salary, if temporary, will be less injurious to me here than a degradation. -The small amount which the Commodore offers me for my services will be sufficient to defray the expenses of my family until the present term of my house rent expires, before which, however, I hope to learn your further instructions on the subject." 82

Although his confidence was not misplaced, he did not rely upon it alone. On July 15, 1842, Brown wrote to his close friend, Seneca W. Ely, editor of the Scioto Gazette, explaining in detail the Hodgson affair that had ended seven years earlier. 83 On the following day, Commodore Porter addressed a note to Sarim Effendi, Ottoman Minister of Foreign Affairs, requesting his honest appraisal of Brown's ability and performance. 84 Sarim Effendi's quick response

81 Letter, David Porter to Daniel Webster, May 27, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
82 Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, June 1, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
(translated by Brown) left little to be desired.

"The confidence which you place in me in thus asking my opinion of your dragoman, is the source of much satisfaction to me, and it gives me pleasure to state that, Mr. Brown has acquired a good knowledge of the Turkish language (which is essential to his office) and of other necessary information; and besides being in every respect capable of transacting only business which you may have for him with the Sublime Porte; he is in fact a gentlemanly person whose deportment up to the present time has proven him to be altogether worthy of our confidence."\(^{85}\)

These letters and one from the missionaries to Brown, applauding his ability as Dragoman, were sent by Brown to the Scioto Gazette and printed in the September 15, issue of that paper.\(^{86}\) The publication of these letters had no effect on the government nor did Commodore Porter's letter of August 13.\(^{87}\) The effect of these letters was in protecting Brown's Ohio reputation and padding the Department records in his favor. Fletcher Webster, acting Secretary of State, notified Brown in a letter dated September 9, 1842, that the President had again appointed him Principal Dragoman with a salary of $2,500 a year.\(^{88}\) Except for a legislative error, in 1858, Brown, though frequently threatened, held the position of Dragoman until his death.

The fledgling official was deprived of his uncle's protection

\(^{85}\) Letter, Sarim Effendi to David Porter, July 20, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).


\(^{88}\) Letter, Fletcher Webster to J. P. Brown, Sept. 9, 1842, Instructions of the Department of State (Turkey, Vol. 1), p.296.
and guidance, on March 3, 1843. From all indications the relationship had been one of mutual benefit. Commodore Porter's death occurred at a time when Brown was no longer in need of his support. In fact, Brown had been the Legation's key figure, since 1838, and would continue to be so until his own death, in 1872.

It is difficult to know what the true relationship was between the Commodore and his nephew. Some indicate or imply that the two were avowed enemies. Newspaper articles carried such claims, in the 1830's, and a letter written by Brown to Commodore Charles Morris, in 1843, contains a prominently penciled exclamation mark between "my lamented!" and "uncle." A long letter by Brown to Seneca Ely concludes with a statement more wrapped in self interest than sorrow. "The loss of my best friend and patron forms a period to me of unprecedented interest and importance." Owing to the Commodore's long painful period of ill health (partial paralysis of the throat, severe bronchial congestion, angina pains, and months of total incapacity), his strong pride and propriety, and the devotion of his equally headstrong nephew, one unacquainted with the situation might draw the previous conclusion. Since mutual respect between two relatives of diverse age is often concealed by conflict of individual wills, an outsider may interpret an otherwise harmless situation as something entirely different. Brown's own words serve to balance


the appraisal.

"You remember that I had joined him (Porter) here, in 1832, at his request; have received from him the protection and support of a father, and owe much of my prosperity and advancement in life to his influence. It was a mournful reflection to me, that the honored relative whom I saw here, then, for the first time, full of the strength and vigor of health, I was now called upon to inter on a foreign soil."\(^91\)

On May 10, 1843, H. S. Legare', acting Secretary of State, directed John Porter Brown to serve as Charge', without compensation, until receipt of further orders.\(^92\) Thus, for nine months Brown served as Charge' and first Dragoman of the American Legation. No American, in the Ottoman Empire, was superior to him in rank, position, or knowledge of the Turkish language.

---

\(^{91}\)Ibid.

CHAPTER II
PROSPECTUS IN PERSPECTIVE

"The fact is, our strength consists in being as quiet as possible. The less that is said and known of our operations so much the better. A great deal can be done in a silent, harmless, inoffensive way in these countries, but nothing in a storm. I do depurate a storm far more than any of our consuls or worldly wise men do. . . . We did not come here to quarrel with governors and Pashas, nor with patriarchs and bishops. And as the Catholics, pray let them entirely alone, and neither curse them at all nor bless them at all." By Rev. William Goodell, Jan. 24, 1834, taken from Edward D. G. Prime, Forty Years in the Turkish Empire (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1876), p. 175.

"Without power or influence or even permission, they quietly seated themselves down in the very city of the Sultan."¹ Rev. William Goodell's reference was to the missionaries, but it applied equally to Americans in general. Permission shortly was granted to American diplomatic representatives and merchants by the treaty of 1832, but the treaty did not protect missionaries as such. Their security was derived from the fact that they were Americans. Thus, the American experience in Turkey was not so much one of gaining permission, as of using that permission for national advantage. American representatives in the Ottoman Empire faced the age old problem of the new nation in an old world. To garner general acceptance and respect, Americans had to cultivate an image of power and influence.

The major nations of Europe had established their power and influence on the basis of military exploits. Well aware of Europe's military superiority, Sultan Mahmoud was in the process of revitalizing the Ottoman military along European lines, when the American Charge d' Affaires arrived in Constantinople. The Sultan and his government were only vaguely aware of the United States. Although it was referred to as the "new world," some Islamic scholars located it in France. For many there was confusion in regard to the language spoken by Americans and Englishmen. An American traveling in Turkey, in 1833, mentioned that "American" cotton was being hawked in the markets with great success, but no one knew what "America" was. The preference for American cotton caused the British to sell their own under the same name.

While the Ottoman government and its subjects were baffled over the identification of "America," the powers of Europe puzzled over American intentions. Europe was wary of her presence in a previously European preserve, for American potential, for world power and ideological domination, was openly recognized by the western nations. Thus they took a position of cautious indifference toward this intruder who might upset their plans for the Ottoman domain.

If the Sultan and his subjects were to learn of America, its principles and potential, Americans would have to educate them. The


Sultan and his ministers were naturally curious, but in no way thirsting to know about this distant land. Their interest was of a parlor type. Since America was too distant to be of any great importance, militarily or diplomatically, the sole benefit expected from a treaty between the United States and the Ottoman Empire was increased trade for both nations. This consideration determined that the treaty, of 1832, was of a commercial nature. The State Department's limited instructions to its new Charge were to complete the treaty and promote trade. Commodore Porter found them too vague. How was he to stimulate trade without a knowledge of both trading partners? His understanding of the Ottoman Empire was based on the Bible, Greek mythology, and an imprisonment of two years in a Barbary jail. In addition, his long service in the United States Navy had left him partially ignorant of his own nation's growth.

Commodore Porter, however, brought to his post a vast knowledge of the sea, ships, and men. This was coupled with a social presence that bordered on the theatrical and a morality that rivaled the missionaries'. The result established him as a representative peculiarly well suited for this post.

Commodore Porter soon discovered that cultivating American relations rested squarely with him. The American community was small enough to allow supervision of its members, yet its composition was such that little supervision was necessary. It consisted of the missionaries and the Porter family. Church services and social events took place in the Porter home. When Commodore Porter received permission to visit the mosques, the missionaries were free to join
him. Rev. William Goodell and his family were the first American missionaries in Constantinople. Arriving, in 1831, to find all of their belongings destroyed by fire, they shared the Porter home for six months. Goodell became Porter's close companion and confidant. They traveled, hunted, and prayed together. It was also common for them to be entertained in the homes of Ottoman officials, and to celebrate with Moslems, weddings and circumcisions. When Porter needed a translator to replace Mr. Navoni, Rev. Goodell supplied him with Joseph Asker, who held the position until replaced by J. P. Brown.

There was no doubt that the Americans, in Constantinople, were of one mind. The United States had to be associated in the Ottoman mind with power, from which it was hoped, prestige and influence would follow. Porter had to exert himself to present the proper posture. Powers were bold, wealthy, extravagant, and freely displayed military prowess. This was the front Porter had to develop and maintain.

The treaty was Porter's first concern. The Sultan expected a quid pro quo arrangement, but Porter's predecessors (those who had initiated treaty discussions) had drafted a treaty in favor of the United States. When the Porte demurred, Porter, with great reluctance, added a written agreement to the treaty, personally binding himself and supposedly all future American representatives (at the Porte), to supply the Sultan with "friendly council and advice" in the area of naval supply, construction, and training.⁴

If the United States were to compete at the Porte for influence it would have to be on the basis of military technology. American success was instantaneous, but short lived. The Sultan, deeply interested in renewing his army and navy, was operating under the influence of Russia. The latter was unable to supply the naval expertise to keep the Sultan from turning to the British for assistance. The arrival of an American Commodore, as a lowly Charge', was as if by Russian design, for the United States could be the perfect pawn to check the British King. Pawns are seldom interested in ideology, especially if used to their own advantage. Commodore Porter had fought the English and the French most of his life and it would have been a great coup for him to out maneuver his former enemies in their own waters. If the United States were to cut into British trade and influence in the Ottoman Empire, Russia would be a natural ally. However, an Anglo-American rivalry never developed, since the United States, not ready to compete economically, fell into an ideological alliance with Great Britain, in opposition to Russia. John Porter Brown wrote reflectively to Daniel Webster, in May, 1843, concerning the pawns position.

"English influence is always executed here to benefit this country (Turkey), in the vain hope of enabling it to hold out against the views of the Russian government. Russian policy is the reverse; her councils are seldom other than pernicious to Turkey; intrigues among the officers of the government, and disaffections in the provinces are promoted by her to sink the power and gradually undermine the now trembling Ottoman throne. As the British Embassy executed its influence to prevent the negociation of the treaty existing between the United States and Turkey, lest our commerce should increase and rival that of England in the Black Sea which apprehensions unfortunately have proven groundless, and it is the desire of Russia that thus should be the case; and moreover
as I believe that her influence was exerted in favor of the treaty, and generally, for the employment of Americans in the different branches of the Turkish service in place of Englishmen, I have always felt it the duty of the Legation to conciliate the most friendly feelings of her Embassy here."5

The United States' failure to maintain the initiative, provided it by Russia, was directly linked to Russia's rapid loss of influence at the Porte, after 1838. The United States had not grown and expanded in the role it briefly had played. It possessed potential, but lacked the hard economic muscle needed for competition with the international giants. The United States made a creditable showing for itself, along the lines of military and naval technology during its first seven years in the Ottoman Empire, but was eclipsed until surplus Civil War supplies became available, in 1866.

Commodore Porter sent for Mr. Eckford, America's leading naval architect, in the spring, 1831. At the same time he suggested to the Department of State that the ten thousand dollar snuff box and fan for presentation to the Sultan be supplemented with a small steam boat which could tow the Sultan's barge on the Bosphorus. The British had given the Sultan a large steam ship, but it was awkward for such a purpose. The suggestion was never acted upon, because it was difficult for Americans back home to understand the exchange of extravagant presents or "bribes" as some considered them.6 Americans did not do business like the Sultan. They pictured themselves as

5Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, May 24, 1843, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).

6Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Sept. 30, 1831, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).
open, honest, and incorruptible.\textsuperscript{7}

The Sultan received his American ships, but had to pay for them. Mr. Eckford sold him an American built schooner, in 1832, and immediately set about constructing two more.\textsuperscript{8} The first was completed and the second was in progress when Eckford died. With Commodore Porter's close supervision and Foster Rhodes great skill, the second ship was completed. Rhodes, who had assisted Eckford, was joined by John Reeves, in October, 1836. These men prepared four more steam vessels for the Sultan's navy: a 60-gun frigate, a 22-gun brig, and two 12-gun cutters. This for all practical purposes ended American naval influence in the East. Rhodes left, in late 1839, after the death of Sultan Mahmoud and the rise of British influence at the Porte. John Reeves remained to build a steam frigate named "Esarajaded" of three hundred horse power, but he too returned to the United States leaving the huge naval yard that had risen under American direction.\textsuperscript{9}

Porter described the yard in a letter dated December 16, 1832.

"The foreman of Mr. Eckford, under my private council and advice, conducts the work; he has fifteen Americans with him who receive each two dollars per day, and all their expenses paid. The money deposited in his hands two weeks in advance. Besides this the sum of 150 dollars for each man has been placed subject to my orders, to pay their passage home, whenever they shall have completed their engagement with the Sultan, . . . .

When I speak of the 600 Greeks, Turks, and Italians

\textsuperscript{7}Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) July 22, 1835, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{8}Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, April 12, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

\textsuperscript{9}Letter, John Reeves to Dabney Carr, March, 1844, USMCR (Turkey, Vol. 1830-1849).
employed I mean those only under the orders of the Americans. The number of men employed altogether in the navy yard amount to four or five thousand. The American part of the establishment, entirely under American control and American regulations, and over which the Turks exercise no authority occupies a space as large as the navy yard at Washington, with work shops, mould lofts, forges and nearly all put up since we have been here."\(^{10}\)

Ship building was not the Porte's only concern. Men had to be trained to operate the new vessels. In November, 1836, Porter put in a prompt request when the Capudan Pasha (Commander of the Ottoman Navy) asked Foster Rhodes to have the Commodore supply him with American naval officers to outfit the Ottoman navy.\(^ {11}\) At that time, the idea was rather irregular and the reply was negative. Seven months later, Porter suggested employing retired United States naval officers to assist in the training of the Ottoman Navy.\(^ {12}\) Over the years other suggestions were made such as attaching bright young Turkish naval officers to ships in the United States' Mediterranean fleet. It is difficult to pin down the reason for continual rejection on the part of the United States. It lays seemingly some where between economic penury and fear of involvement, each of which plagued American diplomacy throughout the period.

Although naval influence seemed most promising in the early years possibilities for trade and prestige existed in other fields.

\(^ {10}\)Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Dec. 16, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

\(^ {11}\)Letter, George Porter to David Porter, Nov. 26, 1836, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VIII).

Private inventors flocked to the city of the Sultan in order to sell their latest inventions, most of which were weapons of various types. Commodore Porter led the way by asking the State Department, in September, 1831, for some samples of the newly invented moveable chamber rifle. Early in the following year his list increased.

"Hall's rifles
Cavalry pistols with swivel ramrods
Muskets with bayonets attached in the new mode
Cadet's muskets
Complete suit of infantry and cavalry uniforms with belt and cartouches
Swords, for both artillery and cavalry."

Weapons were ideal gifts for Ottoman officials, but that was not Porter's primary purpose in presenting them. He was interested in impressing the Porte with American technology and craftsmanship. Well made, practical weapons were used to draw attention to American manufactured goods.

Some weapons were too large to be given as personal gifts. John W. Cochran brought to the Sultan plans for a cannon with two calibers and revolving chambers. When the Porte failed to show interest in his invention, he took it to Russia. Messrs Robinson and Wild arrived with an invention that stirred some attention. They had a plan for projecting balls without powder on

---

13 Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Sept. 27, 1831, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

14 Letter, William B. Hodgson to Edward Livingston, March 22, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VI).

15 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, March 9, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. V).
the basis of centrifugal force. They too left Constantinople without a contract. The most successful of all the inventors was Warren Hidden, an American mechanic whose failure in the arms line was turned to profit; when he developed a printing and engraving process for the Ottoman Treasury. The Sultan, with Hidden's help, was able to supply the city with adequate amounts of paper money. Previous to Hidden's arrival in Constantinople, in 1835, the Ottoman caimes (treasury notes) were in limited circulation. They were written by hand and sealed by the Minister of Finance. Often, faulty printing obliterated the seal. Hidden's success provided him with a job for life and his position gave Americans an ear to the Sultan.

Americans did not confine their promotional activities to the military arts. A sample American plough was sent out from Boston, with a missionary escort, in 1839. Josiah T. Marshall and others lost money, in 1840, when they tried to market a shipload of New England ice in the wrong season. Boyd Reilly, who comes under discussion later, attempted to sell a portable steam bath with marvelous curative powers. His failure plagued J. P. Brown for many years. Cherry

---


18 Letter, H. O. G. Dwight to David Porter, Oct. 8, 1839, USMCR (Turkey, Vol. 1830-1849).


20 Letter, Boyd Reilly to George P. Marsh, March 31, 1851, USMCR (Turkey, Vol. 1850-1854).
Pectoral with its alcohol base hit the Eastern market with measured success. When the Sultan received a case of it from the manufacturer, members of his harem took to it quickly. Most American merchants were aware of some sort of market existing in the Ottoman Empire, but without exact knowledge, hesitated to invest even in exploratory missions.

J. P. Brown, writing for *Hunt's Magazine* in 1857, outlined the reluctance of American merchants to trade in Constantinople. He also displayed a degree of sarcasm at the merchant's failure to promote American ingenuity.

"When the treaty of 1830 was made, one American firm, Churchill, Bunker & Co., existed in Constantinople. Mr. Bunker was from New York, and his associate was an Englishman. It was dissolved in 1832, and since then, up to the present date, no other American (native) firm has been established in Constantinople. Within the last five or six years some natives of the Ottoman capital have visited the United States, and made themselves acquainted with the trade to be carried on between the two countries. A few foreign houses established at Constantinople have also opened some inconsiderable trade with New York and Philadelphia in drugs, oil of roses, geranium, and jasmin. Rum, brandy sugar, clocks, stones, scales, India-rubber goods, paints, and a few other unimportant articles of American ingenuity, have been imported into Constantinople."

Limited American trade was being carried on in other Ottoman ports, but that too was trifling compared with British efforts. Rum was the primary U. S. trade article. The only American trade monopoly was in Mocha coffee. American merchants purchased nearly the entire crop and

---

21 *Scioto Gazette*, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 6, 1854, p. 2.

sold it in the Mediterranean area for ten times the original value. But, no American products were involved in the enterprise. This expanded American capital but failed to secure markets for American manufactured goods. British and European manufacturers had no noticeable competition from American producers for Ottoman markets. However, this did not mean that Porter would allow the situation to remain unchanged. His instructions called for commercial relations and he was determined to encourage them.

The American consular system was inadequately organized and poorly staffed. In European countries where Americans were willing to serve, the system functioned reasonably well, but in the more exotic areas, anyone might serve as a consul. In 1835, Mr. Mourat Aroutin, a Russian subject was the Sardinian and Neopolitan agent for Jaffa and the English and Russian agent for Jerusalem. His great respectibility recommended him for American agent at Jaffa. Most prospective consular agents or consuls did not come so highly recommended. But the choice of consuls was limited and the government had to be satisfied with whom ever it could secure.

The State Department instructed Commodore Porter to appoint consular agents throughout the Ottoman Empire for the purpose of facilitating American trade. These agents were expected to be honorable men who could serve without pay. Commodore Porter imposed

---

23 Letter, William B. Hodgson to John Forsyth, March 2, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VI).

24 Letter, Jasper Chasseand to David Porter, April 3, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VII).
another requirement for his own convenience. "I should prefer those who write English and French as those are the only two languages I understand." In general, Porter viewed the system of appointing consular agents as an undeserved burden.

"It would have been highly gratifying to me if the government had imposed on some one else the unpleasant duty of making appointments of consular agencies, which I foresee is to be, to me, the cause of a vast deal of trouble and labor and will besides involve me in great responsibility, for of all that I may appoint, not one perhaps will be personally known to me, or in any way known, except on the recommendation of others equally unknown to me so that I shall not even have the gratification of obliging by the appointment, a person in whom I feel the slightest interest, . . . ." 

Porter operated on the basis of personal relationships and lived in an age when personal relationships were the more apparent fibers of government. To bear responsibility for the actions of unknown persons in remote places was an entirely new concept for him. The only leverage he possessed to control the agents was the power of removal. This proved to be sufficient, even though Porter was unaware of its persuasiveness. Most persons who served as American consular agents in the Ottoman Empire did so for prestige and the preferential treatment devolving on such persons. Their duties were slight as can be seen in Porter's letter to Consul Bonnal, on Candia. "A letter addressed to me once in six months on the general affairs of the consulate is all that is required of you, unless something should

25 Letter, David Porter to David Offley, Jan. 25, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).
26 Ibid.
occur which particularly calls my attention. . . ."27 Porter did not require them to make trade reports even though he was convinced that such would encourage American trade. Good consuls were difficult to find. It was better to have consuls in whom the merchants had confidence than no consuls at all. Porter was reluctant in demanding commercial reports of unpaid consuls for fear of losing them. He wrote to Secretary of State Louis McLane, in 1834, that American trade would begin when American merchants could trust American consuls in the various Ottoman Ports. Then he concluded. "I take this opportunity of remarking that wherever consuls are established, I have not called on them for reports; as they are not asked of me by the Department, and it is questionable whether they would be sent to me if ordered."28

Porter's greatest consular difficulties arose in Syria, where Ottoman authority was contested by Mehmet Ali of Egypt. Numerous American missionaries and tourists in the area had to be protected. Tourism forced Porter to appoint a consul to protect Americans in Jerusalem. Mr. Cohen, an American Jew, assisted Porter in his selection by recommending Mr. Darmon.29 The latter gentleman, a French Jew, was pressured by the French government to reject the American appointment. Porter took issue and contested France's right

---


28 Letter, David Porter to Louis McLane, April 12, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV).

29 Letter, David Porter to Commander Patterson, Nov. 9, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. V).
to prevent French citizens in the East from serving the United States. The affair ended suddenly when Mr. Darmon renounced his French allegiance in exchange for the position. Shortly after Porter received word of the solution, complaints began arriving. Darmon was accused of using the flag to achieve his own ends. Other reports told of his bad character. All of this was confirmed by Commander Patterson of the United States' Mediterranean fleet. Porter at first defended Darmon, but later discharged him. The social position of Jews in the Ottoman Empire made them unsuitable as agents for a nation in search of prestige. Porter was generally satisfied with his agents, but he knew the dangers.

"Foreigners may be induced to accept of Consular agencies under the U. S. from the advantage they derive from being under the flag, but they do not always feel and act like Americans and it sometimes requires my utmost vigilance to keep them within bounds of prudence and discretion and prevent them from usurping more advantages than are permitted by treaty, and causing complaints from the local authorities. Americans having no such motives could not be induced to settle in places where we have no commerce."

Porter's most efficient and active agent was Jasper Chasseand of Beirut. General political instability and American missionary activity kept him in continual correspondence with Porter. Legal

---

30 Letter, David Porter to Jasper Chasseand, April 23, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. V).
31 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, Sept. 10, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV).
32 Letter, David Porter to Commander Patterson, Nov. 9, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. V).
33 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, Sept. 10, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV).
cases involving Americans were supervised by Chasseand, who viewed American rights as transcending Moslem law. If an Ottoman subject were convicted of an offense against an American, it was expected that the guilty party receive the full penalty of law. Porter disagreed on several occasions, believing that American rights were protected when the law was fairly administered. The maximum penalty was not required to uphold American honor.

"The zeal of Mr. Chasseand has outrun his discretion in this affair - he should, after trial have let the decision of the court go into effect, or not, according to the judgment of the superior authorities of the country, . . . ."34

Porter was interested in promoting American-Ottoman relations. He knew that mutual trust and understanding must exist. Respect for each other had to be maintained. "Should he (Ibrahim Pasha) mitigate the punishment, or reserve to himself the right of pardon - he does no more than is done every day by civilized nations."35

"It is the policy of the United States to use every measure of conciliation with the authorities, and people of any section of this vast Empire, whenever we can do so, . . . without any loss of national character. It is in vain to hope by a show of a hostile disposition to induce the authorities to lay aside the laws, and the decisions of their courts or change their ancient customs to pacify an American Consular Agent who is a foreigner, born in this country and although he may be governed by what he considers the strict line of his duty, . . . he cannot possibly be a judge, of what is due to the honor of the United States, or when demands for satisfying it ought to cease."36

34Letter, David Porter to Commander Patterson, Jan. 15, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. III).
35Ibid.
36Ibid.
By 1840, Porter had established a well organized consular service in the Ottoman Empire. There were a few gaps in the network, but on the whole the system was efficient in protecting American rights. Early that year, Porter received word from the State Department that all the consulates in Turkey excepting Constantinople, Smyrna, and Alexandria be suppressed. In Beirut, Cyprus, and Salonica the consuls became mere agents. The order was based on the President's judgment that the other consuls were not productive of any public advantage. John Porter Brown was instructed, on June 12, 1840, to inform the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the determination of the President had its cause in business considerations of expediency and convenience only.

Porter was concerned for American interests and prestige in the Empire. The Sultan with whom Porter had maintained a close personal relationship was dead, and Russian influence which had supported American interests had been eclipsed by the British. Orthodox groups in the Empire were pressing for a reaffirmation of declining principles. Political turmoil existed throughout the Empire. It was time for the United States to exert a positive influence in order to maintain its rapidly diminishing position. But the President in closing the consulates was taking the opposite tack.

37 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, June 9, 1840, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
Porter wrote of his fears to John Forsyth, Secretary of State.  

"Permit me to observe that I much fear our citizens in the last will feel the want of consular protection, unless consular agents are permitted, they will be obliged to resort to the humiliating alternative of British Consular protection, as was the case before we had a treaty with Turkey."^40

His fears were realized. The missionaries, essentially the only Americans who needed the consular protection, threatened to turn to the British and on occasion did.  

Ironically, British missionary efforts in the Ottoman Empire were a dismal failure. They were initiated in the early 1820's but brought to an abrupt end, in 1828, when the Sultan ordered all protestant missionaries out of the country. A year later American missionaries from the American Board, in Boston, arrived in present day Lebanon. Political unrest forced them to retire to Malta, where they prepared for another assault. The new Ottoman-American treaty encouraged the venture, and in 1831, with renewed enthusiasm, the missionaries returned to Mt. Lebanon, where they were permitted to remain. Simultaneously, Rev. William Goodell established a second station in Constantinople. These missions prospered and expanded in spite of the enormous obstacles that confronted them. The reason was essentially organization and determination, but other factors also contributed to their success. The missionaries had close ties with the American Charge', who took a strictly legalistic approach to the missionary presence in the Empire. He would protect them as American citizens against all charges, but if found guilty of breaking Ottoman

---

^40Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, June 9, 1840, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
law they would be punished. Porter demanded protection and equal
treatment before the law for all Americans in the Empire and the Porte
was unusually prompt in guaranteeing it.

Commodore Porter exhibited a depth of wisdom and understanding
in advance of his contemporaries. The Turks were never considered
barbarians or infidels. They were human beings encompassed by a
different culture, but no less human for their environment. In
September, 1831, Porter wrote. "I find them (the Turks) however a
reasonable people, ready to fulfill their own engagements and only
requiring others to fulfill theirs."\(^\text{41}\) He was speaking from his
experiences with Ottoman officials rather than with the masses. It was
left to his nephew John Porter Brown to make the same appraisal of the
masses.

Porter's opinion of the Turks was never diminished. His
concern was that the Porte's feelings toward him and his government
would not be altered. He lamented, in 1835, that there was no press
in the city to correct errors and rumors that might malign him. "So
long as I can keep the opinions of the Porte from being operated on by
the false reports of others, who from sinister motives would wish to
mislead it, I shall not give myself any uneasiness."\(^\text{42}\) Porter was not
blind to the Turk's faults, as indicated by a dispatch dated
February 5, 1836.

\(^{41}\) Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, Sept. 13, 1831,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

\(^{42}\) Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, Feb. 5, 1836,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. VIII).
"A Turk will prevaricate sometimes if necessary, and
is skilful as a diplomatist and negotiator, in which
caracters he endeavors to gain every advantage, is always
covetous, and perhaps sometimes may be corrupted, but in
general no one respects truth more than he does, or holds it
more sacred or inviolate; knowing therefore its influence, it
would be wrong in me did I not take care to avail myself of it,
which gives me many advantages over those who are less atten-
tive to it.

Perhaps no people in any part of the world are
generally so regardless of truth as the Franks, and Rayahs of
the Levant."43

The missionaries prospered more from the Turk's tolerance than his
respect for the truth, as can be seen in Porter's dispatch, dated
May 16, 1841.

"No people in the world are more tolerant than the
Turks, and they protect all people alike in the exercise of
their religious rites, and do not permit them to be disturbed
in them. The missionaries established in Constantinople have
heretofore been more prudent than to disturb the religion of
any other Christian sect, and give no cause of complaint from
the Turkish authorities, with whom they are generally
favorites, yet they have established schools, and do much
good."44

The missionaries arrived in the Ottoman Empire with the idea
that they would convert the Moslem population. Moslem law imposed the
death penalty upon Moslems who left the faith. This reduced the
missionaries chances of proselytizing the Moslem population. It was
decided, in order to convert the Moslems, good Christian examples were
necessary. Few such Christian examples were available, locally, or so
the missionaries thought. American missionaries believed the old
Christian sects in the East were in need of thorough reformation.

43 Ibid.
44 Letter, David Porter to Daniel Webster, May 16, 1841,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
A new spirit of hope and optimism would have to be kindled in existing Christians before Moslems would be attracted to the Christian faith.  

The missionaries viewed the Armenians as their most likely Christian target. The people were independent of the Catholic and the Orthodox churches. They were virtually an untouched sect with their own patriarch and millet. A weak Patriarch, in the 1830's, allowed the missionaries to make inroads with the Armenian congregation.  

Another equally important factor was the interest of certain Armenians in having their children (both male and female) educated in the western manner. The same interest, on a more selective basis, was exhibited by the Porte. Western science and technology were crucial courses, for the youth of Turkey, in the East-West competition. Within months of Rev. Roodell's arrival, the Porte was calling upon the missionaries to revamp government schools along western lines. It was not enough that Lancastrian methods of education were introduced. The Porte also wanted textbooks and scientific equipment. Thousands of young men, officers in the Ottoman service, were soon exposed to western educational methods and courses.  

Rev. Goodell's success did not lessen the task of conversion, but it did raise American prestige and influence. More Armenians were

---


willing and even desirous of sending their children to the missionary schools. The idea of religious instruction was foremost only in the minds of the missionaries. Conversion was slow, but the educational rewards were encouraging.

In the early 1840's, a conservative backlash against all of Sultan Mahmoud's reforms nearly crushed the missionary effort. The new Sultan was young and under the influence of orthodox Moslems. The liberal Armenian Patriarch was replaced by a trenchant conservative, who saw the missionaries weakening the political strength of the Armenian community, at a time when the whole Empire was threatened with collapse. Sultan Mejid, in order to survive the onslaught of his internal and external foes, turned to the British and Sir Stratford Canning. So did the missionaries.

The missionaries were ordered out of the Empire by the Sultan. Being Americans they expected Porter to strongly defend them. Instead, the missionaries received word from their informant (Mrs. Mary Porter Brown) that her brother was ready to accede to the Sultan's demands. Goodell persuaded Porter to notify the Sultan that missionaries, as American citizens, could not be forced to leave the country unless they had broken a law. 48 Since such was not the case, they remained, but reduced their activities. From this point on, however, the missionaries looked to Canning for any real protection.

The British were reluctant to become involved at first with

religious activities, but they soon realized that American missionaries might serve their own interests. Both Russia and France had priests in the Empire working among the Christian inhabitants. These priests encouraged the people to remain within their own millets, but to support Russian or French activities in the Empire. They were in effect preaching treason. The British who had no missionaries in the Empire saw a chance to use the American missionaries for the same purpose. Protecting missionaries in remote areas where no American consuls existed, enabled the British to spread their influence over a larger area. It also undercut Porter's efforts to extend the United States Consular Service. The State Department could not be urged to increase the number of consuls when its citizens were receiving adequate protection from the British. Besides business interests were not involved.

The American missionaries always took their problems to the American Minister Resident first. He generally got results, but the credit often went to the British, who supposedly exerted their influence in America's behalf. The missionaries never ceased to threaten United States authorities with the possibility of seeking permanent British protection, if all their causes were not properly pursued. ⁴⁹

By the time Commodore David Porter died, John Porter Brown was thoroughly knowledgeable of the American position or better, the Legation's position in Ottoman-American relations. He had seen his

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 84.
uncle try to keep up social appearances when funds were not available. How he was forced to live in the native suburbs in order to reduce his living expenses and to avoid the European party circuit. Brown also had seen his uncle fain illness in order not to attend dinners that he would have to return. He was forced to borrow the Russian barge for occasions of state until he bought an old one which he had refurbished. The Commodore's penury reflected directly upon the United States Government. Its diplomats were among the least subsidised in the "civilized world". The American Ministers Resident to Turkey and their staff members were paid salaries inadequate for their basic needs. Much of the diplomatic correspondence dealt with the tight economic straights of the Legation. The situation became more and more critical with the passage of time. The Crimean War forced prices up and the U. S. Civil War devaluated the American dollar so much that the Legation was caught in the middle. The United States Government did not bother to alleviate the problem in the 1850's and by the 1860's could not be bothered.

American Ministers Resident were left to their own resources in cultivating relations with the Porte. By the end of Porter's ministry, the post had been stripped of all its glitter. The missionaries' problems kept the legation in operation and the American

50 Letter, David Porter to Edward Livingston, March 24, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

51 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, Jan. 8, 1840, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).
name before the public; and a few infrequently seen ships, from the Méditerranean fleet, gave some credence to claims of American power. The real strength of the relationship was America's comparative weakness and disinterest. Personal friendships between members of the Sultan's government and members of the American Legation were open and uninhibited. Porter was especially fortunate in cultivating friendships at the Porte. In June, 1834, he wrote the following to the Secretary of State.

"My residence at St. Stephano is well suited to my limited means, and has the advantage of bringing me into more intimate and unrestrained contact with the Sultan and officers of his family, as his residence here on his visits to the camp, which is always established for the instruction of the troops, is adjoining the grounds occupied by me." 52

His letter of January 5, 1835, is a follow up to the former.

"A few days since on his visit to this place, on hoisting the U. S. flag, I received a message of great kindness from him, and what is considered by the Turks a proof of the greatest attention, servants laden with sweet meats and other dishes from his table, were sent by his order to me. Since my residence here I have been enabled to contribute much towards embellishing and making his rooms more comfortable, which attentions have been well received." 53

A letter dated July 25, 1835, further displays the open relationship between the Sultan and Porter. "I am of opinion that if there was a sufficient object, I should not have great difficulty in obtaining possession of secrets which they have every disposition to keep from

52 Letter, David Porter to Louis McLane, June 25, 1834, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IV).

Porter cultivated the Sultan's friendship with personal gifts from his own pocket. He ordered two lifelike rocking horses for the Sultan's sons. Admiral David Dixon Porter in writing his father's memoirs claimed that Porter and the Sultan were on intimate relations and would sit for long hours reminiscing about their youthful exploits. Existing records do not verify this, and the Admiral did not footnote his source. It seems likely that Commodore Porter's words were misinterpreted. In January, 1835, Porter wrote.

"Did the interest of the United States require it, His (Sultan's) frequent visits to this place (San Stephano) would afford me favourable opportunities of seeking private interviews with him, which could not be obtained were I residing on the Bosphorus and under the observation of the Representatives from other powers; which opportunities if it should be necessary, I shall not fail to take advantage of." Porter was never reluctant to emphasize his influence nor were most of the other diplomats. Years later, John P. Brown admitted that people believed him to have more influence than was actually the case. The Minister Resident and his associates had to maintain a facade of importance to validify their positions at home and increase American prestige abroad.

54 Letter, David Porter to John Forsyth, July 25, 1835, USDD (Turkey, Vol. VII).


In the years following his uncle's ministry, Brown was often called upon to defend his own position. Success rested with the ability to make himself indispensable to the operation of the legation. This was accomplished by assuming as many positions and as much authority as the government would permit, while learning the language and cultivating close relationships with Ottoman officials. But since usefulness and efficiency are not the primary requisites for holding federal office, Brown had to shore up his position by other means. The missionaries, friends in Chillicothe, Ohio, and various government officials provided him with the additional support.
CHAPTER III

ADJUSTMENTS WITH A NEW CHIEF

"Knowledge liberates Man. Without it, Power another source of liberty, cannot exist. Of this, the proud Ottoman is fully aware, and he is satisfied with the limited revenue which ignorance gives him, rather than risk all by either improving his Christian subjects himself, or by encouraging their education by others. But the Press - the great teacher and School-Master of our age, is abroad; the Missionary is awakening the dull and sluggish mind of man to reflection; and notwithstanding these difficulties, both the civil and religious destinies of the Christian population of the People of the East, are in the ascendant."

By J. P. Brown, "Turkey and the Osmanlies," Scioto Gazette, November 11, 1852.

The passing of Commodore Porter brought to a close the most tranquil period in Brown's life. In the four years preceding his uncle's death, Brown had performed most of the duties of the Legation, while bearing very little of the responsibility. It was an ideal situation for the training of a diplomat, but ruinous for a good Dragoman, who is not expected to become accustomed to independent authority. Certainly even then, Brown's ambition was focusing on the time when he would be Minister Resident in his own right. There was no indication of this design, however, other than his excessive zeal in performing the Legation's duties. No one really objected or felt threatened by his growing confidence, although a rivalry seems to have existed between him and George Porter.

The latter was a quiet, shy, insecure individual, whose ambitions were stifled by his own need for approval. As the fourth
Bon in a family of six children, he had been deprived of needed attention. The Commodore took charge of him at the age of sixteen, removed him from his familiar surroundings and friends, and put him in the diplomatic corp. George Porter sought authority figures rather than authority. First the Commodore and Aunt Mary Brown, and then Dabney Carr (second American Minister to Turkey) provided him with the needed approbation. John Brown, having removed himself from the Commodore's home, in 1836, had lessened the possibility of conflict. Tension was reduced further, in January, 1840, by the marriage of Brown to George Porter's sister, Mary Ann. The Legation was a tightly knit family affair and the Commodore remained, even in times of ill health, the man in charge.

Brown had plenty of time, despite his official duties, to travel, study, and write. While providing the Scioto Gazette, and other newspapers and journals, with social and political commentaries on the Ottoman Empire, he began translating a collection of Eastern tales for his first book. He wanted to inform and entertain his readers with the wonders of the East, which in all their mystery and splendor were becoming the central attraction in his life. His articles knew no intellectual, religious, or professional bounds. They touched the curiosity, sentimentality, and philosophy of the age.

Yet, all was not calm. Revolt in the southern provinces of the Empire and the accompanying break down in Ottoman authority, placed American missionaries in jeopardy. The Legation was unable to provide Americans in Lebanon and Syria, with any more than nominal assistance. It was useless to pressure the Porte when already it was doing all it
could. Fortunately the missionaries were deprived of no more than personal property for which they received compensation.

The real ruffle in this placid period came from Dr. Samuel Heap, whose appointment, in 1841, as dragoman in place of Brown, deprived the latter of a year's salary, but not of a year's work. The situation was extremely awkward. Brown had been supported, as a member of the Heap household, in Tunis, for three years; Dr. Heap was the Commodore's physician, brother-in-law, and daughter's father-in-law. Heap, Brown, and Porter had protested the appointment and President Tyler had responded by giving the title of "Dragoman" back to Brown, but not the lost pay.¹ Before this wound healed, the Commodore died leaving his wife as executor of his estate. Brown, as acting Legation chief and with the consent of the relatives in Constantinople, took charge of the property, until the estate could be settled. He also assumed control of government money that the Commodore had on hand for operation of the Legation.² In the meantime, Dr. Heap, in the United States, asked the State Department for the right to administer the estate. The request was granted without consulting the Commodore's widow or notifying the relatives in Constantinople. Heap's arrival in the city was unexpected, but not contested until he took charge of the Commodore's home at San Stephano, where the relatives were still

¹Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, Nov. 14, 1842, USDD (Turkey, Vol. IX).

living.\(^3\) Mrs. Brown, whose claims to the house were quickly quashed, went to live with her son and his wife in Pera.\(^4\) The Legation's archives were not so readily removed. Dr. Heap held them against the return of the government funds in Brown's possession. Brown, thus coerced, complied with the demand, and received the archives, but failed to get a receipt for the money. Later the government held Brown responsible for the missing money, while Dr. Heap remained silent, forcing Brown to make do with his own defense. That defense proved adequate for exonerating him from all malfeasance. He had saved the vouchers (cancelled checks) used in transferring the funds to Heap's account, and elicited written support from Dabney Carr, who had recently arrived as the new American Minister.\(^5\)

This marked the end of the Porter family preserve. The Legation was subject to new influences and more seriously, new direction. Brown was no longer free to assume authority that belonged to the Minister, nor was he free to act without consideration of the consequences to his job. This was all very difficult for Brown to realize and accept, especially after being Charge\(^1\) of the Legation for eleven months, prior to Carr's arrival. The presence of an inexperienced Minister, who shuddered at the thought of formal meetings and

\(^3\)Letter, Dabney Carr to John C. Calhoun, Sept. 27, 1844, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).


\(^5\)Letter, Dabney Carr to John C. Calhoun, Sept. 27, 1844, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).
ceremonies, tended to elevate rather than diminish Brown's importance.  

If Carr had been a lame duck minister, as was supposed by his appointment late in President Tyler's administration, no difficulties would have arisen between Brown and Carr. The election of James K. Polk, as President of the United States, however altered Carr's expectations by extending his ministry. He received the news of his continuance as Minister with mixed feelings. Not having arranged to be absent from his family (seven children) for more than a year, he had to return to the United States to provide for them. His actions, in anticipation of the journey, indicated his intention to assume full authority over the legation and to reduce Brown's influence over legation matters.

Carr, described by Rufus Anderson of the American Board as, "... a kind friendly man ... without his family ..." shared his home with another man of the same description, George Porter. They became close companions consoling each other in word and drink. This all took place prior to the election of 1844, while Carr still believed that he was merely on a year's leave of absence from home. The two men had plenty of time to talk and numerous subjects to discuss, but their one common topic was Brown. Both men felt intimidated by him and subordinate to him, on account of his facility with

---


8Letter, Dabney Carr to James Buchanan, June 6, 1845, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).
the languages and customs of the East. There was no question about his ability, it was a matter of three men, each struggling to assert his own identity and position in the legation. Carr's timidity was, in large part, to blame for the situation, and the election brought the realization to mind.

After ten months of open acclaim for Brown's ability and service, Carr nearly reversed himself, in a letter to the Department dated November 26, 1844. Not yet aware that he would remain as Minister, Carr suggested that he should stay at the post until a replacement arrived. "If there were such an officer attached to the American Legation here as is attached to the others, a Secretary of Legation the affairs of it might, with propriety, be given in charge to him, . . ."9 But the appointment of a dragoman, as Charge' was unheard of until Porter's death.

"Whatever may have been the consideration of a Dragoman here, in former times, he is now considered the mere interpreter of an official character, but that which is reflected on him by the Minister. The Sublime Porte cannot therefore but look with surprise upon the Diplomatic anomaly of the person who appeared before it yesterday as the mere interpreter of the Minister, appearing today as Charge' d'Affairs, and tomorrow as Dragoman again. It must seem still more curious to them, and not a little undignified, to find the Charge' d'Affairs acting as his own Dragoman.

If the precedent set in the case of the present Dragoman, on the death of Commodore Porter, be followed the government of the U. S. may find, here after, that their Legation here has lost influence and consideration with the Sublime Porte, and that the Dragoman, who has been made Charge' d'Affaires, is not so well fitted, when he comes down from his temporary elevation for the duties of the office of Dragoman."10


10Ibid.
Brown was not an ordinary dragoman; he, unlike his fellow dragomans, was sole translator at his legation and a native of the country he served. It was as though the United States had a "Brown" and the great powers had common "dragomans". Everyone knew Brown held a unique position, thus Carr's letter was directed at Brown and not the post of Dragoman. This initiated a running battle between the two which lasted over a year. Carr's guerrilla tactics often left Brown in the dark concerning his intentions.

On December 6, 1844, Carr ordered Consul Chasseand to direct requests to the Minister and not Brown. Chasseand had written two letters, on November 16, one to Carr and the other to Brown. He asked Brown to define the boundaries for the Consulate at Jerusalem, and to state whether Carr protected missionaries for rumors were circulating that Carr did not protect them. Brown turned the letter over to Carr, who sent off the above directive to which he added a denunciation of the rumors.11

Twelve days later in a seemingly friendly and sincere letter, Carr suggested that the archives of the Legation should be removed from Brown's home in order that they be more convenient for his own use. Nothing definite was to be decided until, after the first of the year.12 Whatever transpired between then and January 17, 1845 moved Carr, in a dispatch, to make a scathing attack against Brown. This

11Letter, Dabney Carr to Jasper Chasseand, Dec. 6, 1844, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).

time there was no question; Brown and not the office of Dragoman was under fire. This dispatch, like the Commodore's denunciation of Hodgson, was obviously written out of frustration, personal pique, and jealousy. The letter expressed Carr's expectation of being continued in his post and his desire for a leave of absence during the summer.

Carr, a bankrupt grandnephew of Thomas Jefferson, did not want Brown, whom he accused of seeking a social position beyond his qualifications, to serve as Charge' for the reason assigned in the November dispatch. Once on the subject of Brown, however, Carr could not stop. He complained of his unwillingness, in forwarding the interests, of Americans at the Porte. Brown had refused to present a set of false teeth, made by Dr. Hitchcock of Boston, to the young Sultan, on the grounds that they were offensive and would reflect on his personal prestige. Carr claimed that Brown was a mere messenger for the Minister and could not be held responsible for the latter's directives.

". . . . the Legation, and the Government, are in no wise, dependant on Mr. Brown, except in his capacity as Dragoman, and in that, not so entirely as he fancies; for Mr. Porter, the Consul here, speaks the Turkish language quite well, and his Dragoman, who is a man worthy of all confidence, speaks and writes it infinitely better than Mr. B. and is besides proficient in almost all the languages of the east." Carr wanted George Porter made Charge in his absence, because he was the nephew in which the Commodore placed more trust. The emnity

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
between cousins had found new life in the overly sympathetic Carr, who bitterly feared Brown's ambition. The latter pages of this letter convey a mood that betrays its author's true intention.

"I should not have troubled the Department on this subject, believing as I did, that Mr. Brown had seen the error of his views; but I find that he is instituting inquiries as to what our Ministers at other Courts require of their Secretaries of Legation, and what those secretaries deem to be their rights, and their duties. I have discovered too, by mere accident, lately, that Mr. Brown describes himself, on his visiting cards, which he leaves with the members of the diplomatic circle and others, not Americans, as 'Mr. John P. Brown, secretarie de la Legation des Etats Unis d'Amerique,' while, when leaving one for me on the same day, he leaves one with simple 'Mr. John P. Brown,' now I find Sir, in the Archives of the Legation nothing that authorizes Mr. Brown to assume the title of 'Secretaire,' and the secret way in which Mr. B. has taken it on himself, satisfies me that he knows he is doing what he ought not to do. Indeed, sir, Mr. B's having had charge of the Legation here, after Commodore Porter's death, has put him quite beside himself, and filled his mind with presumptions that injure his usefulness and make him ridiculous. He is filled with the idea of our Government's adopting the European system in regard to the Diplomatic Corps, that of attache's promoted to Secretaryships, Secretaries promoted to Charges, - and Charge's to Ministers, - while he really has no single qualification for employment by the government, but his ability to translate Turkish. His knowledge of French is very limited; of Italian he knows about nothing. His English is so bad that I have to correct all his grammar and orthography, and has less idea even than most Europeans of the theory of our institutions, and I honestly believe, cares as little about them. In a word, he is the most illiterate man I ever met with in his grade of society. He is fit only to be Dragoman, and not, by any means, equal to most of those of that class at this court. I am sorry, therefore, to be compelled to recall all that I have said of him, when I had seen but little of him, and which I wrote at his request, in my dispatch No. 4.

It has been a painful task, to me to make this communication to the Department, but it was necessary both for Mr. B. himself, and for the interests of the Legation. I have not the least unkind feeling towards him, and do not mean by what I have said to do him any injury. He himself would admit that my conduct to him has been kind, liberal, friendly, and indulgent. I wish him to be continued in his present office. If he be put right by the Department, through the Minister here, he may be useful, and he will learn to be contented with
his present situation, which is beyond anything he ever had any right to expect."16

Carr, while professing concern for Brown and the Legation, sent the indictment of Brown to the Department, a month before asking Brown for an explanation.17 When finally requested, Brown not only answered the charge of illegally assuming the title of Secretary with precedents; he also suggested that Carr contact the Department for verification.18 Carr responded on the following day, with a denial of Brown's allegation, explaining that Brown had no right to contact the Department except through him.19 This was Carr's way of rejecting Brown's claim. The Department, however, displayed no reluctance in substantiating Brown in the right to hold the title of Secretary.

Carr refused to give up his stand against Brown serving as Charge', but this time it was based on Carr's inability to pay him for his services. A minister taking a leave of absence was required to reimburse his replacement out of his own pocket.20 He again asked the Department to make Porter Charge', in his absence saying, "Mr. Porter, using my house, furniture, etc. and being my friend, would not expect

16 Ibid.


20 Letter, Dabney Carr to James Buchanan, June 6, 1845, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).
anything additional."\(^{21}\) The Department again sided with Brown, contending that such an action on its part would indicate a lack of confidence in Brown, which was not the case.\(^{22}\) Carr finally acquiesced, recognizing Brown as both secretary and dragoman. "With your dispatch before me, I shall of course continue to maintain the respectability of the Dragoman and to sustain him in the discharge of his duties, . . . .\(^{23}\)

Carr's attitude toward Brown remained unchanged, he merely agreed to hide his feelings from Brown in order to protect the interests of the Legation and the Government.

"Desirous to cultivate the relations which you very justly describe as those which should exist between the Minister and the Dragoman, I shall not leave Mr. Brown access to the record book of my correspondence with the Department of State, (in which my dispatch No. 30 is recorded) nor to your Dispatch No. 16, as these would not be calculated to strengthen those relations. I have however, nothing to retract, of what I said in that dispatch, nor should I have any personal objection to Mr. B's reading every line of it. For my own justification I shall bring home with me, for the perusal of the Department, extracts from the correspondence, on file in the Archives, which the Department has never seen, which will show that I am not singular in the estimate I have formed of Mr. B's character, and if I deem it becoming or proper, might bring with me the testimony of living American witnesses here, that would satisfy the Department that I have had good ground for the formation of an unfavorable opinion of Mr. B., I venture the confident opinion that no Minister will ever act with him two years without forming a like opinion. I can assure the Department, however, that, as I have done heretofore, I shall endeavor so to deport myself towards him

\(^{21}\)Ibid.


\(^{23}\)Letter, Dabney Carr to James Buchanan, July 25, 1845, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).
This letter points up, better than any other, the importance of Brown in the operation of the legation. The Minister was forced to accommodate Brown, whose single qualification was the ability to translate Turkish. Carr's claims against Brown were never substantiated, although he was correct in stating that living Americans would sustain him in his opinion of Brown. Brown was the scapegoat for the failure of businessmen and inventors to negotiate lucrative contracts with the Porte, and in bringing cases before mixed Turkish-American tribunals for adjudication.

It was during the 1840's, that Brown incurred the wrath and sustained animosity of several Americans for the above stated reasons. The most memorable were the cases of those whose expectations were too high. John Reeves, an American ship builder, pressed the Porte for monies promised on an oral contract, and with Brown's help received partial payment. But, Reeves was not satisfied, and confiscated property belonging to an Ottoman subject, to make up the difference. This led to a series of court cases in which he refused to cooperate with Brown, who served as legal counsel or representative at all trials involving Americans. After twelve years of legal maneuvering, Reeves returned to the United States where he threatened to continue the case, with a suit for damages against George Perkins Marsh, who

24 Ibid.

25 Letter, Dabney Carr to John C. Calhoun, Jan 17, 1845, USDD (Turkey, Vol. X).
was then head of the legation.26

A case more bitter and ironical was that of Dr. Reilly, the inventor of a steam bath touted to possess great curative powers. He had both portable and stationary models for use on the battle field or in the palace. The idea presented to the United States Congress for use in military hospitals, became bogged down and was shuffled aside after a sum of $10,000 was suggested for the payment of Dr. Reilly.27 Instead of pressing Congress, he took the advice of an old friend, Dr. Heap, to sell the invention to the Sultan for several times that amount. Reilly arrived in Constantinople, after the death of the Commodore, and asked Brown to present his invention to the Sultan. Brown did so against his better judgment, for why would a Sultan want a cast iron bath tub with a canvass canope, when he already had a spacious marble steam bath? As Brown expected, the Sultan was not interested. Reilly complained to Carr, that Brown made an improper presentation of the bath, thus causing its rejection.28 Carr pressed the Porte for favorable receipt of the bath, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs recommended that a snuff box of about P 4000 in value should be given to Dr. Reilly on the part of the Sultan; and that in consideration of Carr's representation, he would also receive P 2000


(approximately $80 in cash) for the bath. Brown wrote to Carr.

"He (Reza Pasha) hoped this would be satisfactory; and that the individual in question would make no further demands for indemnification." Brown was strongly opposed to Americans bringing trivial inventions to the attention of the Sultan with the expectation of great riches, especially when the Porte had its hands full just in keeping the Empire together. Brown did not view the Porte as a fountain of wealth as he was well aware of its need for economy. Making unnecessary demands upon its limited resources was liable to weaken American influence and friendship at the Porte. Brown explained to Carr, "Many such inventions were yearly offered to the Government by Europeans without their receiving any attention; and were Dr. Reilly not known through you, his would have been returned to him." This was not the end of Reilly's claim; it continued without success for seven more years.

Christopher Oscanyan, a naturalized American, born of Armenian parents in the Ottoman Empire, proved to be one of the legation's most constant problems. He was one of a number of Armenian children sent to the United States, by the missionaries, for an education. After graduating from New York University, he married the daughter of Rev. Skinner, a prominent theologian with connections

---
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both in New York City and at Andover Newton Theological School at
Newton Center, Massachusetts. This enabled Oscanyan to make
connections with the thriving business world and also missionary
ventures. In 1840, he returned to Constantinople to engage in
business. His citizenship came into dispute first, followed by a
terrifying mob scene at his father's funeral, (Armenian Patriarch
refused last rites due to missionary connections), and then a
plethora of legal actions confused by the citizenship of the parties,
jurisdiction, and terms of contracts. Twenty years was not
sufficient to settle the issues or Oscanyan's animosity toward Brown.
From 1858-1869, he actively worked to undermine Brown in order to
obtain his position.

Carr kept his promise to the Secretary of State, even to the
point of telling Brown that the missing correspondence was not
derogatory of him. Harmony was maintained with the exception of
two occasions upon which Brown asked Carr for additional pay during
the Minister's absence from Constantinople. Carr resigned himself to
the position of supervisor and to serving as a rubber stamp for Brown's
capable management of legation business. Carr's only positive

[footnotes]
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contribution to American interests was a trip, in the latter months of his ministry, to Syria where his presence strengthened missionary influence.

In August, 1845, Carr and Porter departed for the United States on a year's leave of absence, while Brown remained in Constantinople to serve as Charge', Dragoman, and Consul. During that year, American relations with Turkey showed signs of returning to a pre-1838 level. The Porte wanted to free itself from British pressure, without falling under the influence of another great power, and once again the United States seemed to be the avenue of escape.

Sultan Abdul Mejid recognizing his government's need for increased revenue sought relief in the cultivation of new crops and markets rather than undertaking basic economic reforms. Cotton was a key crop in international trade and one that required minimal expenditure on the part of the producer. It seemed the natural product for an agricultural country in need of cash. Thus, early in 1846, Brown was requested to visit the Sultan's secretary, Shefik Bey for the purpose of receiving a secret proposal for the introduction of American cotton culture into Turkey. He wanted agricultural specialists, a variety of cotton seeds, and machinery for cotton cultivation sent from the United States. His desire was to establish an experimental farm on his own property for the development of the latest agricultural methods in cotton and other crop production.

Secretary of State Buchanan, prompt in meeting the Sultan's request, sent Dr. Davis to Turkey with the appropriate supplies. Dr. Davis signed a six year contract with the Porte and with what he believed to be full authority over the project, planted the first crops late in the season. Nothing went properly after the contract was signed. Dr. Davis' translator, farm steward, and laborers were of one grasping Armenian family, who held claims to the land under cultivation. They helped sabotage what nature did not. In 1846, Turkey and southern Russia suffered severe drought reducing the yield on the model farm, but not enough to discourage the experiment. After harvest in 1846, the farm hands returned to their homes with cotton seeds and equipment causing a lack of both for the following year. Perfect growing conditions, in 1847, were met with continual set backs. A plow was borrowed from the missionaries to prepare the ground, a scarcity of seed reduced the acreage under cultivation, and the unfenced fields became a public pasture and an inviting roadway.

The Porte called for the termination of the contract and Dr. Davis with Brown's assistance sued for full payment. Lengthy legal maneuvers resulted in an out of court settlement of $24,000 for Davis, whose health and eye sight had been greatly impaired.

---
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Brown viewed the failure of the project as a blot on American ingenuity and sensed the ridicule of European powers. This may have prompted Brown to write the article, "Culture of Cotton in Turkey," which appeared in Hunt's Magazine for February, 1852. In it, Brown explained the experiment in clear factual terms, neither apologizing for nor condemning either party. Brown's articles were usually written in reflection of an event and published much later. This was partly due to communication of the period, but mostly to the nature of his position as a member of the legation.

A month after Brown's visit to Shefik Bey, a second request was made. This time it was the Sultan's brother-in-law and Capudan Pasha, Mehmet Ali, who approached Brown. He was interested in sending three Moslem naval officers to the United States for the purpose of learning naval architecture, and also suggested that perhaps some could be attached to United States ships in the Mediterranean to learn the skills of navigation.

In May, 1846, Rechid Pasha made further inquireries on the same subject. Brown wrote to the Secretary of State. "I have encouraged these projects in the hope that they may lead to a better knowledge of our country on the part of the Turks, as well as serve to strengthen the relations of friendship which exist between the two

The idea was acceptable to the United States Government, but unlike the cotton affair the initiative rested with the Porte, thus the project never got under way. The tragedy of Ottoman rule was not its inflexibility or unreceptiveness to change; it was the government's vacillation and indecision in the face of change. High government officials were too frequently shifted from one post to another making it impossible to carry out programs once suggested or initiated. As time passed, limited revenue caused the condition to become ever more acute. Reform was spotty and ineffective, but not insincere. Brown recognized this and did everything in his power to make the Ottoman position understood. He was careful to present American cases to the Porte in the most precise terms, knowing that reason and justice would not be rejected. Carr in some brief missives to Brown seemed to ridicule the approach, but at the same time maintained a healthy respect for Brown's influence in accomplishing ends unobtainable through ordinary diplomatic channels. All too frequently the Minister requested Brown to use unofficial means to achieve desired settlements.

Brown earned most of his experience handling cases involving missionaries. It was in this area that his employment of reason and
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justice were put to greatest advantage. The Porte, although supporting a policy of religious equality, found it difficult to enforce such a policy in areas remote from the capital. The presence of protestant missionaries in the Empire heightened the issue of religious equality by presenting a new view of an old faith. The missionaries were, in effect, attempting to bring the protestant reformation to the East, three hundred years after its occurrence in the West. Reformation was not a popular cause among eastern Christians, any more than it had been to the Church of Rome three centuries before. Contrary to missionary protests, reformation teachings were splitting traditional congregations, and in order to protect the dissenters it was necessary to establish a recognized protestant community. Sir Stratford Canning, British Ambassador at Constantinople, became champion of the cause, as a means of extending British influence over the Ottoman Government.

Numerous incidents involving protestant Armenians brought the issue of a separate protestant community to a head in 1846. The arrival of protestant missionaries in the Empire, engendered the first idea of such a community; and increased missionary activity made it a necessity. This became apparent to the missionaries, early in the 1840's and was given impetus by Rufus Anderson's visit, (December, 1843-March, 1844). At that time, the missionaries were in firm agreement, that a split in the Armenian church was imminent.45 They

were quick to point out that the missionaries were interested, only in saving souls by reforming the individuals, not in splitting the church. A schism in the Armenian community would develop from within, not from without. Their line of distinction, though fine, demonstrated their interest in remaining above the political turmoil that was bound to result. Anderson recognized the problem of political involvement, but rather naive in thinking the missionaries could change the political make up of a country without being discovered. His advice was to be interpreted more accurately, as to beware of supporting British policy. It was too well known that the British were interested in increasing their influence, through a protestant community, as Russia and France had done with the Orthodox and Catholic communities. The British did not make a move in this direction until, 1846, after private claims against the Ottoman Government had been settled. Canning then led the movement, in behalf of humanity, and other protestant nations sided with the British lead.

In 1844, Matteos was selected to succeed Patriarch Stephan III as head of the Armenian community. Matteos had no intention of being as indulgent as his predecessor had of protestant activities. The

Armenian church organization was all that held the Armenians together as a people. On March 23, 1844, the Sultan issued a decree to the effect that no Christians in the Empire were to be persecuted for religion. This did not seem to prevent a dutiful Patriarch, from correcting or punishing, members of his own flock. In May, 1844, Brown went to the Porte to answer complaints made against Americans in Erzurum, Trabizon, and Brusa by the Armenian Patriarch. These dragged on, and in January of the following year, additional charges came from the Armenian community in Beirut. Brown recorded the following dialogue he had with the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the occasion of the second charge. Brown's contention was that the case under dispute had been heard by a prejudicial court, not in the tradition of Ottoman justice.

"(If Americans were menaced they) would have to look, to their own Pacha for protection. 'Who do you mean' asked he (Minister)? I (Brown) replied 'the Commander of our own Naval force in the Mediterranean.' The Minister seemed embarrassed by the remark, and replying confusedly, said, '... - do you think it is easy?' I said 'I had no reference to the facility, but the necessity of looking to him for protection."

---
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The Minister, in an attempt to regain the offensive complained that the Consul in Beirut was bribing people to convert to protestantism. Brown ended the discussion by mentioning that the Consul received no salary and, in addition, was Catholic. The issue quieted and for a year there was no major threat to Americans from the Armenian Patriarch. In the meantime the Patriarch changed his plan of attack. Instead of bringing complaints, to the Porte, against American missionaries, he excommunicated their Armenian converts, who still depended upon the Armenian church for their rites, and the Armenian community for their livelihood. Employees and customers deserted the shops of Armenian converts, at the Patriarch's request. Brown approached Reshid Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, with the tales of persecution brought to him by the missionaries. He explained to the Minister that he did so, in the interest of humanity, and not to interfere with the affairs of the Empire. Brown informed Secretary of State Buchanan, that the Porte was aware of English and French interest in acquiring influence among Ottoman subjects, and that more than once, the Porte had complained that American missionaries were subservient to British policy. But, he assured the Secretary, that the Porte knew missionary efforts were not connected with the government of the United States. Thus, Brown joined the British and Prussian

---
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Ministers in a plea for humanity.\textsuperscript{58}

Reshid Pasha, who fell in line with many of the reforms proposed by the British Minister, could not allow the British to form a protestant community through which greater pressure could be exerted upon the Ottoman Government. In early April, Reshid warned that persons wanting a separate protestant millet would be exiled from the capital.\textsuperscript{59} Brown convinced that there was no chance of forming a protestant, English community, arranged for a meeting with Patriarch Matteos.\textsuperscript{60} In the ensuing conference between the two men, Brown explained that the United States Government was not protestant, nor was it interested in spreading protestantism, but the persecution of protestant Armenians drew the sympathy of it, and other foreign governments to the point of interference. If the Patriarch was interested in getting out from under the pressure, then exerted upon him by the Porte, all he would have to do, would be renounce persecution and take the protestants back into the church. Matteos demonstrated confidence in Brown's proposal by promptly adopting it, in a written declaration dated May, 1846. This was only a temporary solution, and one with which Brown was not satisfied. The alleviation of so many missionary problems seemed to rest on the establishment of
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a protestant millet and British sponsorship was the road block. The circumstances under which the block was removed indicates that Brown may have been wrong in placing the blame with the British rather than on Canning himself. Sir Henry Layard, a close associate of Canning's, hints that Canning's overpowering presence, often defeated his objectives. The case in point may be one of those occasions. During Canning's leave of absence, Lord Cowley negotiated the matter with the Porte, and on November 15, 1847, the Grand Vizier issued a firman, declaring that the "Christian subjects of the Ottoman government professing Protestantism" should constitute a separate community. It was made official by an Imperial decree in November, 1850.

Carr returned from the United States, in August, 1846, and was greeted with missionary troubles in Trabizon and Erzurum. An Armenian mob had destroyed Dr. Smith's home in Erzurum and carried away his property; and in Trabizon an Armenian Bishop refused burial to a child of a convert. Reshid Pasha and Carr agreed that Brown should go to these two locations with a representative of the Ottoman government

---
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and settle the difficulties. Normally the representative would have
gone to the scene of the disturbance by himself. His presence was
needed outside of the capital to force reluctant and often recalcitrant
Pashas into obeying the laws and directives of the Sultan. Brown was
sent to add more weight to the Sultan's orders. He noted, "It is
something for an American functionary to come here, and the people
see that the Americans have a protecting power of their own."
Although well received and invited to dine at numerous homes, Brown
was not favorably impressed with the eastern portions of Turkey.

"From the first hour of my departure from Trabizon,
when I was hot enough, I commenced rising height after height -
ascending three mountains and going down only two, until I
was brought up here 6270 ft. above the land of the sea, with
a temperature constantly chilling me. The country fifty miles
from Trabizon is wooded, but from there to here the mountains
and plains are bare as a wigless pate with chasms and . . .
rocks in the forms that are frightful. The people are really
as wild and barbarous as their country, a little more
hospitable when well paid for it, and apparently possessing
little regard or respect for the Sultan."

The Pasha in charge had failed to act due to the absence of reliable
troops. The eastern region of Turkey was in constant turmoil. Persia
and Turkey were at war, while Russian, French, and British agents
plotted against both and each other. The United States had no consuls
there nor diplomatic relations with Persia, yet American missionaries
eagerly moved into the hazardous situation. Neither fools nor angels,
these missionaries found themselves treading a charmed path courted by
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all, but the French and the local inhabitants. It was hoped by each that American influence would serve as the counter weight to oust the opposing power. Persia, Turkey, and Russia wanted the United States to replace Britain, while the British wanted Americans to serve as an extension of the lion's paw. The latter, being a protestant, English speaking power, possessing institutional affinity with the United States found itself possessed of the prize. By default it had won the honor of protecting American missionaries, and in so doing assumed the title of guardian and protector of humanity. Brown departed after three months leaving the British Consul in charge of the situation. This was not as Brown desired it. The United States would fair better as a neutral and so would its missionaries. In league with Britain, they would draw the animosity of her enemies and receive very little as her friend. Canning, Carr, and the missionaries, however found it the most administratively and ethically acceptable solution.

Brown spent three cold, damp months in eastern Turkey solving two very notty problems, with the greatest of finesse. Although, rewarded, with the acquaintance of Sir James Redhouse, the great orientalist, then serving as Consul at Trabizon, and with large quantities of material for his letters to the Scioto Gazette, he suffered greatly. In a letter to Carr, he wrote, "I had a most fatiguing ride over these mountains from Trabizon; and if you suffer for your country in making visits of ceremony in Pera, I am a martyr to the same cause in executing the long visit on which I came here."67

67Ibid., p. 352.
Legation business suffered as badly as Brown did during the months of September, October, and November, for without Brown, Carr was unable to communicate with the Porte. During 1847, Carr did little more than occupy space at the Legation, and between December 14, 1847 and August 1, 1848, he did not even bother to send dispatches to the Department. His excuse when asked, was, "I had nothing, important, to communicate." During 1848 and 1849, Carr marked time with the hope of maintaining his position through another four years. He tacked his ambition to the missionaries rather than the success of his political party. In November, 1848, he requested Rufus Anderson to use his influence in keeping him on as Minister to Turkey. This favor would of course be returned for benefit of the missionaries. A three month tour of Syria and Egypt, early in the following summer, may have been gauged also to garner missionary support. But, all was for naught. His letter of recall, dated May 29, 1849, was received in July while he was on tour in Syria.

Between 1847-1850, Brown's duties were increased but not onerous. Carr virtually supervised while Brown administered. Brown made suggestions, composed letters for delivery to the Porte and Carr

---
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approved them. Although Carr held Brown's French in low esteem, he had him translate official letters into that language. Brown even took over some of Carr's formal duties. It was Brown who visited Abbas Pasha of Egypt, who had come to Constantinople to receive the Vice Royalty, with congratulations from the American government.

During these years, Brown also made constructive suggestions for improvement of the American position in Turkey. He saw a need for a hospital or money to care for destitute American seamen; he surreptitiously hinted at the establishment of an eleve system for diplomatic personnel; and he proposed a United States tariff, separate from that of Britain, in order to encourage American commerce and boost American prestige at the Porte, by demonstrating independence from British policy. His proposals were not limited to American activity. In conversation with the British Ambassador, Brown asked him to end the Circassian and African slave trade, being carried on in British ships. Canning showed interest in the idea, by bringing it to the attention of the Sultan, who instituted a law prohibiting the embarkation of negro slaves from Turkish ships after August, 1850.

"The white slave traffic was still undisturbed; but the Sultan regarded it as 'a shameful and barbarous practice,' and 'hoped before long to
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abolish the infamous trade within his dominions."^76

During the same period, Brown kept the farmers of Ohio informed of the fluxuation in the grain trade and outlined a process whereby they could can beef for easier marketing. 77 So thoroughly satisfied was Seneca Ely, editor of the Scioto Gazette, with Brown's information, that he was compelled to reply to a letter that appeared in the Morning Courier and New York Enquier, on April 25, 1849. The writer condemned the United States representative at Constantinople for not collecting trade information for the promotion of the Black Sea trade. A portion of Ely's reply follows.

"I know not what degree of culpability attaches to 'our Representative' at Constantinople, but this I do know, that the principal Dragoman of the American Legation, Mr. John Porter Brown, has been 'instant in season and out of season,' in laying before his countrymen at home, through the medium of the press, full statements of the amount, kinds and value of the commerce of the Euxine - facts with which he has made himself familiar by study and personal observation, for which a long residence at the East has afforded him unusual facilities. The results of his examinations have appeared, from time to time, in the 'Knickerbocker' of this city, in the National Intelligencer, Washington, and in the Chillicothe, Ohio Gazette, a newspaper printed in the place of Mr. B's nativity, and in other periodicals too numerous to mention.

It is undoubtedly true that the British have pretty much of a clean sweep of the Black Sea commerce; - but the circumstance arises from other facts than the neglect of 'our Representative'. . . .

In other words, American commerce east of Smyrna is yet in its infancy as it were. If there were inducements enough to tempt advances, our shrewd tars and traders would


not be long in discovering them, however neglectful 'our Representative' might be."78

While pleasing his countrymen, settling disputes among Armenians and with missionaries, Brown was busy ingratiating himself upon the Sultan with gifts of American trees (sugar, hickory, walnut, oak, and magnolia) for the Sultan's extensive garden.79

The 1840's had been mildly chaotic for Brown and the American Legation, but nothing could compare with the 1850's. They were the years of Brown's greatest achievement and satisfaction in spite of turmoil and adversity. In the midst of war, inflation, and professional rivalry, he found himself both condemned and toasted throughout the United States and in parts of Europe, for his concern for humanity and international understanding.

"The East, the splendid East, the Orient Land, the land of the Sun, of magnificence and grandeur, alas! is no longer to my eye or heart, what it once was. I now look upon what I formerly held as a fairy land, on which to draw largely in my imagination, as a land of realities, only differing from all others by being in an advanced and decrepid age I might say with Shakespeare, 'in the lean and slippered pantaloon' of life, neglected, wronged by man, yet shone upon as brightly by the sun as it ever was, and as much favored by nature as in the palmiest days of its youth and prosperity.


The countries of Europe were set a stir by the revolutions of 1848-1849, but none received international repercussions more directly than Turkey. Unsuccessful nationalist leaders from Poland, Hungary, and Italy sought refuge in the Ottoman Empire, the traditional refuge of revolutionaries. The situation was fraught with seeming anomalies; revolutionaries welcomed to a land of legendary traditionalism, republicans in the stronghold of monarchy, and Christians drawn to the bosom of Islam.

For Americans and Western Europeans, the situation was new and startling; western "civilization" had finally penetrated the Eastern monolith. Newspapers and magazines on both continents carried stories of the Sultan's benevolence, compassion, and justice. John P. Brown shared these channels of communication with the liberal publicists of the day, expanding and prolonging the Sultan's good press. Centuries
of fear could not be swept away with one humanitarian act, but saturation publicity could weaken the hard shell of prejudice that had so long held East and West apart. Brown saw the printed page as the greatest teacher of the age and used it to draw the United States and Turkey into a closer relationship.\(^1\) The challenge offered by writers with an adverse point of view, heightened public attention and debate. Brown never promised miracles, he merely pointed up the Sultan's liberal tendencies, his concern for humanity, and his susceptibility to change. Brown recognized the latter quality as supporting the greatest hope for the Empire and mankind. It was on this score that he condemned Russia and its iron heeled Tsar. There was no hope in Russia, because change was not allowed.\(^2\)

Russia and Austria saw no cause to recognize an alteration in the Sultan's attitude toward revolutionaries or humanity, and in truth they were correct. The Sultans had always harbored the enemies of Russia and Austria, for political advantage, and had used their European provinces to launch attacks against these European powers. The critical difference, at this point in time, was Turkey's military inferiority, and Europe's concentrated interest in the division of the Ottoman Empire.

Sultan Abdul Mejid was placed in a dilemma of enormous proportions with the flight of five thousand refugees into Turkey.


His alternatives were either to accept or expel them. The former meant drawing the wrath and threatened invasion of Russia and Austria, while the latter would invite the censure and possible hostility of England and America. Since England and the United States were responsible for much of Turkey's modernization up to this point and were depended upon for its continuation, the Sultan rallied to their plea for humanity, especially since it was accompanied by proffered military support from the United States, England, and France. 

England and France were more interested in protecting their Ottoman territorial aspirations from Russian and Austrian incursions than in protecting humanity, but humanitarian causes were great crowd pleasers, and popular support was needed at home. The United States was not the naive partner to a European deception, but an earnest associate in an international action which it hoped would encourage republican revolution throughout the world. 

In the closing months of 1849, as the refugees began drifting into the Ottoman Empire, the American Legation as well as the American community opened its doors to the homeless and often destitute refugees. The departure of Carr and delayed arrival of the new Minister Resident left Brown in charge of the Legation. Brown relieved of "Carr's incorrigible habits of interference" and "his gross immoralities," lost no time in asserting himself and the American

---
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In mid-December, he informed the Secretary of State of his activities.

"The Department is aware of the private friendly relations which existed during the absence of the late Minister in Syria, between myself and Count Andrassy; and I now feel it proper to let the Department know how far I have acted in behalf of his Countrymen.

On the arrival of some eighty Hungarians from England, who had succeeded in escaping from the Austrian army in Italy, and were sent here through the generosity of the English friends of the cause of their country, with the hope of their being able, by this route, to return to Hungary, I procured, in concert with an employee of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Ahmed Effendi, permits for eighteen of them to pass through Roumelia to the Danubian frontier. These permits are required by the regulations of the Porte, for all foreigners passing through any part of the Empire, and can only be granted at the request of a foreign Legation. In this instance they were given under supposed names, to persons in the protection of the Legation, and without any reference to their nationality or character. The Consul of the United States at this place gave passports to Hungarians of rank, who had escaped to this place down the Danube, as natives of Switzerland, under fictitious names, furnished me by Count Andrassy, on their way to the U. S. through France and England; and when the Count left here for England in November, I gave him at his urgent request, a passport as a native of Switzerland, on the way to the U. S., in the name of Herbert Leuman. I also gave a similar passport to his secretary Mr. Keiss.

I have verbally expressed to the officers of the Porte, a strong personal sympathy for the unfortunate Hungarians, and my warmest admiration of the magnanimous and noble conduct of the Sultan in their behalf. The Grand Vizir, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs have learned through the American and European papers, the sympathy of many Americans for the Hungarians; and recently the former mentioned to me, that it was reported that the American government had offered its squadron in the Mediterranean to act in concert with the English and French fleets, in support of the Sultan, should the course pursued by him in behalf of the political refugees in his Empire draw upon him an hostile attack from Russia and

---

Brown was not asking for approbation or instruction, he was simply relating, what seemed to him natural responses to immediate problems. The British were treading a more cautious path or as Brown put it, "(Sir Stratford Canning's) influence is exerted, I believe, in such a manner as not to give open offense to the Austrian and Russian Ministers." Brown was accustomed to making rapid, accurate decisions and assuming responsibility for them. His position as American representative gave him greater flexibility of action. The American presence in the East had demonstrated itself to be a threat, only to British trade interests, not to territorial acquisition. American action was a poor excuse for war on the part of Austria and Russia especially with England and France serving as her shield.

The Sultan arranged with Austria and Russia to place the leading political refugees under house arrest at Shumla, Bulgaria and Kutahya, Turkey for a period of one year. This stayed international interference, but brought cries of betrayal from Western Europe and America. George Perkins Marsh, the new American Minister Resident at Constantinople, under orders of President Taylor, offered to transport and settle the heroic refugees in America. The Sultan hesitated and President Taylor died, so that when the Sultan finally accepted; it


was Congress' turn to hesitate. As usual Congress was concerned with the expense. Brown who was well aware of the government's tight control of the dollar, even when just debts were to be paid, took up the cause of the Hungarian refugees and their leader Louis Kossuth. Letters in the press were not enough. American officials had to be urged more directly. Brown was soon given the opportunity to promote the refugee cause and Turkish-American relations. It came in the form of a long desired leave of absence which turned out to be a seven-month tour of the United States with the first Turkish envoy.

In the United States, Brown met with the President, members of the Cabinet, and Congressmen. There was little opportunity during official functions to speak to these men, for he served as the official interpreter for the Turkish agent, but he did make their acquaintances. Ten days after his arrival in the United States, he sent a long letter to Secretary of State Daniel Webster. In it, he made a worthy plea for the refugee cause urging the Secretary to accept the Sultan's most recent offer to send the refugees as far as England for American convenience.

"Thus far, the American government, or its Congress has not done more than sympathize in their (the Hungarian's) misfortune; will the latter not add effect to this general willingness, and stretch forth the hand of public benevolence to Kossuth and his friends. The moral affect of such a step will be as influential in Europe as is the example of our prosperous and happy country. I view the matter wholly in that light. Benevolence to unfortunate patriots, speaks with a force and power, which rivals even the mighty armies of those governments, which wish the world to become 'Cossack', and
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whose greatest dread, is the steady advance of those republican principles which are the beacon of all well meaning men. Allow me to plead with you in favor of Mr. Kossuth, and the Hungarians and Poles now at Constantinople, and who are so desirous of joining their happy countrymen in Iowa. The Noble and generous Sultan stretches further his hand toward America. He offers to place them within our reach, within 10 days of our shores: cannot Congress in its wisdom and generosity, seize the proffered hand of that excellent Prince and carry out the offer already made by the lamented General Taylor? It would be honorable to the American people, and to the memory of that excellent man."9

After further passage of time, the government relented and several hundred refugees were placed on United States ships and sent from Constantinople to New York. Kossuth, in whose behalf Brown labored so diligently, jumped ship at Gibraltar, postponing his arrival in the United States for several months. Kossuth's action was gauged to rally more support in Europe and especially England, for further revolutionary activity in Hungary. Brown, who never personally met Kossuth, was hurt by his ingratitude.10 While speaking to an English audience at Southampton, he had given them full credit for his release and rescue.11 This was after he had given Brown full credit in letters previously published in the Scioto Gazette. The Browns, while in Constantinople, had received Kossuth's niece, Countess Dembinsky, as a three-month house guest;12 and Brown's mother became

9Ibid.

10Editor, "John P. Brown, Esq.," The Daily Scioto Gazette (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 17, 1851, p. 2.

11Editor, "Kossuth - Who Freed Him?" Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 19, 1851, p. 2.

12Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) July 12, 1850, p. 2.
an intimate friend with Madam Wagner, who rescued Kossuth's wife and children in two desperate visits to Hungary.\textsuperscript{13} The elder Mrs. Brown joined her son in writing and speaking publicly in behalf of the Hungarian relief fund.\textsuperscript{14} Little attention was paid to Kossuth's remarks in Southampton and Kossuth himself slowly passed from the public eye as enthusiasm waned for his cause.

The revolutions of 1848-49 and the refugees they spawned served as a backdrop for the events of the 1850's and were directly responsible for many of the American Legation's problems.

In May, 1849, George Porter notified the Secretary of State that he was leaving Constantinople, on a two month tour of Syria with Dabney Carr.\textsuperscript{15} He placed the consulate in the hands of Francis Dainese, a Levantine merchant under the protection of Austria. All would have been well had Porter not left for the United States on completion of his Syrian tour. In Washington, he reported on conditions and trade in the areas visited and asked for an appointment to one of the Empire's other consulates, preferably Beirut or Tripoli.

In the meantime, refugees from Hungary, Poland, and Italy were pressing the American Legation and Consulate for assistance, in the

\textsuperscript{13}Editor, "John P. Brown, Esq.," \textit{The Daily Scioto Gazette}, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 17, 1851, p. 2.


form of passports or papers of protection. Swiss businessmen and tourists, who had no representative in the Empire, made similar requests rather than seek the assistance of England or France whose position on the revolutions were decidedly Monarchical. Previously the expense of issuing passports had been absorbed by the consulate; Dainese set a precedent by charging two dollars. This disturbed the refugees and somewhat lowered American prestige. The Legation composed of Brown and Henry A. Homes, (a former missionary of long residence in Turkey) who served as an assistant secretary and translator, was apprised of Dainese's activities, but did not possess any control over them. The law permitted such charges and he was merely taking advantage of it.  

On Marsh's arrival, in March, 1850, Dainese was quick to make his acquaintance and ingratiate himself upon the Honorable Minister Resident. Dainese was a man of high charm, intelligence, culture, and ability, but he also possessed all the qualities that the term Levantine signifies. Satisfied with his position at the consulate, Dainese worked to make it permanent. Marsh was not an acute judge of character. In fact his greatest fault was a trusting nature, or in Brown's terms "a simplicity of heart." Brown, who was aware of Dainese's colorful past and his shady business dealings, may have misjudged the danger of leaving Marsh uninformed in his own haste to

17 Ibid.
take leave. Too often Brown had been forced to cover the desk in the absence of others. Whatever the reason, Brown's error ironically and tragically helped to destroy his own chances of becoming minister. Dainese was to be a subject of wide controversy for many years.

Marsh, although not well acquainted with Brown on a personal basis, shared mutual friends in Washington with him. He was informed of Brown's long years of service and devotion to duty. Thus, when Brown requested a six months leave of absence (the first in fourteen years), Marsh granted it before official permission was received from the Department. This was done in order to facilitate Brown's departure on board the Erie, whose captain was William D. Porter, a son of the late Commodore.

A few weeks in advance of the trip, the Sultan consented to send an agent or a special Commissioner to the United States, for the purpose of familiarizing himself with American institutions and resources. Brown had long wanted the Sultan to send a representative to the United States but had in no way anticipated this turn of events. Instead of a vacation in his beloved Chillicothe with friends and relatives, he was to serve as an interpreter and tour guide for the first Turkish envoy to the United States.

Amin Bey's visit to the United States marks the beginning of a four year plateau in Brown's career and its zenith. Departing Constantinople on May 20, 1850, the Erie slowly made its way through the Mediterranean, touching Malta, Syracuse, Catania, Messina, Naples,
Leghorn, Pisa, and Genoa. The traveling party consisted of Brown, his wife and mother, Commissioner Amin Bey, Nishan an Armenian interpreter who learned English from the missionaries, and Hassan a lieutenant in the navy who posed as a servant. They played very much the role of tourists even to the point of Brown carving his name and those of friends high in the tower of Pisa. So leisurely was the cruise that New York was not reached until September 12th.

Six days later they arrived in Washington where Congress appropriated $10,000 for the party's expenses. President Fillmore held an interview with Amin Bey and declared him a guest of the nation. Transport companies throughout the country provided free transportation; hotels held rooms vacant in anticipation of their arrival; and cities competed for the honor of their presence. For seven months the press noted their every action and the populace reeled with delight at meeting a "Turk," and especially one of such great refinement and intelligence.

In Washington, D. C., the Marine Band serenaded outside of their hotel as the crowd milled craning to catch a glimpse of the "Turk". Amin Bey pleased them with a brief speech and Brown

---


19 From the Columbus Journal, "Visit of Amin Bey to Columbus," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 29, 1850, p. 3.


translated for the applauding crowd. 22 This performance was repeated in each city and town along the route. No political leader up to that point in history had traveled so extensively and examined American institutions and society so intensely. On days when no news was being made, Brown answered the editors' prayers with choice articles on the customs of Turkey or some other aspect of Eastern life. Brown was able to introduce Amin Bey to waiting crowds as a "Turk". He was an example of the modern Turk, from whom all traces of barbarism had been erased. He was an example of change, the change that to Brown meant hope for a revitalized and better Turkey. He also was the means for strengthening Turkish-American relations. At the same time Brown was busy cultivating personal relationships with America's leaders. The visit was assuring him of a more secure position in Constantinople.

The routine must have been extremely grueling. If the traveling and end on end of festivities were not sufficient to weaken the constitution of the heartiest of souls, surely the inspection tours must have been. In mid-October the party visited Philadelphia and the Fairmont Water Works. 23 A few days later Amin Bey was seen sitting stone faced at the Jenny Lind concert at Fitchburg. 24 By November, they were in Massachusetts. Three days of festivities, at Marshfield, Daniel Webster's home, were climaxed with visits to the


24 Ibid., Oct. 21, 1850, p. 2.
factories of Lowell, the Quincy granite quarries, and a series of hospitals, prisons, and poor houses. The high point of the New England tour was reached, on November 4, when the Boston merchants dined the party at the Revere House and then boarded a specially constructed Railroad for a gala celebration at the home of Dr. Hitchcock, probably the same gentleman who had sent the false teeth to the Sultan. The following is a report of that party from the Boston Transcript.

"A very tasteful and brilliant entertainment was given to Amin Bey, the Ottoman Commissioner, on Monday evening, by Dr. Hitchcock, of Boston, at his beautiful residence, Newton. The cards of invitation to city guests took them thither and back by special railroad trains; and many of the most distinguished citizens were present on the occasion.

On leaving the cars at Newton, the guests proceeded to the house, which was seen brilliantly illuminated, while a fine band of music gave forth a melodious welcome. Brilliant fireworks were sent up, both at the entrance and the departure of the company. On one side of the doorway hung the Turkish flag, and on the other the American. The center ornament of the supper table bore the inscription, "Amin Bey, the Nation's guest" surmounted by the Turkish and American flags in miniture.

Amin Bey expressed himself highly gratified with this fete; which was one of the pleasantest reunions we have had here for some time. The company left about ten o'clock, highly pleased with the liberal and successful arrangements, which their host had made for their entertainment; . . . ."

Before leaving Boston, Brown provided the Boston Daily Advertiser with an article on the conditions of the Ottoman Empire and the


27 Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 7, 1850, p. 3.
ameliorations it had undergone.28

A courtesy visit was made to Burlington, Vermont, the home of G. P. Marsh, and then off to Buffalo, Detroit, and Sandusky. By rail they traveled to Springfield, Xeniz, and Columbus.29 In Ohio's capital, Governor Ford led the welcome, and from the Neil House they made visits to some of America's most modern institutions. Amin Bey was especially interested in the methods used in the school for the deaf, dumb, and blind.30 Some of Chillicothe's leading townsmen, who had known Brown as a child, escorted the entourage from Columbus to the "ancient metropolis" as Chillicothe, was known.31

Bursting with emotion Brown was unable to respond to the initial greeting of his homespeople.32 There was no question, Brown was home. For two weeks he was the center of the universe for the people of Chillicothe. The Scioto Gazette, which had carried Brown's articles for over ten years, was filled with laudatory remarks.

"He is invaluable to our government. With the aid of the accomplished statesman and scholar, Hon. Geo. P. Marsh, of Vermont, our Minister at Constantinople, we think no court in Europe is better represented by us than is that of the


30From the Columbus Journal, "Visit of Amin Bey to Columbus," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 29, 1850, p. 3.


32Ibid.
Sultan."\textsuperscript{33} Even the Mad River Valley Gazette chimed in. "He is one of the best-informed men of European as well as Asiatic politics it has been our fortune to meet, and though so long absent, thoroughly American in thought and feeling."\textsuperscript{34} Brown was not only a man of world affairs, he was a literary figure of some note and the Scioto Gazette reminded:

"John P. Brown, Esq. -- our distinguished townsman, now sojourning in our midst, after a long residence in the East, has commenced a highly creditable career, as a literary man, as well as a diplomatist. His 'Turkish Evening Entertainments,' published last spring, in New York, are alluded to by the venerable philosopher, Alexander von Humboldt, in that world-renowned work Cosmos, as 'supplying a niche in literature that was before empty'. Washington Irving, in his 'Mahomet,' credits Mr. Brown with some important passages in that work; and Mr. B. himself informs us that his later translations from the Persian, shortly to appear under the auspices of the American Oriental Society, will impart much light, to the English reader, in reference to Eastern history and literature, hitherto unattainable save to the Oriental scholar.

We are happy to inform the readers of this paper, that we are promised a continuation of Mr. Brown's interesting correspondence, on the return of that gentleman to Constantinople."\textsuperscript{35}

The visit was accomplishing more than Brown or the Sultan could have imagined. Even though editorials became weighed down by their own verbosity, they carried the pictorial image desired for strengthening Turkish-American relations. One of the finest examples comes from the Scioto Gazette.

\textsuperscript{33}Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 29, 1850, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{34}'J. P. Brown,' Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Dec. 2, 1850, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{35}Editor, "John P. Brown, Esq.," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 29, 1850, p. 2.
"The visit of Amin Bey will serve to eradicate many prejudices, from minds of our people, regarding his country, its government and his co-religionists. Turkey is not the barbarous land some have thought it; and supposing him a fair specimen of his countrymen, they are certainly not the tyrannical, blood-thirsty Turks many have heretofore supposed they were. The world, indeed, is progressing; Civilization is advancing with steady strides in the farthest East. Light is beaming now, as in olden times, upon the land of the Bible and of the earlier Prophets. We will cheerfully extend the hand of welcome to our new visitor; and the 'Far West' will no longer be so far separated from the heretofore distant East."

Brown could not correct the editor's misconception without destroying the essence of the impression.

Brown's mother remained in Chillicothe to visit with relatives when the party headed south. Portsmouth and Cincinnati provided the usual entertainment and sights. A visit to Newport barracks, an address by President Medill at College Hall, and a public dinner at the Burnet House highlighted the Cincinnati stay. After Christmas, they took a paddle wheeler to New Orleans. On January 22, 1851, they arrived in Mobile, for a short rest before journeying to Pensacola and Ft. Barrancas. At the latter locations Amin Bey witnessed with tremendous interest the construction of large docks. Steam powered pole driving equipment and underwater cement were new to the

---

36Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Nov. 27, 1850, p. 2.
Commissioner, as was the diving bell, which allowed him to view the construction from a depth of thirty feet.\(^4\)

Visits to Savannah, Ft. Pulaski, Charleston, Norfolk, and Annapolis put the party back in Washington by early March.\(^5\) Good news awaited Brown in the capital. A civil and diplomatic bill had passed into law carrying an amendment appropriating $5,120 to Brown, for his services as Charge\(^{1}\) d'Affairs (pro-tem) to Turkey.\(^6\) On March 11, a farewell dinner was given by the President.\(^7\) A week later the party began its trip north with plans to sail from Boston on April 9th.\(^8\) The Browns, however, changed their plans and parted company with Amin Bey, in New York City. Newspapers claimed that Brown and the Commissioner had had a disagreement, but in fact personal business was the reason.\(^9\)

The Browns, having not been blessed with children of their own, discovered in a New York foundling home, during one of their numerous tours, a little boy they wished to adopt. The child was the

\(^{4}\)From the Mobile Advertiser, "Amin Bey at Pensacola," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Feb. 13, 1851, p. 3.

\(^{5}\)From the Savannah Republican, Feb. 10, 1851, Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Feb. 21, 1851, p. 2.

\(^{6}\)Editor, "Amin Bey to Sail for Europe," The Daily Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) March 10, 1851, p. 2.

\(^{7}\)Editor, "Valedictory of the Turkish Envoy," The Daily Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) March 22, 1851, p. 2.

\(^{8}\)"Mail Items," The Daily Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) April 8, 1851, p. 2.

son of Irish immigrants who had died shortly after his birth. He was an alert three year old with fair complexion and delicate features. His name was David, the same as Mrs. Brown's oldest brother, so the parents, who soon expected to receive a large inheritance from the brother's estate, gave the child the remainder of the name -- David Henry Porter Brown. On April 20, the newly enlarged family left New York on a packet boat for England.

The Browns left their well weathered vessel at Hastings, England, in order to take advantage of the May countryside and the firm ground they had missed for a month. Their sojourn in "Merry Old England" is carefully detailed in the pages of the Scioto Gazette, under the title "Leaves From the Old Stalk". This brisk and often critical account of English life and institutions was written by either Brown or his mother. England was viewed as being due the respect of an aged parent whose way of life and concept of the world denied the changes taking place around it. The American arrogance exhibited in these letters stands out against British snobbery as a brief rebuttle to Dickens' visit to America.
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49 (J. P. Brown or M. P. Brown), "Leaves from the Old Stalk -- May 24, 1851," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) June 26, 1851, p. 2.
Brown's mother suffered a broken nose in alighting from her carriage at the Crystal Palace on May 26th.\textsuperscript{50} This unfortunate accident marred the family's visit and prevented them from boarding the Sultan's steamer with Amin Bey for the trip back to Constantinople.\textsuperscript{51} In mid-June, they mailed their London tour booklets and brochures to the Academy, in Chillicothe and left for Paris.\textsuperscript{52} A rapid trip home took them through Switzerland to Milano, Verona, Venice, and Trieste. It was in Trieste that they met the son of Mayor Skerrett of Chillicothe, who was with the United States Navy on duty in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{53} On July 13, 1851, they arrived in Constantinople to face a complex situation that had developed in their absence.

Marsh, not wishing to rent a winter house and being obliged to send friends at the Smithsonian Institute, rare and exotic objects from the East, left Constantinople for a tour of Egypt and Syria on January 7, 1851. Homes was made Charge\textsuperscript{'} in the absence of Brown, and held the position until the latter's return. Thus, it was Brown who received Amin Bey and a delegation from the Porte bearing a formal

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{50} Editor, \textit{Scioto Gazette}, (Chillicothe, Ohio) June 25, 1851, p. 2.
  \item \textsuperscript{51} Letter, J. P. Brown to Daniel Webster, June 14, 1851, \textit{USDD} (Turkey, Vol. XIII).
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message of appreciation to the United States for its gracious
treatment of the Ottoman Commissioner. Brown wrote to a friend
back home, "This is quite a reversing of our late positions, and it
seems almost providential that I thus receive the fruits of my own
labors." Later, Brown was summoned to an audience with the Sultan.
This was the second time that he had been so honored. "Neither my
rank as Dragoman; nor even that of a Charge' d'Affairs (ad interim)
gives me the right of an audience of the Sultan; and, therefore, the
attention of H. I. M., in inviting me, would be considered here as
being a very honorable one." Aali Pasha, Minister of Foreign
Affairs, personally thanked Brown for defending Amin Bey in the
newspapers. This was in reference to the only incident that dulled
the brilliance of the American tour. While the party was enjoying
their Ohio Visit, a letter from Constantinople was published, in
London papers, declaring Amin Bey an imposter and John P. Brown the
perpetrator of a great hoax. Brown at first ignored the reports as
they spread to American papers, but was finally forced to respond in a

54 On Sept. 5, 1851, the Sultan visited the Arsenal to view
articles brought back from the United States by Amin Bey. (200 vols.
of historical and scientific works; 150 maritime and other charts;
models of cannon, gun carriages, muskets and pistols; a complete
collection of nautical and mathematical instruments; and models of
ships and machines.)

55 Letter, J. P. Brown to William Skerrett, July 28, 1851,
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In looking over the Enquirer this morning, I met with an article, taken from the New York Express, comprising the substance of a letter, said to be from Constantinople, and dated October 25th, respecting the friendly reception given to the agent of the Sublime Porte, Amin Bey, by the Government and citizens of the United States, and making mention of my humble self, in a manner so evidently hostile to both Amin Bey and myself, that I feel it a duty to appeal to you for its refutation.

I am sure that neither the present excellent Minister Resident of the United States, at Constantinople, in his official correspondence with the Secretary of State, on the subject of Amin Bey's mission to this country, nor any letter of mine, public or private, has made any allusion to Amin Bey in any other character than that of an 'Agent of the Sublime Porte', sent to the United States for the purpose of cultivating more intimate friendly relations than have heretofore existed between his country and our own, and to visit and examine our numerous building establishments, and with a view to his deriving benefit from them for his own Government and people at home.

This, he says, wherever it is necessary, is the entire object of his mission. A mission of so particular a nature, informal within itself, and somewhat flattering to us, has been cordially responded to, both by the government and the citizens of the United States wherever he has gone. From an intimate association with him of several months, I can say that I have found him to be what his own Government told me he was, on recommending him to my care, -- one of the most intelligent and amiable officers of the Sultan's Navy, in which he holds the rank of a Commander, and in the Army that of Lieutenant Colonel. His civil position of 'Agent' of the Sublime Porte, is higher than his military or naval grade. As is irrelevant to the point in question, I need scarcely allude to it; yet for your further information, I will take leave to add, that Amin Bey, of late years, has been employed by the Government on other missions of a confidential nature to the Imam of Muscat and on the Hungarian frontier. I never, before heard that it had been said he had been sent as 'Ambassador to Austria', nor, indeed anywhere else, until so apprised by the article in question.

Respecting my 'leave of absence' from my post at Constantinople, which the correspondent of the Express says I do not possess, I am happy to add, that I received one previous to my departure, -- fortunately for me, of a limited nature; and after an absence from my native State of Ohio of some twenty-two years, I, thanks to the kindness of friends,
have and am still enjoying it in a manner which will recompense me for so long an absence, and this, too, not withstanding the anonymous remarks of a correspondent of more than doubtful veracity."

Additional letters from Marsh and the Grand Vizier, Reshid Pasha, verified Amin Bey's identity as a Turkish agent, but the New York Express continued to harass the party.

Brown, as the most influential American functionary in the East, was exposed to the intrigues of other nations, especially those of Great Britain. Although, the American Legation worked closely with the British in humanitarian activities, there was a growing concern among the English that the United States was moving into their trade sphere. Competition was already brisk in Mocca, the Persian Gulf area, and India; if the United States developed closer relations with Persia and the Ottoman Empire, it could in time shut off British trade routes. Conversations were underway for the United States to construct a number of ships for the Ottoman Navy which was one more indication of American encroachment on the British preserve. The Amin Bey tour was a significant step toward closer Ottoman-American


61 Letter, J. P. Brown to Assistant Secretary of State Appleton, March 22, 1858, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).
relations which could result in the decline of British influence in the Ottoman Empire. Despite the possibility of the letter being a British plant, it is reasonable to believe that British feelings were still too general in nature to have focused so sharply on Brown.

The author of the letter from Constantinople was never identified, but Brown felt sure it was Francis Dainese. Whomever it was had to be intimately connected with the operation of the United States Legation in order to know about Brown's leave of absence. As it turned out Dainese was interested in replacing not only George Porter as consul but also Brown as dragoman. These positions had the potential for giving him business advantages superior to those of other merchants at the Porte. A consular bill passed by Congress, in 1848, gave the consuls in Turkey jurisdiction in criminal cases; and lobbying was underway for the granting of civil jurisdiction. The possibility of bribery was monetarily attractive. But there were other advantages, consuls were covered by diplomatic immunity and could move goods through customs duty free.

George Porter, who was heavily in debt to Dainese, left for the United States with the understanding that he would apply for the consulate at Beirut or Tripoli (where the salaries were higher) and leave the consulate at Constantinople for Dainese. No sooner had


Porter left than Dainese began cultivating his position. He used the consulate to collect personal claims against fellow merchants and had others against himself dropped.\(^6^4\) He made claims of large expenditure, for refugee relief, against the consulate, and collected over $200 from the same refugees for passports. Brown later questioned the rational between the supposed expenditure and the amount collected, but this did not occur, until 1852, when Porter was held responsible for an expenditure of $1,967 over the consulate's $500 annual limit.\(^6^5\)

The success of Dainese's venture depended upon eliminating Brown. It had to be done carefully, so as not to bring the weight of government down upon his own head, and yet Brown had to be unalterably expunged from the Legation. His influence with the Porte, the United States Government, and the missionary community made Dainese's task a very delicate one. Even Marsh, who was not well acquainted with Brown, found an affinity with him through mutual friends and interests in language. Marsh was an avid linguist and a scholar of note. He had a healthy disdain for those who failed to take advantage of language study. Dainese's facility for languages assisted him in winning Marsh's favor and a recommendation for Consul of Constantinople that hinged on Brown's concurrence.

Brown's absence, during 1850-1851, enabled Dainese to ensnare


others, besides the Minister Resident, in the plot against the Porter dynasty. The summer of 1850 saw Constantinople invaded by great numbers of American tourists. Unfortunately for Brown, too many of them had high political connections and fell under Dainese's charm. The unscrupulous vice-consul pandered to their desires and extricated their purchases from custom's charges.66

By mid-summer his connections with influential Americans, and Greek and Italian merchants were sufficiently secure for him to begin undermining the dynasty. Although George Porter was a friend, for Dainese the relationship was one of convenience. Brown's weakness was his association with Porter. The public destruction of Porter's character was hoped to have an adverse effect on Brown. Marsh, to whom Porter was unknown, became the unwitting foil for Dainese's plot. The following letter inspired by Dainese was confidentially sent by Marsh to Secretary of State Clayton on August 19, 1850.

"Learning that Mr. George A. Porter late consul at Constantinople, is a candidate for the consulship general of Syria, in case such an office should be established. I deem it my duty to remonstrate against his appointment to that post. I have no acquaintance with Mr. Porter, and have no personal feeling whatever in relation to him, but his universal reputation at Pera is that of an idle ignorant weak and dissolute person, and I know that he was here generally considered a discredit to the country that employed him. Long as he resided in Turkey, he was, as I am credibly informed, never able to acquire anything but a shallow smattering of any of the European or oriental languages used at Constantinople, he could not speak still less write, any of them correctly or even obtain to a respectable position in the cultivated society of the city. I know that he obtained letters of recommendation from the good nature of some American residents in the Levant, but some, certainly, and I believe, all of those

who gave these letters would have refused them, if they had
supposed there was any danger that he could have secured an
appointment by the use of them. . . .

... the incumbent (for the Consul Generalship of
Syria) ought to be a man of energy, intelligence and character,
and if not already acquainted with the Turkish, Arabic and
French languages, at least he should possess the capacity to
acquire them. In all these qualifications Mr. Porter is
lamentably and hopelessly deficient, and I trust not only that
this appointment may not be conferred upon him but that his
nomination to the consulship at Tripoli, if not already
confirmed, may be withdrawn."67

The next step was for Dainese to transfer Porter's qualities,
by association, to Brown. He hinted at Brown's laziness and
inefficiency in order to put Brown's usefulness in doubt. Writing
Marsh a note on September 19, he stated, "I very much regret, that
Mr. J. P. Brown left the matter unsettled on his departure from this
city, and cannot abstain from declaring that the neglect on his part
is chiefly the cause of the trouble it gives us."68 A second note,
eleven days later, was gauged to reinforce the first one, and to
elevate Dainese in the process.

"Mr. Panagotte who accidentally happened to be at the
consulate this morning, having seen that I had done both my
consular duty and the duty of the interpreter, told me that
Mr. Brown would be very vexed against me because I took care
of a charge belonging to the interpreter. As I am not here
for a mere etiquette, but for the service of the Americans, I
pay no attention to this remark and only mention the matter to
you, in order that you might know the facts, and might see how
everything I do, either at the sacrifice of my own time, for
the benefit of the citizens of the country which I have the

67 Letter, George P. Marsh to John Clayton, Aug. 19, 1850,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).

68 Letter, Francis Dainese to George P. Marsh, Sept. 19, 1850,
UDCC (Constantinople, Series 2, Vol. XIV).
honor to represent, is judged wrongly."69

In the meantime, Porter received word from the State Department that Marsh's letter had quashed his nomination as Consul to Tripoli. Unaware of Dainese's duplicity, Porter unburdened his soul to him, complaining of the new administration, begging for continued support, and asking for an extension on his loans. Dainese encouraged him but sent harmful extracts from his letters to the State Department making it appear that Porter blamed Brown for the Marsh letter.70

It was at this juncture that the letter concerning Amin Bey appeared in a London newspaper. Brown's response, supported by both the Ottoman and American governments, followed. Until this point, it is uncertain whether Brown had made any accusations against Dainese, even though possibly consulted by the Department concerning his application for consul. It is to be supposed that Brown met with Porter, in March, 1851, and decided on the basis of reports from Constantinople to remove Dainese. Porter, who may have been reluctant to take such a step earlier, now found himself responsible for over two thousand dollars worth of consular debts. To protect himself from further expense, he had to remove Dainese. On April 1, 1851, Porter, who still held the title of Consul at Constantinople, notified Dainese


70Extracts of Letters, George Porter to Francis Dainese, Oct. 6, and 17, 1850, sent by Dainese to the Department of State, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).
that Homes was to serve as vice-consul until the consular finances were settled.71 Homes, being alone at the post, since Marsh's departure, for Egypt and Syria in early January, decided to wait until Brown returned to take action.

Homes asked Dainese to transfer the consular records to him, but Dainese refused to comply without written orders from the Department.72 Each circulated papers declaring the other a fraud. Homes turned to Brown for assistance, and he in turn, asked the Austrian Legation to secure the consular records from Dainese, an Austrian protege.73 Austrian troops marched to Dainese's office and in quite a scene divested him of the consular records. On the threat of imprisonment for debt, Dainese fled to the United States, where he called upon his influential friends.

Their response was quick and enthusiastic. By March 22, 1852, Dainese was pleased to inform Marsh, that the President of the United States by the advice and with the consent of the Senate had appointed him consul of the United States for Constantinople. In his absence, Camille Vigoureux, a teacher of French, was to serve as vice-consul.74 Dainese also had pursued the government to supply a ship, to carry

71 Letter, George Porter to Francis Dainese, April 1, 1851, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).

72 Letter, Francis Dainese to Daniel Webster, July 25, 1851, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).


him to his new office, in order to correct the public feeling brought against him by Brown and Homes.

The Legation and the American community in Constantinople was mortified. On receipt of the word, Mrs. Jane E. Redhouse, an English woman, tried to console Mrs. M. A. P. Brown.

"I am perfectly astonished with the news you have heard, and which for all your sakes, as well as the honor of your nation, I sincerely hope may not be true. It is possible the person in question may have caused the report to be printed, for what will not a Peraote do to gain his end."

The community's astonishment was due to the Government's complete disregard for the Legation's feelings. It had appointed Dainese against the advice of Marsh, Brown, and Homes, the very men with whom he would have to work. Brown's letter to Francis Markoe, under secretary of state and a long time friend, displays the shock, the hurt, and the disbelief.

"I feel that the good heart of the President has been assailed by an unworthy object, and that he has been imposed upon. Mr. Webster would not, I am sure, wittingly appoint to an office, under such peculiar circumstances a man whose character does the country, the legation, and the Americans here, dishonor. I did all I could when I was in the U. S. to commend myself to Mr. Webster's favor, and felt happy that I had an opportunity of showing him the sincere respect which I felt for him, and how anxious I was to merit his protection. Can this have been all in vain, and that an adventurer - a foreign - mongrel - Italian - Austrian swindle have found more favour in his eyes than my humble self? With this approbrium, I feel much disappointed and discouraged. It casts a shade over my official character, with the Turkish authorities, and the foreign Legations, which will greatly impair my usefulness.

All the American gentlemen here are my old personal friends. All the enemies I have in the world that I know of,

75Copy of a note, Mrs. Jane E. Redhouse to Mrs. Brown, 1852, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).
are Hodgson, Dr. Reilly, Reeves/ and Dainese and neglect no opportunity of serving others when in my power. I am not always so influential as others are pleased to think me, and when the Legation fails in pursuing what they wish, it is put down to my fault. I also seldom get credit for my success. If I have an enemy in the U. S. I do not know him and I believe I can confidently say that I have some excellent friends there, . . . .

The American community did not remain stunned for long. Marsh acted first, by refusing to recognize Dainese or his vice-consul.77 Neither of them were the type of people with whom missionaries would associate. Brown had once seen Mr. Vigoureux at a picnic, "carried insensable with liquor to a caique for transportation to his residence." 78 It did not take long for Brown to rally missionary support against such unworthy men. They wrote letters and signed petitions to reverse Dainese's appointment. Homes turned to Senator Charles Sumner and Brown to Senator Lewis Cass. This barrage during the spring and summer, of 1852, turned the tables on Dainese.

Dainese, unaware of the battle brewing against him, had left for the Mediterranean, after contacting Marsh. He arrived, in Naples, to board the assigned naval vessel, only to discover that it had already left. He chased it from port to port missing each time by a single day. In Athens, he tried to take the ship attending Marsh, who was in Greece to settle the case of Rev. Jonas King. Slightly

---

77 Letter, C. Vigoureux to Daniel Webster, April 25, 1852, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).
embarrassed he repaired to Syra to await the arrival of the promised ship. In the meantime the navy, learning of Dainese's removal, cancelled the stop at Syra. After several months, Dainese returned to the United States much perplexed.

In his absence support had been growing, especially among the Catholic members of Congress who believed Dainese's persecution was on the basis of religion, and well it might have been. The overwhelming majority of Americans in the Ottoman Empire were protestant missionaries, and American relations with the Empire were almost exclusively missionary. Politically the missionary effort maintained American prestige, influence, and power at the very center of European affairs. Without the missionaries, there would have been no reason for an American Legation in Constantinople, or anyway of sustaining American influence there.

The missionary effort, on the other hand, could not have survived without the ever watchful protection of a strong government. Great Britain would have provided the protection, in the absence of the United States, but her political activities would have, as in the case of her own missionaries, soon resulted in the termination of protestant efforts in Turkey. The missionaries often in spite of themselves were carefully led through treacherous affairs by the diplomatic skill of John P. Brown. His presence or the presence of

Letter, Francis Dainese to Daniel Webster, Aug. 17, 1852, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).

Letter, Joseph Chandler to President Millard Fillmore, Nov. 27, 1852, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).
someone like him was instrumental in maintaining the missionaries. He was a government official, dedicated to the missionary cause, acutely aware of the delicate balance between people, governments, and various special interests, and educated in the languages, customs, and skills required for the positions he held. Defending Brown was in reality defending themselves. Morally Dainese could not be trusted, and being a foreign Catholic he was even more suspect. At Constantinople religion and nationality were synonymous, as far as international affairs were concerned. If he had been satisfied with the consulate alone, the missionaries might not have acted, but threatening Brown brought danger too close to home.

Dainese, who had the support of Congressman S. S. Cox of Ohio, Congressman J. P. Chandler of New York City, Mayor Charles Gilpin of Philadelphia, Secretary of State Daniel Webster, Senator William Seward of New York, and J. M. Hallerean, Archbishop of Petra and Apostolic Vicar of Constantinople, continued to be the center of political intrigue against Brown. He never returned to Constantinople, but, from 1853-1863, he pressed the United States government for

---

81 Letter, Samuel S. Cox to Francis Dainese, Feb. 18, 1852, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. III).
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repayment of personal funds spent as consul and vice-consul at Constantinople. Several times it appeared that Congress would approve his claims, but in the end they failed. Sumner, in the footnote of a letter to the State Department, dated February 25, 1863, wrote, "I believe that the case of Francis Dainese here will not be heard of again." He was wrong. Dainese moved to Egypt and began perpetrating frauds there. This time the target was Consul Hale, whom Dainese referred to as, "Seward's pet in Egypt." But for Brown the damage had already been done although Dainese was of no consequence to him after 1863.

During the spring of 1853, some of Brown's friends suggested recommending him for promotion. Brown's response was that of a man very much in doubt of his prospects for the future. Although pleased by the proposal, he felt it was the wrong time to bring up such a discussion. The commotion over Dainese had not quieted, and the government had displayed little confidence in Brown during the affair. He was in the process of reappraising his situation. The question bothering him most was, "Why had the government lost faith in him?"

85Letter, Charles Sumner to State Department, Feb. 25, 1863, USMCR (M-179, Roll 197, Feb. 2-28, 1863).

country. He had done just that and yet he feared the loss of his job. There seemed to be no answer for his uneasiness.

Two months later, while toying with the idea of retiring from the diplomatic corps, Brown, then Charge in Marsh's absence, was asked for advice concerning a minor incident at Smyrna. A Hungarian refugee named Martin Koszta, who had declared himself interested in becoming an American citizen (while in the United States) was arrested as a political prisoner by Austrian sailors during a visit to Smyrna. The American Consul at Smyrna refused to get involved and Captain Ingraham of the United States Navy, wrote Brown for advice.

Brown asked the Porte to intervene since the incident had occurred on Ottoman territory, but the Porte refused for fear of giving Austria and Russia the excuse they had been seeking to enter the Empire and forcibly remove other political refugees. Brown thus took the situation in hand and in true Porter fashion recognized Koszta as being under American protection. He ordered Ingraham to request Koszta's release and if the captain of the Austrian vessel, in which he was a prisoner, refused - Ingraham was to "take him out." The Austrian captain refused but relented when Ingraham cleared his decks for action. Koszta was turned over to the French hospital for treatment of his injuries, while the Austrian and American Legations

---
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debated the issue. Brown saw the case in sharp, clear terms.
Koszta was a Hungarian by birth and subject to the laws of Austria.
According to an old Austrian law, any citizen of the Empire who left
it without permission from the government forfeited his citizenship.
Thus, Koszta was no longer an Austrian citizen and being on Ottoman
territory Austria had no right to interfere with him. It seemed so
easy, but it was not. The prestige of several nations was involved
and thus more elaborate measures of extrication seemed necessary.
Secretary of State Marcy and Minister of Foreign Affairs Hulsemann
discussed the international ramifications of the situation and turned
the business of settling it over to their Ministers in Constantinople.
Marsh returned from Greece to handle the negotiations.

In order to legitimize American interference, it was
necessary to establish a precedent in international law. Austria
concurred with Marsh's reasoning that any person declaring himself
interested in becoming an American citizen has a right to the same
protection accorded to a citizen; but Austria forced Marsh to make a
painful concession in order to get Koszta released. In this case the
principle was to cover only American interference and not Koszta.
Koszta would be released to American authorities only if he were


91 Draft of a note in J. P. Brown's handwriting among letters
dated July 1853, USDF (Turkey, Vol. II).

92 "Mr. Marcy to Mr. Hulsemann, Sept. 26, 1853," Scioto Gazette,
(Chillicothe, Ohio) Oct. 5, 6, 7, 1853, p. 2.
immediately returned to the United States, and if in the future he
were to return to Turkey, he would be subject to Austrian seizure.\footnote{Letter, Edward Offley to George P. Marsh, Sept. 23, 1853, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).}

Koszta supported by the United States Consul at Smyrna
refused to sign the agreement, not only embarrassing Marsh and Brown
but impeding a settlement. Koszta's consent was received after the
United States government informed him that it intended to leave him to
his own devices if he did not co-operate.\footnote{Letter, Edward Offley to George P. Marsh, Oct. 1, 1853, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).} Amid claims that he was
a prisoner of the United States government, Koszta arrived in the
United States in December 1853. Although the government did not
know what to do with him, it did prevent him from returning to Smyrna.
Thus either by choice or default he remained in the United States and,
in December, 1854, he married Mrs. Lucinda McFall of Chicago and a
year later they moved to Texas.

Austria presented the officials of her government involved in
the incident with high honors.\footnote{Editor, "Extracts of a letter from J. P. Brown," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) April 3, 1854, p. 2.} In the United States, Brown and
Marsh carried the onus of concession, while Ingraham received a
governmental medal.\footnote{Editor, "Release of Koszta," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) Oct. 25, 1853, p. 2.} The American public was not so quick to divide
the honors. Brown and Ingraham were heroes together. Ingraham may
have performed the act, but it was Brown who had assumed the
responsibility and given the order. "Take him out," became a popular toast, while the incident became the subject of a theatrical production entitled, "John P. Brown and the Liberation of Koszta." Congressman Baily, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, indicated his intentions to have Brown promoted for his role in the Koszta affair. Senator Bright, of the corresponding Senate committee, offered a resolution calling for the correspondence and all other material dealing with the Koszta affair. Senators Cass and Douglas advocated it as justice to Brown and Marsh, "who had been much misrepresented in the affair." The Senators defended them on several other occasions, but no official resolution was passed in their behalf.

The closest thing to a government honor was a remark made to Brown by Aali Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs and ex-Governor of Smyrna, whom Austria caused to be displaced. "You have avenged my disgrace." Chillicothe, in an attempt to do Brown justice, presented him with a "silver something" purchased from public

contributions. Brown was a public hero, but the fact that he remained unrecognized by his government troubled him deeply.

---


"There is no degradation in servitude; - man serves man, either a public or a private servant, and the nature of the service rendered, if humble, never ought to effect the character of the servant. On the other hand, it seems dishonoring to the party served, when it requires of the servant to degrade himself for the purpose of supporting pride and pretensions of fancied superiority."
"Leaves from the Old Stalk - June 18, 1851," Scioto Gazette, July 8, 1851, p. 2.

Brown's efforts to establish better Turkish-American relations fall into three classifications; public duties, administrative reform, and private interest. These categories although interdependent do not overlap. The public duties could be performed without administrative reform or private interest on the part of Brown, but with very little results. Thus, it is the latter categories that show the extra effort expended by Brown to prosecute the public interest with greater efficiency and effectiveness.

During the 1850's, Brown held anywhere from two to four positions at the American Legation and Consulate simultaneously. Excluding one year for the Amin Bey trip, he was Secretary of Legation and Dragoman each for nine years, Consul or Consul General for six and a half years, and Charge't two and a half years. In that decade there were three Ministers Resident, none of whom served more than three years and ten months or less than one year and four months.
It is thus confusing to pinpoint the particular capacity in which Brown was serving at any given time, and easier to view him in a combined role as information agent, publicist, and promoter. As the central figure in the expansion of Turkish-American relations he did not provide the impetus for the affairs arising under the topic of public duties, although his efforts were always vital. Claims, complaints, and proposals came from both sides and it was his duty to attend to them. Many of these were quite routine and deserve no special consideration, while others indicate a keen interest on the part of both nations to develop closer ties.

Samuel Colt, who visited Turkey in 1849 and became friends with Brown, suggested sending young Turkish officers to the United States to learn the art of arms manufacture.¹ For reasons that are unclear, the Sultan never accepted the proposal. Jews from the New York City area were interested in building a canal from Palmyra to the Mediterranean, in order to open the interior of Syria to trade, but they backed out for monetary reasons.²

Financial embarrassment was frequently the primary factor in cutting short promising plans. The excitement created by the visit of Amin Bey prompted the committee of the New York World's Fair to extend

¹Letter, Samuel Colt to John P. Brown, May 12, 1850, USMCR (Turkey, Vol. 1850-1854).

Brown found the Sultan quite receptive to the idea, but as the time approached for putting together the program, he suddenly withdrew. The United States government offered twenty thousand dollars for transportation and accommodations, but it was all in vain. The possibility of a war with Russia drew the Sultan's attention and energies in another direction. He was also perplexed as to what Turkey might offer in comparison to the technological developments of the other exhibitors.

Russia was impatiently pressing the Porte for repayment of fifty million dollars in loans, and France was calling on the international community to cut off further loans to the Ottoman government. For the Porte, the situation was critical but not hopeless. On October 4, 1853, Brown was summoned by Rifat Pasha, President of the Council, and Hossile Pasha, Director of the Sultan's mint, to ask if he knew anything about any money to be sent from the United States. Perhaps the Porte expected to receive the previously mentioned $20,000 even though the Sultan would not participate in the world fair.

---

5 Editor, Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) June 18, 1853, p. 2.
with whom Brown was on "terms of intimacy," "inquired where
Mr. Vanderbilt and his steamer were, and said that it had been
learned here that Mr. V. was a great capitalist and could make the
govt. a loan." Non El Din Bey, Dragoman of the Porte, asked Brown if
he had received a note from Mr. Black, a highly reputable banker,
concerning the possibility of a loan. The next day Marsh and Brown
received notes from Mr. Black. Brown left the matter up to Marsh with
these remarks.

"Do you think it is worth while to let the Porte
make an appeal to our government, through the President, or
to let it send an agent to the U. S. for the purpose of
getting up a loan there? He (Non El Din Bey) said such a
plan would give the Legation great influence with the Porte,
for I am sure nothing would carry so much weight with a Turk's
heart, as a metallic one in his pocket." Interestingly enough, Brown was not so easily freed from the
responsibility that he wished to avoid. The following report made by
Brown to Marsh, although long, concludes the diplomatic record of the
affair. It was marked "confidential," and dated October 18, 1853.

"H. E. Hossile Pacha, Director of the Sultan's Mint,
and Privy Treasury, sent for me yesterday evening with the
request that I would do him the favor to call and see him at
his country seat on the Bosphorus.
H. E., on my visiting this morning, told me that he
had been directed by H. I. M. the Sultan, to broach the
subject of his difficulties with Russia to the American
Legation and to ascertain whether the government of the U. S.,
which had already shown itself very warmly the friend of his
Majesty, would not loan him some pecuniary aid in the defence
of what, H. M. regarded not only as the rights and independence
of his own government, but also as being of those general
rights of nations, now menaced by the unjustly hostile position

8 ibid.
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of the great absolute power of Europe. H. E. added that the Sultan felt an assurance that the government and the people of the U. S. were not indifferent spectators of the threatened increase of the already gigantic power of Russia, and of the struggle in which he was compelled to embark alone in the support of those rights. That public report stated the possibility of the government of the U. S. giving an active expression to the sympathy which it entertained in favor of the Sultan, and that this circumstance induced His Majesty to believe that the position which he, at this moment occupied, would recommend him to the assistance of the people and government of the U. S. Such assistance, at so momentous a period, H. E. said, would greatly strengthen and perpetuate the relations of friendship which have grown up between two governments, which, in some respects, have a similarity of interests, and of principles.

In reply, I stated to H. E.: the principles of nonintervention which have heretofore governed the U. S. in their relations with European powers; and that their government, had no direct interest in the question on which the difficulty now existing between the Sublime Porte and Russia was based; - that I was well aware that sentiments particularly friendly and sympathetic had grown up between the U. S. and the gov't. of H. M., and that I believed the U. S., would, at all times, be happy to remain thus towards the Sultan, whenever it was in its power and consistent with its principles. I explained to H. E. the form of the gov't. of the U. S., the restricted powers of the President, and the necessary action of the House of Representatives, on all financial measures, - that the army was small and principally for the purpose of preserving the fortifications; and that the navy, was, generally, engaged in the protection of commerce in different parts of the world. I reminded H. E. that, as he had done me the honor to speak with me on the subject of the wishes of the Sultan, one of such delicacy, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, should make a confidential communication direct to yourself, and that I believed, out of respect for H. M., you would lay it before the gov't. of the U. S. He added that the Sultan has authorized him to speak with the Legation on the subject in strict confidence, and he therefore wished it to remain so, with you and myself.

I am (of the) opinion that the well known good feelings of the Legation, and the gov't. and people of the U. S., have led the Sultan to hope that pecuniary assistance might be given him. Reshid Pasha has never alluded to this matter to me, and I therefore suppose it one of a personal nature confined to the Sultan. I of course could not encourage such expectations, yet I said nothing to show a decrease of our sympathy for the Sultan, and in his power position. The Pasha seemed to think that a loan, at a high amount of interest, if at any at all, would not be intervention; and that the
peculiar nature of Europe, and of the Sultan, visa vie Russia would recommend it to our countrymen and government.\textsuperscript{10}

It was England and France, not the United States, that came to Turkey's aid in the Crimean War. Neither Brown nor the United States Government was interested in getting involved, as one can see in a letter to Samuel Colt dated July, 1854.

"I am afraid that 'Cousin Nicholas' has 'waked up two wrong passengers,' and that on the other hand they will find him a 'troublesome customer' to manage. England wishes to cripple a great rival to her power and France to revenge the sad fate of her sons in 1812. 'Go it,' says I, 'whilst you're young,' - and let young America prosper in her peaceful course, until attacked."\textsuperscript{11}

Later in the decade, Mehmet Pasha of the Ottoman Navy was sent to the United States for training in naval architecture, and to arrange for the purchase of naval vessels.\textsuperscript{12} His trip, as Amin Bey's, was hailed a success, but it came too late. The ships constructed for the Sultan were finished just in time to be sequestered for use in the American Civil War.

Brown's efforts at administrative reform cover a much longer period than the 1850's, but they were intensified during this period as a result of personal experience gained in operating the legation and the consulate as a one man show. One's impressions of another


\textsuperscript{11}Letter, J. P. Brown to Samuel Colt, July 16, 1854, Connecticut State Historical Society, Samuel Colt Papers, (Box 3-4), folder marked, Correspondence and Papers 1838; 1842-1861.

\textsuperscript{12}Letter, J. P. Brown to Lewis Cass, April 7, 1858, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XV).

country, in the absence of other channels of communication, are derived from its diplomatic representation in the capital. It is therefore important for a country to provide officials of dignity and intelligence as well as homes and offices to match. Few complaints could be made about the American officials, but the physical facilities were an entirely different matter. There was no official residence for the Minister or any of his staff, nor did their salaries provide for adequate accommodations. Small amounts were provided for renting separate offices for the legation and the consulate, but these covered only a fraction of the actual cost. Whereas the major countries, and many of the minor ones, had permanent facilities, the United States did not. The legation and consulate were no more permanent than the officers. Brown's office was generally at his home. It was not uncommon for the location of the consulate to change twice a year. Office furnishings and an ever growing library and archives put a great burden on Brown as the permanent officer, in Constantinople. An increase in pay for the employees was the simplest solution, but even that was not undertaken.

The Crimean War made the difficult situation all but unbearable. Inflation reduced the purchasing power of the American dollar; the cost for rent and basic food supplies was prohibitive. As Brown had told the Porte, getting money from the United States Government was a tedious affair. It seemed too inflexible to meet the ordinary demands of its own operation.

Along with the rise in the cost of living, came added problems. The Crimean War, although not involving the United States, was
attracting many American ships and sailors to Constantinople and the Black Sea area. The British were critically in need of cargo ships and troop transport vessels. They had cancelled many of their regular routes in several parts of the world in order to have sufficient ships and still hundreds of American ships were readily accepted.\textsuperscript{13} American seamen hired on with British captains, often to find themselves abandoned in Constantinople where British seamen replaced them.\textsuperscript{14} Brown, as consul, had to provide the American ships with clearance papers and assist with customs. Then he had to find lodging and often hospital care for destitute seamen. The American community was unable to provide either, so he turned to the Lutheran Sisters of Charity for hospital care and to a newly established soldiers and sailors home (British) for lodging. The expense was borne by the government, but Brown often was forced to ask for additional funds.\textsuperscript{15} Surprisingly the government gave in to his requests and even allowed him to make a $200 contribution to the Sisters of Charity.\textsuperscript{16}

The new transient American population brought a rise in the need for consular jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases. In 1848,

\textsuperscript{13}Scioto (J. P. Brown), "A Visit to the Crimea - May 1, 1855," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe, Ohio) June 12, 1855, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{14}Letter, J. P. Brown to William Marcy, May 4, 1856, USCD (Turkey, Vol. IV).

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.

Congress had granted both jurisdictions to all of its consulates with the exception of those in the Ottoman Empire. These consulates were denied civil jurisdiction due to the misinterpretation of a clause in the treaty of 1832, granting civil jurisdiction to the Ottoman government. Since the Porte did not recognize civil jurisdiction over cases strictly involving foreigners, the American representatives in the city were in a desperate situation, as they had been, since 1832. Nothing seemed to convince the United States government that it had a right to grant civil jurisdiction over its own citizens. The numerous suits that were a part of everyday life for Brown had to be settled by joint commissions, but he had no way of enforcing the decisions. It was not until June 22, 1860, that Congress finally granted its consulates in the Ottoman Empire civil jurisdiction.

In criminal cases, Brown hated to sentence anyone to jail, even for the most heinous offenses, because they would have to be incarcerated in a Turkish jail, in the absence of one attached to the American Consulate. Brown's pleas for a jail were answered by government appropriation long after the need had passed. The useless facility then became a drain on the legation's finances and added time was required to abandon it.

The war put pressure on the protestant community (British, Prussian, American, Swiss, Swedish, Dutch, and Danish) to expand and


\footnote{18Letter, J. P. Brown to Lewis Cass, July 8, 1859, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. VII).}
fence its cemetery. Brown persuaded the government to finance its share and later, in his capacity as Secretary of Legation, served as treasurer for the cemetery association. This was a revolving position shared by the secretaries of the protestant legations.

One of the major problems, of all legations, was that of proteges or persons under the protection of a legation to which they were not attached by citizenship. The revolutions of 1848-49, increased the number of stateless persons living in Constantinople, and the Crimean War added to the number. To these were appended foreign businessmen, who like the Swiss, had no official representatives in the Empire, and the indigenous proteges who wished to avoid the disadvantages of Ottoman citizenship. Most of these people were willing to do anything to receive papers of protection. During the first twenty years of American representation in Constantinople, the United States had successfully shied away from involvement with proteges, but in the fifties the cry of humanity seemed too great to be ignored. Carroll Spence, who succeeded Marsh as Minister Resident, in 1854, opened the flood gates. Brown, as a close friend of Spence, found it difficult to control his boss' generosity, even though it put a greater burden on his own shoulders. These proteges came within the imperfect jurisdiction of the American Consulate, consuming endless hours of Brown's time in often unenforcible legal proceedings. But worse than that was the emphasis their cases place on the inadequacies

of the American Legation and Consulate. They proved a constant source of embarrassment, but at times were influentially useful. In September, 1857, Brown wrote to Francis Markoe to try and stop the flow of proteges.

"Our commerce newly increases here, and Americans, or rather American proteges increase fast, thanks to Mr. Spence, who freely extends the cloak of American protection, over many of the 'unwashed'. If it would not be an indiscretion, might I ask you to suggest Gen. Cass, to instruct the new Minister, not to grant any protections but to real American citizens; for these proteges give me as Consul and Dragoman, a great deal of trouble."

Secretary of State Cass gave the order to curtail the number of proteges and Brown then serving as Charge' received the instructions, he had initiated, with the following reply.

"Having communicated your instructions on the subject of the protection of foreigners here to the late Minister Resident, he informed me that he would explain his reasons for giving protection on the part of the Legation, and strongly appealed to me in their behalf.

I believe this practice will be much limited if not discontinued entirely, hereafter, by the Legation. As Consul General I issue no passports or papers of protection, and would prefer that the Legation followed the same usage, as the entire trouble of attending to the affairs of the individuals thus protected falls upon myself, as Consul and Dragoman. It is, never the less, very agreeable to me to be of any service to meritorious persons who can not obtain any other protection and it would be a source of regret to me to have to withdraw the papers of protection granted by the late Minister without the consent of their holders or they should render it necessary. Indeed some of the proteges of the Legation are very useful to it, by their social positions here, and by their influence among the Turkish officials."

---


He would limit their numbers by attrition rather than remove protection from those whose influence might serve as a double edged sword.

A renewal of the consular student program, terminated in the early years of the Jackson administration, had been urged by Brown, in the mid-forties, with little affect. The fifties brought doubled efforts. Brown's trip to Chillicothe, aroused in him the thought of terminating his service in Constantinople. During the fifties he often looked back to Ohio, where life seemed safe and secure. He could raise his son in the hallowed hills of home, and allow his aged mother to spend her last years in the land of her birth. Daineses would not bother him nor would he have to fight his own government for the amelioration of conditions at its own legation. Life would be uncluttered, but for Brown terribly dull. Time and again he weighed the idea of retirement, but passed it up because there was no one to take his place. He continually pressed for the student program, until Congress set one up in the late fifties. The appropriation attached to the program was insufficient to serve as an inducement to students in such an expensive capital. Four young men, connected with the East either as the sons of missionaries or merchants, offered some promise, but their interest shortly waned. There were more lucrative pursuits less confining in nature and more stable in duration.

The fifties, with all there difficulties, were Brown's most fruitfull years. He had a tremendous capacity for work; the ethic of which compulsively drove him to ever greater efforts.
"I am desirous of being always kept confined in a place offering no resources, like this. Were I not thus busy, I should soon be very unhappy and discontented. I have some literary enjoyments in hand which call on any spare moments I may possess, and thus I am seldom idle."22

His literary pursuits were geared to familiarize the West with Eastern literature, customs, and culture. He was without a doubt Turkey's most loyal and devoted friend, and thirty five years of public testimony stand as a witness to the fact. He wanted America to know and appreciate the "Turks" whom he hoped would profit from their association with the distant western neighbor.

Brown's efforts in behalf of Turkish-American relations, were set at a one to one ratio, of people to people living and prospering together. The concept was practical for close neighbors or even distant neighbors with frequent intercourse, but for two nations separated by thousands of miles and only casually linked by infrequent visits, the idea seemed unworkable.

"I wish Turkey was nearer to the U. S., than it is. She is disposed to learn from us, but needs some practical lessons. If the Sultan could only behold with his own eyes, what he has heard and read of, respecting our wonderful prosperity, he would, I feel sure, become - not exactly a Republican Whig, or Democrat, but - a warm advocate of our popular institutions."23

He had a naive faith in the uprightness and power of the Sultan, who in the fashion of the noble savage would accept what was right if it


were made known to him. The greatest barrier was not distance, it was religion and indifference.

"Among so taciturn a people as Moslems mostly are, it must be added, that it is really very difficult to obtain correct information. They have an indubitable contempt for all who are not of their own religion, and this is the chief obstacle to their own improvement. It prevents foreigners from enjoying social intercourse with them, and their profiting by an association with those from whom they might learn much. A history of the gov't., as well, as of the habits and usages of the Turks, would be so intimately connected with their religion, that it might, almost be copied from the Koran itself; and anyone desirous of writing about the Moslem, must bear this always in mind."

The indifference was on the part of both the Turk and the foreigner. Neither wished to understand the other, each found it easier to condemn or ridicule. Authors in the West, were guilty of exchanging fact for fancy in order to enrich their efforts.

"Not with standing the Ottoman Empire is an European government, and is not farther from the center of Europe than St. Petersburg is, still but little is known respecting it to general readers. It has, heretofore, been regarded as a barbarous government, and as containing a people almost beyond the bounds of civilized life. Less correct information is, therefore, possessed by Europeans, on the subject of Turkey than of any other country in Europe; - and many of the numerous books which yearly appear on Turkey and the Turks, are written for sale, and not for the purpose of imparting facts respecting the government or the people. They are intended to amuse, and not to instruct; - to benefit the writer, and not the reader."

Brown, ten years earlier, had written that his choice of materials to translate was eastern tales rather than moral works, the latter being

---

\(^{24}\)J. P. B., "Notes on the Ottoman Empire - March 24, 1852," *Scioto Gazette*, (Chillicothe, Ohio) May 12, 1852, p. 2.
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very profound and instructive but dull. "I have preferred attempting
to make a translation of what will amuse, rather than fail in
 instructing the public." The tales, although fantasy, were from
eastern literature, not of Brown's own imagination. He was always
quick to draw the line between the two, in order not to mislead his
readers.

Believing in the natural equality of man, Brown viewed
education and environment as the means of freeing man from a debased
existence. "Turks are educated to be nobles of the land exhibiting
idleness rather than industry." Thus the Christian minorities
(Armenians especially), uninhibited by Koranic scripture, made greater
progress in the adoption of western techniques. "The Greek clergy is
the most illiterate in the world, and as a result their congregants
are sadly debased." "Greeks and Bulgarians are far lower in mentality
than any group of U. S. slaves," the reason being, "the intellect of
their masters show through." "Knowledge liberates man, without it,
power, another source of liberty cannot exist." Some years earlier
Brown had written, "Colleges and universities (in Turkey) show
equality of an example to be followed by Europe." But he admitted,
"Little has been done for the mental improvement of the people of the

26J. P. B., "An Interesting Letter from the Constantinople
Correspondent of the Scioto Gazette," Scioto Gazette, (Chillicothe,

27J. P. B., "Turkey and the Osmanlees, - Oct. 2, 1852,"

28Ibid., Nov. 11, 1852, p. 2.
Early in the Crimean War, despite the stumbling blocks in Turkey's path, Brown demonstrated faith in her progress and hoped that America would sustain her with moral support.

"I am very glad to see that my countrymen at home sympathize with the Sultan. You know that, in my humble sphere, I have always strongly advocated his cause. I do so still, and, I trust, I always shall. I cannot bring myself to feel any good sentiment for either of the great despotic powers of Europe. I may say, of the world. I know all the Turks - their bigotry; dislike for non-mussulmans; and their slowness of action; but, with all this, theirs is a free country, the reforming and progressive one; - that in which despotism is fast disappearing, before a better state of things, and I am encouraged to hope. But there is nothing of this in either Russia or Austria; and there, there is no hope just now, for freedom."^30

It was hard for Brown to see the Crimean War in other terms than of good and evil. Russia as a government was so obviously bad he could not understand how an American with freedom of choice could side with her. When American papers carried editorials in defense of Russia, Brown's initial response was, "It is hard to believe that anyone would be so frail as to take bribes from Russian agents."^31 After that Brown never let up on his defense of the Turkish position. He provided Turkey with an invincible rear guard. Pen and ink could not have been used more effectively than by Brown in attempting to

---


cut Russia, Austria, and Greece off from American sympathy. All the tactics of modern propagandists were employed with little subtlety. Disregarding the low opinion of Greeks held by Brown, Americans as well as English speaking people everywhere had sympathy for them. When a Greek insurrection threatened Turkey's internal security during the early stages of the war, Brown wrote, "(Greeks) are as vile a set as ever lived and merit no one's sympathy." The Greeks in Turkey were pro-Russian because of "religious bigotry and fanaticism."33

A continuing theme for Brown was the superiority of Saxons over Slavs, or moral courage opposed to brutal compulsion. This was exemplified by the fact that, "Russian soldiers at batteries were chained to their guns." Brown taking pride in his Scottish heritage attempted to win American support for Turkey by drawing them closer to England, "the mother of American institutions and political thought."34

Persistent editorials in favor of Russia compelled him to reply in strictly ideological arguments.

"(The Saxons are fighting) the armies of a Despotic-Absolute Emperor, who, whilst he courted the support and favor of my fellow countrymen in the U. S. with the same cunning subtlety which animated the serpent, he would, nevertheless, if he was able, crush them beneath his

32Ibid., June 28, 1854, p. 2.
'Iron heel', and so free the world forever from the bane (to him) of Republicanism."35

However, Brown could not maintain his own ideology when faced by the individual participants of the conflict. Each of them was a human being uprooted from his normal environment and tossed into the mass, struggling for the ambitions of an unfeeling government.

"Two thousand men have found 'untimely deaths' for a doubtful cause, and to satisfy the ambitions of a few designing men. Surely the motto of the Globe was a true one, the 'man' is governed too much."36

War was not a picture of glory as "the historian loves to paint."37 Brown visited the British encampment with his family before battle, saw the wonderfully dressed troops and enjoyed the bagpipe drills, but after the battle he visited them alone. All the starch was gone. The lifeless piles of courage were a less agonizing reminder for Brown than the overcrowded hospitals, where partially animated bodies lingered with thoughts of home. Russian and British soldiers were treated equally in the hospitals and Brown's heart went out to them all. Even the tall fair Russian had a mother waiting with concern in, "a frozen corner of the Tsar's empire."38 All had the same "high protection;' they merely approached him in different ways.39

36Ibid.
37Ibid., Dec. 30, 1854, p. 2.
Brown's visits to the battle fields, encampments, and hospitals provided the people back home with graphic descriptions, lithographed pictures, and military souvenirs, which drew their interest to Brown's part of the world. Although Brown's newspaper articles drew American sympathy for the Sultan's cause, his magazine articles were turned in another direction.

The war had drawn American shipping to the Black Sea and it was Brown's desire to encourage it to continue after the conflict. Hunt's Merchants' Magazine carried Brown's trade reports throughout the fifties, but it was futile. The transient American population disappeared with the last puff of cannon smoke. Some few American vessels continued to ply the Straits, but the American Civil War drew them back to more prosperous waters. Even ships of the American Navy were seldom seen, but when they did appear Brown never passed up the opportunity of introducing the officers to members of the Porte and providing tours of the ships for members of the Ottoman Navy. His efforts put him on a personal basis with almost every high Ottoman official. When Commander Stringham arrived in Constantinople, on the frigate Cumberland, in 1853, Brown wanted to introduce him to the Sultan, but as Charge he could not ask for an audience. Brown decided to use his personal influence for the occasion. After explaining his situation to Reshid Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Brown and the Commander were summoned to an audience with the

---

40 Letter, George P. Marsh to William Marcy, July 13, 1853, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).
Brown impatiently wanted the Sultan to send a diplomatic mission to the United States. The Sultan's main objection had been the expense in proportion to the benefit, but the Amin Bey visit added conviction to Brown's description of what America had to offer. Unfortunately the Crimean War postponed further consideration. In September, 1857, Brown wrote to Markoe in the State Department.

"It is . . . , high time, in my humble opinion, for our Government to demand of the Sultan to reciprocate a diplomatic mission to the U. S. in this, the new Minister might do in his speech to the Sultan direct. He has now Missions in Russia, Prussia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, France, Naples, England, and Sardinia, and none in the U. S.!!"42

In spite of Brown's urgings no mission was sent, until 1864, but when it was, the Sultan's choice of representatives was Edward Blacque, whom Brown had recommended. Consulates had been established earlier in Boston, New York, and Baltimore, but they were operated by Americans.43

Inextricably associated with Brown's interest in promoting better Turkish-American relations was his obtuse preoccupation with

---


43In 1857, J. Hosford Smith, a New York businessman and former U. S. Consul at Beirut, was named Ottoman Consul for New York City. In the following year George A. Porter was made Ottoman Consul for Baltimore and later Washington, D. C.
Persia. The cultural and linguistic affinity between Turkey and Persia were sufficient to justify the attention of the oriental scholar, but for Brown the attraction was even deeper. Since America's earliest days in the East, Persia had been the object of her attention, or it might be more clearly stated that the treaty was signed with the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire to give American merchants and missionaries access to the greater riches of Persia.\textsuperscript{44} Congressional resolve did not equal the challenge.

Commodore Porter wrote to American Consul Offley in Smyrna as early as January, 1832, "The government attaches vast importance to the Treaty from the prospect it opens, of extending our trade to Persia, through Trebizon and Sinope."\textsuperscript{45} Five months later the missionaries were already mapping out their route for penetration. Some of the finest trade reports on Eastern Turkish and Persian trade were sent to Porter by the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight, who at that early date had traveled the entire area. He remarked that the only Franks in Tiflis were two Swiss merchants connected with a house in New York City.\textsuperscript{46}

During the 1830's, members of the American Legation in Constantinople, spoke of the Persian trade, while missionary difficulties on the eastern frontier, drew their official attention to

\textsuperscript{44}Letter, David Porter to David Offley, Jan. 25, 1832, USDD (Turkey, Vol. II).

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{46}Letter, H. G. O. Dwight to David Porter, June 15, 1832, USMCR (Turkey, Vol. 1830-1849).
making diplomatic connections with Persia. The first well organized proposal was made by Brown, in 1842, based on information provided by Baron de BeIn of Belgium. The first commercial treaty between Persia and a European nation was with Belgium. Brown sent a copy of this treaty to Porter for forwarding to the Department of State, and listed the cost at about three thousand dollars.47

Two years later Dabney Carr suggested to the government that he go to Tehran and negotiate a treaty. His main aim was the increase of American trade to compete with that of England, but if that did not result it would at least, "be a cheap price to pay for the protection of our citizens already residing within the jurisdiction of Persia." His cost estimate was six thousand dollars.48 Brown supported Carr's proposal and made a number of his own, during the later forties. Brown's visit to Erzurum, in 1847, further excited his interest in a treaty with Persia.

George Marsh arrived in Constantinople with instructions to negotiate a treaty with Persia. Shortly thereafter the Shah's representative at the Porte asked his sovereign for permission to negotiate a treaty with the United States.49 Negotiations did not get underway until Brown returned from the United States and Marsh

47Letter, J. P. Brown to David Porter, March 5, 1842, USDF (Turkey, Vol. I).


49Letter, George P. Marsh to John Clayton, April 18, 1850, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).
from Syria. The negotiations took less than twenty days and a copy was sent to the Senate for ratification.\(^{50}\) By March, 1852, the Senate had approved it with an amendment appended. The Shah under British pressure rejected the amendment and thus the treaty.\(^{51}\)

Carroll Spence replaced Marsh in Constantinople and quickly requested that he be given power to negotiate with Persia. This time the Shah was anxious to negotiate. Caught between England and Russia in a power struggle over domination of Persia, the Shah took the Tsar's suggestion to use the United States as a counterbalance. This was the same thing that had happened in connection with the American-Turkish treaty. The Shah specifically wanted the United States to provide naval protection for the Persian Navy in the Persian Gulf, and if that was impractical, give Persia permission to fly the American flag on all its ships. In addition he was interested in purchasing four American made war ships with officers and crews. The Shah was so desperate in his relationship with the British, he might have gone even further. He hoped the American Ministers in Paris and London would serve as confidants and advisers to his representatives in those cities and they did.\(^{52}\)

Spence received permission late in the spring, 1855, and

\(^{50}\)Letter, George P. Marsh to Daniel Webster, Dec. 18, 1851, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XII).

\(^{51}\)Letter, Carroll Spence to William Marcy, Nov. 25, 1854, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XIV).

\(^{52}\)Letter, Carroll Spence to William Marcy, Dec. 22, 1856, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XIV).
negotiations were completed by June 13, 1856. Costs had increased tremendously, since 1842. The presents alone received a Congressional appropriation of ten thousand dollars, and the suggested salary for a minister of highest rank (which Spence deemed necessary) was twelve thousand dollars a year. Naturally, Congress balked and a representative was not sent to Persia for several decades.

Brown's promotion of East-West relations was in large part bound up with his own ambitions to be American Minister to Turkey or Persia. The frustration of hopes, goals, purposes, and programs in the face of increased service and devotion gravely tore at Brown's normally strong constitution.

In September, 1853, shortly after his thirty ninth birthday, Brown wrote to Elisha Whittlesey, a close friend and first comptroller of the United States Treasury, concerning Marsh's successor. Having heard that Carr or Hodgson might return in Marsh's place, Brown was determined to resign rather than work with either of them. This was


the first indication of Brown's willingness to put his job on the line. In the spring, he had shown uneasiness over the prospect of losing his position; by early fall, he felt sufficiently secure to test the government's confidence with a suggestion of resignation. It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of Brown's letter, but the results were as he had hoped. Carroll Spence, four years his junior, was named to succeed Marsh. The initial appraisal of each other was favorable, as was their four year relationship. Spence relied heavily upon Brown's experience, deferring many of the decisions to him. Mutual trust and respect prevailed as it had between Marsh and Brown. The only point of contention was Brown's triple position which prevented him from giving greater attention to the duties of Dragoman. But since Spence had begged him to fill the office of consul, until a successor could be named, the blame was placed on the government for delaying the appointment. The government on the other hand did its best to fill the position of consul, but its appointees always refused their appointments.

Brown's involvement with the war turned his mind from the thought of promotion to the efficient prosecution of the business at hand. However, in 1856, the cost of living and the pressure of offices forced Brown to seek relief. He wanted to be replaced as consul, given an increase in pay, and a leave of absence.


In March, he responded to a request from Christopher Oscanyan, concerning government vacancies in the East. Brown attempted to have him appointed Ottoman Consul at New York, but Fuad Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, discouraged it on the basis of expense. Brown also informed him that the Consulate at Constantinople was vacant at twenty-five hundred dollars a year, a vice-consul was needed at Galatz for one thousand dollars annually, and the legation needed an assistant dragoman.59 However, he made no recommendation. Oscanyan decided on the Consulate at Constantinople, and received recommendations from the following persons: Washington Irving, William C. Bryant, George Bancroft, Dr. Hackley, and Rev. Henry P. Tappan (Chancellor of the University of Michigan).60 Although unopposed, he failed to receive the appointment. Francis Markoe working in Brown's behalf saw only one way of increasing his salary, which was by making Brown Consul at Constantinople. Thus as Under Secretary of State, Markoe quashed Oscanyan's nomination to hold the office of consul open for Brown.61

59 Extracts from a letter, J. P. Brown to Christopher Oscanyan, March 17, 1856, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).

60 Letter, Christopher Oscanyan to Henry P. Tappan, Feb. 22, 1861, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, (Christopher Oscanyan file).
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For Brown the position of consul was the furthest thing from his mind. He wanted a leave of absence, in order to return to the United States with his wife and pursue his claims for back pay. He had never received compensation for service as Charge' (ad interim) or as acting consul. Brown could not afford to join his wife unless he received leave with pay, and a new law stated that government officials absent from their posts for more than ten days would forfeit their pay during continued absence. In mid-May, 1856, Mrs. Brown and young David departed for Boston with the Cyrus Hamlin's. Late in July, Brown received the leave, but no money was attached. He wrote that he was financially trapped in Turkey; he simply could not afford to take leave.

He told Elisha Whittlesey, that he had contemplated resigning and returning to the United States, but had decided upon remaining, in the hope of being sent as agent to Persia. There was no thought of his being made Minister to Turkey at that time; he in fact expressed the hope that Spence would remain as Minister.

A new consular bill came to the legation's attention. Its vague terms left Brown confused as to his rate of salary and position for the coming year. He immediately wrote to Whittlesey, who was assisting Mrs. Brown in the advancement of her husband's claims.

"Said Bill says 'provided the compensation of the Sec. of Leg. to China, acting as Interpreter, shall be at the rate of $5,000 and if not acting as such, at the rate of $3,000; and that of the Sec. of Leg. to Turkey, acting as Dragoman, at the rate of $3,000 and if not acting as such, at the rate of $2,000 per annum.'"67

Brown had no quarrel with the salary for the man in China, or even asked for equality of salaries with him.

"My commission calls me 'Principal Dragoman' and it is only in Mr. Clayton's dispatch, that I am called Sec. of Leg. as well as Dragoman. I think also that in applying for the extra pay for me in 1851, I am also called Secretary. If the plain language of 'Principal Dragoman' is to be literally construed, I am no longer such after next Dec. 31! At least, no new appointment has been made for such an office, except for one of $1000.

I have been informed that the Dept. of State recommended $3,500 for me, and am thus confident that it has no unfriendly feelings towards me. My whole duties have, always, been those of a Dragoman, and I have always had quite enough to do as such. No Minister has ever called upon me to act as Secretary, other than to prepare letters for his signature in French or Italian. Dragomanizing is my forte, and I do not feel much disposition for a secretarialship, which, with us, is but a common scribe. During the past year and a half, or 2 years, I have had the additional duties of a Consul to perform, which gave me a great deal of trouble, I am always ready to 'take the responsibility,' and act 'for the best,' when I have no . . . instructions; and seldom do I ever receive any from the Ministers Resident, who, even in Carr's time, have had full confidence in my good intentions and experience here. Any person can act as a Sec. of Leg. at this place; but the duties of a Dragoman are exceedingly important and require considerable qualifications and experience."68
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He was anxious to be retained as Dragoman with more than $3,500. "I can not now support my family with $2,500, and for some years past have spent full $3,500." He did not blame Secretary of State Marcy whom he knew to be on his side.

"... whatever be my fate, I can only attribute it to some silly members of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in the House, who for motives which I can neither understand or appreciate has not only deviated from the project of the Dept. of State but jeopardized my position here entirely.

Can that 'Devil incarnate,' Dainese, have found some person weak enough to listen to his advise, and to reject that of Mr. Marcy? It would really seem so, though I do not know why any member of Congress, should go out of his way to injure me whom he does not know, - and for whom!!"

The letter trailed off with, "I miss my wife and child excessively. 'Man,' truly, 'was not made to be alone!' It would have been well had his wife remained in Turkey. She vigorously pressed her husband's claims, although with some reluctance. Being a woman in an all male sphere made her uncomfortable and increased her longing for her husband. She hopelessly pleaded with him to come and take over his own claims, but without success. Her letters to Whittlesey and Cass portray her as a devoted wife, overly protective of her husband's interests and ambitious for his success. Unfortunately the Browns and their friends worked at cross purposes with one another, in trying

---
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to improve Brown's position.

Two weeks after Brown wrote to Whittlesey concerning the consular bill, his wife wrote to the same gentleman saying that it would be best if her husband resigned, if the Chinese interpreter got more than the Turkish interpreter. A week more passed and she told him that she wanted Brown to get a post in the United States as translator at the Department of State for $3,000. In the meantime, Dainese was busy influencing the Catholic members of Congress against Brown, who continued to ask for $3,500 and the position of Dragoman and Secretary of Legation. On December 28, Brown made public his desire to be Minister to Persia, by notifying Whittlesey, Douglas, and Cass. This was in anticipation of the Buchanan administration, but Mrs. Brown was still hopeful of the Pierce administration. In a January, 1857, interview, President Pierce told her that Brown would receive either five or six thousand dollars for the combined offices of consul, secretary, and dragoman. She claimed this to be satisfactory with Brown.

After the inauguration, Brown got competition from Oscanyan, who asked for the position of consul or secretary at Constantinople. Brown had been uninterested in the position of consul and on March 7, had suggested A. Azarian (a naturalized American) for the position. Three days earlier, Spence had warned the State Department not to unite the offices of dragoman and consul; it would destroy the dragoman's usefulness to the minister. Three days later, desperately afraid of losing his job, and his only friend in the Department (Markoe), Brown addressed the Department. "I speak and write the Turkish language almost as well as I do the English . . . . It forms now my profession - the only one I know." The point he wanted to make was that many people could qualify as oral interpreters, but he alone was qualified to write Turkish. The following day he notified the Department of his willingness to accept the triple position of consul, secretary, and dragoman, because of reduced consular duties, but he still needed more money.

78Letter, Christopher Oscanyan to Lewis Cass, April 4, 1857, U.S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).


Oscanyan was determined to get a diplomatic post even if it required stepping on his "friend" Brown. He wanted the position of dragoman or consul at Constantinople, but would accept a consulate at Smyrna, Tunis, or Alexandria, Egypt.

"The American Legation at Constantinople has hitherto, been confined to the family of Commodore Porter and represented in the person of his nephew Mr. Brown; some change therefore might not be disadvantageous, particularly, as through the Porter dynasty no progress has been made in the mutual affinities of the two countries for the past 25 years. Ministers Resident have frequently been changed, but the prime mover and regulator has always been the Dragoman."83

While Brown was drawing back to settle for less his wife took it upon herself to ask for more. The new Secretary of State was Brown's old friend Lewis Cass, and it was to him that Mrs. Brown suggested her husband be made Minister to Turkey.84 This was awkward for Brown whose friendship with Spence was well known. On the same day, without Brown's knowledge, J. Hosford Smith recommended him for Minister to Persia.85

Within a week Brown was thanking someone for notification of his appointment, as Consul General at Constantinople.86

---

83Letter, Christopher Oscanyan to Henry P. Tappan, March 11, 1857, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).


felt that he was promoting Brown, but in effect was giving him a title with less pay (due to the office expenses). Brown again asked to be sent to Persia as Minister, expressing some hesitation, however on account of the cost and effort required. In a matter of days Brown wrote to Whittlesey in a much different tone. He informed him that he preferred the position of dragoman to consul general, because it was more secure, or not as frequently subject to change. Persia was mentioned again, but this time as a suggestion on the part of Spence and the American community in Constantinople. He was quite definite in his rejection of the idea that he should be Minister to Persia without adequate money.

Mrs. Brown still active as her husband's chief lobbyist informed Whittlesey, that Col. Key Bond and other Ohio friends were intent upon getting Brown appointed Minister Resident to Turkey. She felt sure that if Brown did not get the position while Buchanan and Cass were in office the opportunity would pass for ever. Although motivated by an intense desire to get the appointment, neither Brown had any faith in its possible realization. The position of dragoman was the touchstone of Brown's career, and also the most powerful position at the American Legation. He was afraid to part with it for

---


the purpose of greater promotion, yet yearned for promotion. Some people wondered who would serve as dragoman if Brown were minister; Mrs. Brown's response was that he would serve as his own dragoman in most cases, but also mentioned Henry Homes and William Van Brunt. Oscanyan, who was then applying for the positions of secretary and dragoman, was rejected out of hand by Mrs. Brown. "I am sure that Mr. Brown would not like to be connected with him in any capacity." He was just not suitable for any of the positions.

Throughout 1857 and 1858, Oscanyan and Brown kept their names before the government through their own correspondence and that of friends. Oscanyan was an active national Democrat with influence in New York City. Brown was widely known, with friends in both parties and especially in the American Board of Missions. Oscanyan had no chance of taking any job Brown wanted, because Brown had the ear of the principle leaders. Brown's problem was his own ambivalence. He individually failed to communicate his desire for the position of minister to the people who had the power to give it to him. He let his wife and friends carry the message, while he aimlessly


92 Letter, John B. Haskin to President Buchanan, May 16, 1857, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).
contemplated the excitement of a mission to Persia. It was in his nature to be a servant with amazing influence rather than a master with ordinary power. Subconsciously he was satisfied with being dragoman and nothing else, yet he had to be secretary of legation to maintain an agreeable level of social status.

In June, 1857, he told Whittlesey he was indifferent to the Persian post, because a salary of $12,000 was insufficient, but he would accept it if asked, due to the requests of his Ohio friends. His diplomatic career would end with the Buchanan administration, and though he threatened to retire, he had no intention of doing so. He wrote Oscanyan, in July, "I would now cheerfully become Sec. and Interpreter with $3,000 rather than remain Consul General and Dragoman with $4,000." In November, he told Cass to have the President reappoint him dragoman and secretary of legation, because he would soon be serving as Charge' again. When Aali Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, was asked if Brown were acceptable as a replacement for Spence ad interim, his reply was unequivocal.

"It is superfluous to tell you how much the choice of Mr. Brown as Charge' d'Affairs is agreeable to us. His conciliating character, his knowledge of our country, give us the certainty of his continuing to join his efforts to our own

---


94Extract from a letter, J. P. Brown to Christopher Oscanyan, July 17, 1857, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).

Brown was well known at the Porte. He was the embodiment of Turkish-American relations, a fact no more visible than during the first five months of 1858, when he held all four top positions at the legation and consulate. He deeply lamented the death of Reshid Pasha, the great Turkish reformer, as a personal friend of both the man and his country.

"For many years past he has honored me with his kindness and regard, and I am indebted to him for many acts of goodness to myself and to my fellow countrymen, which attached me warmly to him personally and which will ever render his memory dear to me."97

Reshid's death and the departure of Sir Stratford Canning left Turkish reform to the vagaries of a new administration, whose anxiety over the need for visible accomplishments combined with changing world events to stifle reform and promote the reformers' early demise. Eighteen hundred fifty eight, marks the beginning; and Brown's death, in 1872, the end of the reform era and the reformers. By 1858, Brown was physically and mentally tired and financially and spiritually depressed.

The positions of dragoman and secretary were separated in 1856, for the purpose of giving Brown a promotion and relieving him of one office. But the promotion to consul general was more trouble


and expense than it was worth. He had to hire an assistant for $500 out of his own pocket; he had to be bonded; he had to keep up a correspondence with the Department; and he had to make returns. With no means of monetary exchange other than through merchants in Boston or London (taking two months) he could not maintain the expense of the consulate and his family. He gave Cass four alternatives in order of preference:

"1. Dragoman and Secretary ----------- $3000
2. Consul General and Dragoman ------- $4000
3. Consul General with pay increased beyond ---------------- $3000
4. Return home."98

Two months later he wrote Markoe, "I am a cab horse for all, ... I prefer to be recalled and so abandon my career for ever."99 In March, 1858, he declared his readiness to quit on account of his financial situation. Since 1851, he had been spending a $1000 a year from his savings to live on. This was mainly the interest from his wife's Mexican claims inheritance. He regretted giving up friendships with Turkish officials and Americans in the Empire, but saw no other solution.100

"... after 22 years of service, I thought/ alas! it was but a cruel dream/ that President B. and Gen. C. would have


100Letter, J. P. Brown to Lewis Cass, March 8, 1858, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. VI).
commended their Administration to all just men/ not party hacks/ by promoting Mr. Brown. It is now impossible. Under no coming Administration can I ever hope for such a close to my career. I cannot throw off a deep seated feeling of disappointment, and somewhat of mortification, with my fate, and wish I was a British subject, with ½ of my 22 years service, and ¼ of my oriental qualifications to recommend me to official favor. The 'Demon of Party,' whose shadow be painted 1000 times more terrible than the Devil himself can only be favorable to me, by my returning to the U. S. and making new and more friends, and this, the new law which takes the pay after the absence of 10 days renders impossible. The Department can find no one to perform the duties of Dragoman. Homes would not come here for $5000 a year, who next are you to ask, Dainese and Oscanyan!! If so, pray make a selection at once. 101

This came with the announcement that James Williams would be the new Minister Resident. Buchanan's choice of Williams, a Tennessee Colonel, was an attempt to maintain harmony between the North and South. Following on the heels of Congress' rejection of Buchanan's proposed mission to Persia, Brown was bereft of hope. He grudgingly remained to get Williams, who knew no foreign languages, established. 102

Marsh wrote to Cass concerning Brown's contemplated resignation due to poor compensation.

"Mr. Brown is one of the most laborious and faithful officers I have ever known. He has great influence with the Porte and his withdrawal from Constantinople would strip the Legation of half its respectability, and nearly all its


102Ibid.
influence and utility."  

The missionaries in Constantinople told Cass that Brown had been maligned by Dainese. Rev. Schauffler, believing that Oscanyan had received an appointment to replace Brown, as secretary and dragoman, wrote to Cass a month later.

"I cannot doubt for a moment, that if Mr. Oscanyan's appointment is confirmed, the American missionaries in Turkey will be obliged to put themselves and their work under English protection."  

The next day Rufus Anderson of the American Board addressed Cass in behalf of the sixty American missionaries living in Turkey.

"(Oscanyan's) appointment as Dragoman in the place of Mr. Brown, would be regarded, by them as a serious and alarming calamity. It would greatly disturb their present feeling of security in Turkey, as American citizens; since Mr. Oscanyan is believed by them to be unfitted for the post."  

Brown gave in to the pressure of Spence, Williams, and the American community, in Constantinople to stay. "I agree to be grounded by

103 Letter, George P. Marsh to Lewis Cass, April 22, 1858, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (John P. Brown file).


105 Letter, William Schauffler to Lewis Cass, May 18, 1858, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).

106 Letter, Rufus Anderson to Lewis Cass, May 19, 1858, U. S., Department of State, Letters of Application and Recommendation During the Administration of James Buchanan, (Christopher Oscanyan file).
He wrote Markoe.

"What in the world is this about Oscanyan as Consul for Constantinople? Here he was a buffoon and a (pimp?), and in New York, a retailer of Fig paste and Segars. He and Dainese are quite on a par, for position and property. All the Americans here are up in arms about the mere mention of O. as a Consul. He is a fussy consecrated, addlepated puppy, and has not one recommendation for a Consulate. At the most, he could act as an interpreter for a Consul who would . . . and keep him in his place. I fear, if he is sent here, that my sun has set for ever. . . . I do not wish to leave here now."

Brown continued to carryout the duties of all three positions in the same excellent manner. On September 28, 1858, he was rewarded by the President with a commission as dragoman. Everything was back to normal, only the scars remained. Williams and Brown were on the best of terms, as can be readily seen in Williams' report to Cass following the visit of Commander Lavallette of the Wabash. The Sultan met the Commander and visited the Wabash after which he presented a banquet for the ship's officers, and members of the Legation.

"I desire also to refer in conclusion to the eminent services rendered, not only upon this, but upon many occasions, by Mr. John P. Brown the accomplished Dragoman of the American Legation. His long residence at Constantinople, his perfect familiarity with the Turkish language, and with the manners, habits, and etiquette of the Turkish court, together with his promptitude and zeal in the discharge of the


important and delicate duties incident to his position, impart a value to his services, which it is not only my duty but a pleasure to acknowledge."109

This was in October, 1858, and although Brown's time was divided between the consulate and the legation, Williams was willing to put up with the arrangement, until the new consul general arrived. James McDowell, Consul General at Constantinople, assumed his duties on March 15, and on May 15, he departed for the United States, again leaving Brown to fill the vacancy. Williams, unwilling to share Brown's services with the consulate, fired a letter off to Cass.

"I am fully satisfied that the three offices of Consul General, Secretary of Legation, and Interpreter should never be combined in one person unless that of Minister Resident be either added to them, or abolished."110

The three years of turmoil over Brown's position and pay had solved nothing. He remained under-paid and over-worked. Mrs. Brown, witnessing her husband's mounting anxiety and declining health, took it upon herself to write Cass, "to have justice done," her husband.111 By December, Brown was ready to ask for himself. "The state of my health strongly induces me now to ask for," a six months leave with pay. Brown promised to remain at his post, until Williams returned

110Letter, James Williams to Lewis Cass, May 18, 1859, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).
from a two month tour of Syria and a new consul general arrived. Leave was granted and on April 11, the family departed for the United States. Six months was expanded to ten, enabling Brown to press claims for back pay, answer charges against himself, and ask President Buchanan to assign him a brief mission to Persia.

Brown felt the government owed him $1655.55, for back services as consul, but he failed to receive satisfaction. As he told Whittlesey, "the government is too interested in its own pay." The charges against him were made by John Reeves, who had been harassing him, since the early 1840's, and Joseph Smolinski, having lost a court case at which Brown officiated, wanted the case tried by another legation. Reeves' charges of robbery, conspiracy, and attempted assassination, were soundly refuted by a petition signed by the missionaries, a letter of exoneration from the Porte, and articles from the Levant Herald and the New York Argus.

---

113 Letter, J. P. Brown to Lewis Cass, April 11, 1860, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XV)


Upon the Department's request, Williams investigated Smolinski's charges, finding Brown blameless.\(^{118}\) He told the Department it was imposing upon Brown to do everything, and as a result, Brown was subject to unjust accusations and the Minister was made to appear subservient to him. He insisted that the Department make the Minister a freer agent.

"I have only been governed in this matter by a regard to general and fundamental principles, and it is not my wish that what I have said shall be regarded as in any manner reflecting upon Mr. John P. Brown. I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Brown has so far as I have any knowledge promptly complied with every legitimate order or request which I may have made to him, and his long residence at Constantinople, has qualified him, perhaps better than any other American citizen for the discharge of the duties of his office. It matters not who may be placed in the position occupied by Mr. Brown, or how transcendant his virtues, I would still repeat all that I have already said, and more if it could accomplish anything in regard to the necessity, of freeing the chief of the Legation from the real or supposed condition of absolute dependance, which he at present occupies."\(^{119}\)

A perfect example of Williams' problem is exhibited by a letter addressed to Brown, in the United States. "Forgive the trouble which these inquiries may cause you, upon the ground that although you are now upon leave, we look to you as active chief of the American colony here."\(^{120}\)

Brown proposed that the government send him to Persia as an

\(^{118}\) Letter, James Williams to Lewis Cass, July 22, 1860, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).

\(^{119}\) Letter, James Williams to Lewis Cass, April 10, 1860, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).

\(^{120}\) Letter, C. J. Green to J. P. Brown, June 20, 1860, USCD (Constantinople, Vol. VII).
agent to assure the Shah of American interest. He asked that his salary be continued in his absence from Constantinople and that his traveling expenses be paid. "I freely admit that, I have, for many years, entertained a strong desire to visit Persia either as a private individual [which he could not afford] or in the service of my government." He wanted to make the trip as a farewell to his service in the East. "I have no desire to visit Persia on a permanent mission, the great age of my mother rendering it impracticable, and because I contemplate, before long, retiring to the United States to reside." Brown was apparently interested in retiring to the United States where his mother could die on her native soil, and his son could be educated in a useful profession. None of this worked out as he had planned.:

Brown returned to Constantinople, on the eve of the American Civil War, to find his previously harmonious relationship with Williams eroded by jealousy. The Department had refused Williams permission to hire a private secretary, who would partially replace Brown. He notified the Secretary of State, on January 25, 1861, that he would hire one anyway, "as a measure of self defence."

"I presume that it is not unknown at the Department that Mr. Brown is my personal enemy. I have just learned that

---

121 Letter, J. P. Brown to President Buchanan, June 11, 1860, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).

122 Mrs. Mary Porter Brown (mother of John P. Brown) died in Turkey, in March, 1862, at the age of 72.

123 Letter, James Williams to J. S. Black, Jan. 25, 1861, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).
it has been determined by the government, to continue him
defacto as Consul General at Constantinople, in the name of
another person, and he will thus remain invested with all the
powers of his multifarious offices. . . .

I beg to say frankly however that I am unwilling to
be made the victim of an excess of confidence in the
administrative capacity and personal integrity of Mr. Brown,
on the part of the Department.

Believing that Mr. Brown entertains towards me
feelings of such a character as would prompt him to adopt any
means which might present to him the prospect of doing me an
injury. I . . . hope . . . you . . . will . . . , give your
official sanction to the . . . employment of
(a secretary)."124

On March 4, Williams sent in his resignation, but continued
to serve as minister.125 His departure, in May, was, "one month too
long."126 Williams was a loyal American, but a staunch Confederate
and the American community began to express concern for his continued
presence, as their legation chief. Rev. Dwight had written to
Anderson, of the American Board of Missions, in late 1860, that
Williams was one of America's finest ministers and wanted the govern-
ment to keep him.127 Nine months later, Rev. Goodell was the only
missionary willing to write a memorial letter to Williams. His

124Ibid.

125Letter, James Williams to William Seward, May 25, 1861,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVI).

126Letter, William Goodell to Rufus Anderson, June 21, 1861,
Harvard University, Houghton Library, Papers of the American Board of
Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Western Turkey Mission, (Vol. II,
Item 385).

127Letter, H. G. O. Dwight to Rufus Anderson, Sept. 25, 1860,
Harvard University, Houghton Library, Papers of the American Board of
Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Western Turkey Mission, (Vol. II,
Item 265).
feelings are explained in a letter to Anderson.

"I send you herewith our closing correspondence with Mr. Williams. He was a good Minister for us, but he staid (sic) just one month too long, for his sympathies were with the South, and he was receiving instructions from Washington which he could not honestly carry out. He was also giving impressions about the state of our country, which in our judgment were far from being true, and which his successor will find it necessary to counteract . . . . We all feel, that he was really one of the best Ministers we ever had."

Brown wasted no time in counteracting the impressions, and in accordance with instructions, presented the Porte with an explanation of the situation, existing in the United States.

On May 1, he wrote to Whittlesey that Ohio friends were calling for his promotion, but lacking confidence as usual, asked, "Can I keep what I have got?" Twenty-one days later, he told Whittlesey that the President did not intend to make another appointment for awhile and in a like number of days applied to Lincoln for appointment as Minister to Turkey. It was too late. Before the letter reached Washington, Edward Joy Morris was informed that he had been made

---


Minister to Turkey. Brown may have felt some disappointment in being passed over again, but there was no evidence of it in his note to Secretary of State Seward, on July 17, 1861.

"I beg leave to express my personal gratification with the appointment of the Hon. E. Joy Morris as the chief of the Legation. I have had the honor and pleasure of his acquaintance for many years, and my intercourse with him has been of a very friendly nature. I have already mentioned his appointment to H. H. Aali Pacha, in terms which I thought would be agreeable and useful to him." 

---


CHAPTER VI

REQUIEM FOR A CIVIL SERVANT

"I can show you higher minarets, loftier domes, more splendid palaces, fatter Pashas, and more veiled 'beauties,' to say nothing of the extensive bazaars, than you have in Chillicothe; and yet, I would exchange them all for a month's intercourse with the dear old Academy, and the never-forgotten hills on which, I suppose you stop to gaze, as seldom as I do at the rare choice sights here. We have a Turkish proverb which says that 'even honey sours upon the tongue, and rose leaves lose their odor when too common;' and I feel that if these objects have lost their interest, they are still the same, whilst the 'dreary change is in me.'" By J. P. B., "Editor's Correspondence - April 5, 1852," Scioto Gazette, June 4, 1852.

"The conflicts must therefore go on until one or the other succumbs. Providence overrules all things for the best, and divine wisdom can only be judged of, by the results." By J. P. Brown, "Editor's Correspondence - March 1867," Scioto Gazette, April 23, 1867.

Edward Joy Morris promptly arrived at his post, in mid-August, 1861, to find the American community in a secure and peaceful state. Moreover, all the American citizens in Constantinople were loyal to the Union. Brown was singled out for praise.

"I am happy to say that everyone connected with the representation of the United States at this place is ardently loyal to the Union. Mr. John P. Brown the Dragoman and Secretary of the Legation has exerted his well known influence with the Turkish government in behalf of the Union and with great effect. In this emergency, as at all time, he has shown himself a trustworthy loyal and valuable officer of the United States eminently worthy of its confidence. The Consul General Mr. Heap is equally true to his country. This unity of sentiment of course increases the influence of the United
Union loyalty was a critical issue throughout the 1860's, and public officials, especially, wished to prove their devotion. Prior to Morris' arrival, Brown had not only demonstrated his loyalty through letters to the Department, but also through a $100 contribution to aid families whose men were fighting for the Union. Col. John Madeira of Chillicothe turned the money over to the Scioto Gazette. Unfortunately for Brown, dedication to the Union was insufficient. He was expected to exhibit a similar loyalty for his chief at the legation.

Morris, who possessed everything a man could ask for, except physical stature and personal warmth, was determined to be both chief of the legation and the American community. For the first time, Brown was confronted by a Minister with diplomatic experience, and a knowledge of the Turkish language. Williams had asked the government to make the minister a freer agent, and it had done so in selecting Morris. Brown was expected to take a subordinate role at the legation, after twenty-two years of being the focal point for Turkish-American relations. The psychological situation that evolved is one of the most fascinating and tragic in American diplomatic history.

Morris was a brittle, jealous man whose incorruptible

---


morality and bluntness of approach heralded a self-righteousness equal to that of the missionaries. He was a legalistic idealist, lacking in humor, but nurturing hatreds with a smile. Determined to reorganize the legation for greater efficiency, he made requests as if they were original with him, when in fact; the same suggestions had been the topic of discussion for thirty years and a civil war made their adoption at that moment more remote than before. Brown, willing to serve the new chief with all the ability previously displayed, found his own pragmatic approach to life constricted by red tape. Although these moves limited Brown's flexibility and usefulness, they greatly enhanced Morris' feeling of control. Brown rode the waves of the new administration as he had so many others with mild frustration. He served as secretary to Messers Azarian and Thompson in setting up a tariff treaty between Turkey and the United States. For discharging that duty, "... with his usual fidelity and ability," Morris noted his service.3 Even the families of the two men spent time in pleasant social exchange. At the birth of Morris' daughter Mrs. John P. Brown was named godmother.4

The relationship slowly deteriorated over a period of three years, after which social pleasantries were reduced to a bare minimum. The missionary community, with its high regard for Brown, too frequently made comparisons between the two men. This was especially


true of occasions when Morris failed to respond with the promptness expected of him. Rev. Cyrus Hamlin and his son-in-law George Washburn were the primary pot boilers. Continually complaining of Morris' ineffectiveness, they drove an ever deepening wedge between him and Brown.

Hamlin and Washburn kept Morris on the defensive from the moment he arrived, due to their concern over the punishment of the murders of the Reverends Coffing and Merriam, and over the Sultan's permission to construct a college. Since they were uninformed of what the legation was doing and fearing the worst, their concern turned to frustration and was vented against Morris in superinflated language. Answering in kind, Morris found himself subject to the Department's request for an explanation.5 This he did, prior to the request, with creditable directness that the missionaries could not refute.6 His letter to Secretary of State Seward concerning the college was marked private in order to convey a few remarks about Hamlin. It too removed the blame from Morris.

"That gentleman (Dr. Hamlin) though a distinguished missionary has a very querulous disposition, and a despotism of character that often leads him to do injustice to the motives of others. Some years since he actually complained to the British Government through Lord Shaftesbury of some fancied default of duty on the part of Sir H. Bulwer to protestant interests here and the letter was sent to Sir Henry as in this case for explanation. There was no foundation for it.

5Letter, William Seward to E. Joy Morris, Nov. 6, 1862, USDIT (Turkey, Vol. II), p. 76.

For 18 months Mr. Hamlin has had a controversy with the Porte about a College (secular) which he proposes to establish out of subscriptions raised in America. I have had the college approved of by the Council of Education; but Mr. Hamlin has stopped everything by obstinately selecting a site for the building . . . . He was warned not to choose this spot, but . . . persisted. The government has refused to allow it to be built there. I have had an immense deal of trouble on the subject and possibly this too may be a source of complaint. It is not properly an affair of Diplomatic business. Americans have no relations with the College except in their contributions as it is intended for universal use. Nevertheless I have done all in my power for the location of it where Mr. H. desires it to be built."^7

In the same set of dispatches, Morris brought to the attention of the Department the abuse of American protection."^8 Feeling he had offended some persons, he was unwilling to allow the abuse to go uncorrected.

"It will hardly be believed but it is none the less true that a brothel kept by a Greek woman Aniki enjoyed the protection of the Legation of the United States, and complaint was recently made of the fact by the Municipality. But for this, the fact would not have come to my knowledge as her protection seems to have been a secret one, her name not being recorded on the books of the Legation. Rely upon it, that I shall do my duty, without fear or favor, and in such a manner as to maintain the honor of the American name."^9

What Morris did not tell the Department, was that the protection had been issued by Brown and that the Archives of the Legation were stored at Madam Aniki's place.^10


^8Letter, E. Joy Morris to William Seward, Sept. 18, 1862, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVII)

^9Ibid.

Morris' reluctance to involve Brown is peculiar in view of later events.

With explanations made, and holding a stick over Brown's head, Morris had little reason to feel insecure. But the missionaries were unwilling to admit their mistakes with any grace. Washburn writing Rufus Anderson from Andover, Massachusetts carried Hamlin's gripes to the Board of Missions.

"(I take) the opportunity to make some statements in a more or less public manner to the friends of the Board as to our present Minister at Constantinople. Things there are growing worse and worse. Mr. Morris openly insults the Missionaries on all occasions. He told Dr. Hamlin the other day that the missionaries were 'the most illiterate and unchristian set of men he ever saw' and more to the same purpose.

Mr. Brown, our only friend among the American officer officers is about to or has already left Turkey for good, I understand. What are we to do with two such characters as Morris and Goddard (Consul General). The one calling us illiterate and unchristian, and the other a man without sense or honesty who contents himself with calling us impudent puppies. You can think of this and act as you think best at the meeting . . . ."

Upon receiving word from Constantinople that Anderson's letters to Seward were being sent to Morris for confrontation of the missionaries, Washburn suggested that Anderson put a soft pedal on his subsequent letters.

"Now it is our duty to cultivate sincerely a forgiving spirit - but aside from this it is also good policy - especially in dealing with a worldly man of weak mind to appear magnanimous.

Mr. Hamlin drove Sir Henry Bulwer into a proper
position by telling the plain truth about him in unmeasured terms in England. The English and American customs and habits of thought are so different that I believe a judicious mingling of just complaints with every possible acknowledgement of good—will answer the purpose here much better.

I have been urged by the brethren in Constantinople to write Mr. Morris down in the newspapers—but I have carefully avoided anything of the kind with this very object in view—of coaxing him with a bundle of hay when the opportunity affords.

It will be much better weak and inefficient as he may be—to keep on the best terms possible with him as long as he remains there. I am sure that, do what we will, he will remain here two or three years longer.12

The Department again asked Morris to answer the charges. This time he called upon Brown for a statement of facts, in reference to Hamlin's accusations. Brown responded with a lengthy report in which he took a neutral position. His last paragraph carries a preceptive analysis of the situation.

"The results of your course of conduct in the two cases of the late Messrs. Coffing and Merriam, which have secured the condemnation of death of the four assassins arrested, furnished the best reply to Dr. Hamlin's remarkable statement that he does 'not think any American life will have any guarantee for its safety in Turkey while Mr. Morris is here!' I do not believe there is another American citizen in the Ottoman Empire who would make such an assertion; and it must have been written by Dr. Hamlin during a moment of strangely mental excitement, which, I am sure, from his general kindness and generosity of character, he would subsequently regret. As Americans in the Interior of the Empire, as well as others at this capital, are continuously appealing to you for their various interests, some of which are still before the Porte, I do not observe any want of confidence in their part, in your desire or ability to serve them; and I am compelled to believe that the idea of your 'hostility' to your fellow countrymen and that it is 'known all over the official world in the interior,' is purely

12 Letter, George Washburn to Rufus Anderson, Nov. 4, 1862, Harvard University, Houghton Library, Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Western Turkish Mission (Vol. IV, Item 270).
imaginary on the part of Dr. Hamlin, and must be attributed only to his own feelings of personal hostility towards you." Hamlin, following Washburn's directive, begrudgingly offered Morris an apology. It was not as complete as Morris desired or in any fashion humble, but it did end the conflict. The legation turned its attention to daily business. Petty strife was either put aside or failed to enter the records.

A seven-month lull began to break, in September, when first Goddard, and then Morris, asked for a leave of absence. Goddard complained of expense, overwork, and declining health, while Morris had private business to transact. Granted their requests, Goddard left for Athens, and Morris held his leave in reserve. Before the month was out Mr. Giacomo, the American harbormaster, filed charges of fraud against Consul General Goddard. Giacomo alleged that Goddard had made him a party to padding the consular expense account. He had been named jailer (when there was no jail) and consular dragoman. The salary for the two offices and the rent for the non-existent jail totaled $1159.93. Giacomo received $506.63 and Goddard pocketed the

---

The charge passed without mention, until January, when Morris brought up the fact that Goddard had been appropriating to himself all the fees collected from proteges in legal suits. Morris gave the Department his opinion and asked for its judgment.

"(Since) civil jurisdiction is recognized by the statute of June 22, 1860; and a list of fees prescribed. In my opinion all fees for legal services concerning proteges since that system has gone into effect belong to the U. S. Government, and ought to be accounted for by the Consul General and the Consuls throughout the Empire. It may be that I am wrong and the Consul General is right touching the proper disposition of these fees. If the former be the case I respectfully request that I may be advised to that effect by the Department."

Eight days later Brown filed charges against Goddard, "to clear imputations upon himself." There is no indication of what these imputations were, but Brown's letter got results. Seward ordered Morris to conduct a thorough investigation. In the interim Goddard resigned. Testimony was taken in April, but Goddard, notified of the proceedings, was unable to leave his critically ill son. The disposition of the case was left with Washington, where findings were

---


made in Goddard's favor. The political white wash resulted from Morris' own efforts, and was perpetrated while he was on leave in the United States.  

Morris, left Constantinople, on May 18, 1864, upon receiving word of his father's death. Brown emerged from virtual obscurity again to take charge of the legation. As usual the perennial Charge drew attention to the legation as though events waited for his presence to take place. H. H. Mehmet Pasha, Minister of the Navy, asked Brown for naval aid. Having been entertained in the United States in 1858, Mehmet Pasha was aware of American naval construction, but to keep him up to date Brown had supplied him with the latest information. The submarine sketched in an issue of the Harper's Weekly favorably drew his attention. What he precisely wanted was an American naval constructor, to spend five years in Turkey, building monitors and other turretted ships. Dahlgreen and Parrot cannons plus torpedoes for the proposed submarines were on his shopping list. In accordance with Mehmet Pasha's instructions this was to be confidential, for fear of British intervention against it. Being Mehmet Pasha's personal project, his death seven months later ended what

---

22 Letter, E. Joy Morris to Hamilton Fish, June 8, 1869, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXI).


seemed a promising entente. However, in the meantime it was a feather for Brown that Morris could not touch.

A second event was the closing of all protestant book stores, by order of the Porte in mid-July, for selling anti-Islamic literature. Brown took the issue immediately to Aali Pasha. Assuring him that the missionaries were not breaking the law, Brown suggested that the store be thoroughly searched for the offensive literature. At Aali Pasha's request, Brown attended a two-day search of the premises, during which time no such literature was found. The store was quickly reopened. Brown reported the incident to the Department with the following comment.

"As the case is one which will be reported in the public papers, I thought it best not to leave the Department to remain ignorant of what I have done for the interests of American citizens."26

His second report reveals that the British missionaries were not as lucky but their converts no less deserving of Brown's intervention on humanitarian grounds.

"... the British missionaries, whose book stores have also undergone an examination, after having been closed precisely in the same manner as that of the Americans. The obnoxious books against Islamism were found in them, and have all been seized by the police. The converts from Islamism to Protestantism, are all with one exception, in their employ, or in connection with the church of England. These converts acted also as preachers in rooms hired for the purpose in Khans and other places in Stamboul, and gave great offence to the Porte, and to the more rigid Mussulmans


of the capital. H. H. Aali Pacha, to whom I spoke in their behalf, told me, that it would be necessary to require the most of them some 10-12 in number, to leave the capital for a short time."27

George Washburn, correspondent for the New York Tribune, played the story up in the papers. Brown was heralded as the protector of missionaries. Other newspapers picked up the story including the Scioto Gazette.28 Morris had turned the legation over to Brown for four months and missed the opportunity of boosting his image. Morris' return pushed Brown out of the spotlight and into near retirement.

Brown's home being separated from Morris' by sixteen miles, made communication difficult. Morris later complained that Brown was not readily available between November, 1864, and June, 1865, because of distance, ill health, and frequent short junkets.29 This supposedly put the burden of office on Morris. The facts of the situation are unknown, but Morris did become irritable and resentful of Brown. Mrs. Brown claimed that Morris was "very rude and disrespectful" in his treatment of her husband, and "From the time that my beloved husband obtained . . . the appointment for our son, he became also his enemy."30


For fifteen years Brown had urged the Department, time and again, to provide the legation with a young man, who would be trained, to replace him as dragoman. The incentives and assurances were never sufficient to fulfill Brown's intentions. Those familiar with Brown's concern for the legation would have seen nothing wrong with his request for the Department to provide his son David with a stipend to further his education as dragoman. However, Morris was appalled.

David Brown had been reared in Pera, frequently called the worst city in the world. Sixteen when his father made the request, he had already developed a reputation as a wholly corrupted individual. But being young, his parents overlooked the rumors and held faith in his perfectability. Morris, who saw no reason for such expectations, attempted to discourage Seward from granting an educational allotment to the boy. Rather than tell Seward of his objections, he suggested that the legation's contingency fund could not bear the strain and that an American, educated in the United States, would be a more suitable dragoman than one educated amidst the corruption of Pera. He cancelled his latter argument by saying there were local dragoman who would be more suitable than David Brown.

Seward feeling that Morris' main objections involved the contingency fund, he decided to pay David out of the Department's


secret service fund. Brown was notified that he would receive fifty dollars a month for his son's education, dependent upon the boy's diligence. Morris informed Seward of the misconstruction of his letter and hoped that all would go well.

"What I meant to say was that if it was deemed expedient to train up an American youth for such a purpose it would be infinitely preferable to send one directly hither from the U. S. instead of adopting one reared up under the competing influences of this notoriously the most morally depraved society in the civilized world.

I might have made objections personal to Mr. Brown's adopted son himself, did I not apprehend that they might lead to a misconstruction of my motives. I earnestly hope that he may prove himself worthy of your patronage, and that I as well as others here, may be agreeably disappointed in his future career and conduct. For the time that I shall remain here, I shall certainly throw no obstacles in his way, my object being to discharge my own duties, to assist others in the performance of theirs, and to render myself worthy of your esteem and confidence."

Morris' sincere and self-effacing statement was made to conceal his feelings from Brown's friends in the Department. Morris seemed determined to undercut Brown's influence, in order to rule the legation, yet it was difficult to attack Brown directly. He was forced to look hard to justify his personal animosity against the dragoman. In March, 1866, Morris wrote to Seward concerning economy at the legation. His proposals were to abolish the position of Marshall, held by Brown's close friend Alexander Thomson, and to

---


withdraw the $600 a year from David Brown. Brown, unaware of the private letter, was neither able to counter nor comment.

Legation files, for the late sixties, contain very little substantive information on Brown's activities. Extant records give the appearance that Brown was doing little more than writing articles on Constantinople for the *Scioto Gazette*. His letters to the editor were curtailed during the Civil War, but on January 2, 1866, the first of a long series came to print, under the title, "The Streets of Stamboul." The narrator strolls the streets of the capital, describing the people whose way of life lends itself to social commentary. The topics are varied as the city and its people and the comments as numerous as their problems. From financial administration to food preparation, or Dervishes to dogs, the entire society was x-rayed and then dissected. These articles are no less interesting than his earlier efforts but are more critical of Turkish reform. Forty years of reform had brought little change. Only external appearances had been altered, the headdress but not the head, the cloak but not the heart. Humanity was safe where the European powers were feared. "We are in a country where neither civil nor

---


religious liberty exists. This was in direct contrast to his frequent defense of Turkish reform, but he was neither anti-Turkish nor anti-reform. He was telling his reader not to expect too much of the "Turk".

In the meantime, Morris was digging his own diplomatic grave. On April 11, 1866, he sent a confidential dispatch to Seward bearing a fateful sentence, "The Sultan gives evident proof of positive mental imbecillity and incapacity." This common rumor, related by him as fact, would haunt him later.

In December of the same year, Morris had indiscrete conversations, at a public function, concerning Ottoman military policy, in suppressing a rebellion on the island of Candia (Crete). Morris, who was informed of the situation by the American publicist and consul, W. J. Stillman, believed that humanity would be served by foreign intervention. A love of classical Greece animated his sympathy for the Greek insurgents and blinded his consideration of the Ottoman position.

Aali Pasha, learning of Morris' remarks, asked Brown unofficially to convey his feelings to Morris. Brown's letter, of


40 Letter, E. Joy Morris to William Seward, April 11, 1866, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XIX).

December 8, 1866, clarified the Porte's position and infuriated Morris.

"I scarcely know what to say, your Minister and Consul are so enigmatical to the Gov't. On the occasion of the recent soiree of the Russian Minister, your Minister spoke with several persons about the affairs of Candia, and entertained them with accounts of victims of the insurgents and the fury of the Sultan, in a manner which shows his hostility to the Gov't. here which he is accredited. His remarks were reported to me by the individual with whom he conversed. But two months ago, Com. Steadman came here on purpose, and your Minister reported to me in a formal letter, by direct orders from the Gov't. of the U. S. to carry to the Ottoman Gov't., the acknowledgments of the President for the course pursued by the Sultan's Gov't. during the late civil war in the U. S. by refusing to permit any of the vessels of the Southern States to enter any of the ports. The Ottoman Gov't., at all times, has been most friendly towards that of the U. S., and is very desirous of continuing friendly relations with it, - but the conduct of the Consul at Candia and the Minister at the capital, show a hostility totally at variance with the friendly language of the Commodore. Neither has any right to meddle in the affairs of the insurgents, and the Sultan's Gov't. cannot permit any interference with them of any nature, - no more than the American Gov't. permitted the interference of any foreign gov'ts. in behalf of the Southern States when in revolt against its authority. I think H. H. added that you had informed him that you had written to the American Gov't. from reports of war to remove the women and children of the Candotees, - . . . . H. H. requested me to report to you his words, - which I do as clearly as I remember them."\(^\text{42}\)

Morris' response came, on the 10th, and Brown was ordered to read it to Aali Pasha.\(^\text{43}\) Morris made three points. The United States was not involved with Candia; he did wish to remove women and children from the battle zone (with the Porte's permission); and he strongly believed the war would end if Governor Ismail Pasha were replaced by

\(^{42}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{43}\text{Letter, E. Joy Morris to H. H. Aali Pasha, Dec. 10, 1866, USDF (Turkey, Vol. II).}\)
a man of more temperate character. Speaking as Minister Resident, Morris contradicted his first point with the second two. But more devastating was the fact that Ismail Pasha was a close personal friend and appointee of Aali. Brown, not indifferent to suffering humanity, felt Morris had made a mistake in jeopardizing Turkish-American relations for the sake of Canadian intervention.

The ensuing difference of opinion, between Morris and Brown, moved from the personal to the public sphere, when the former sent a voluminous "confidential and private" report to Seward. Morris either by direct threat, or rumor understood that Brown intended, through his friend Attorney General Henry Stanbury, to represent his inability of continuing in official relations with Morris. Thus, Morris wanted the government fully apprised of the situation at the legation. He contended the report was a matter of personal defense and not an official complaint against Brown. The information, if not worthy of official charges, made Morris appear the fool or a liar. (See Appendix II for the entire letter.)

"I understand that Mr. J. P. Brown in his own effort to injure me intends to represent to you that the public interests suffer because of his feelings towards me, and my alleged 'incompatibility of temper' etc. This most absurd of all his charges, justifies me in exposing for the first time


his gross neglects of duty."  

None of Morris' remarks concerning Brown can be substantiated by existing records. He claims that Alexander Thomson destroyed the Madam Anika file and that he himself eliminated other records against Brown, saying, "I have not brought them to the attention of the Department . . . . , because I did not wish to injure him, or to give him causes of quarrel, preferring to work sometimes like a galley slave, rather than to distract my time and attention with personal disputes."  

The report, composed of numerous inconsistencies, was the product of a severely troubled mind. Morris, torn between destroying and preserving Brown, hoped his report would take the responsibility of a decision from him. Henry Stanbery's action threw the whole thing back in Morris' lap. He wrote the following to Seward upon reading Morris' report.

"I return the papers relating to Mr. Morris' charges against Mr. Brown.

My engagements have been so engrossing that I have had only time to glance through them, but I have seen enough to satisfy me that they are not reliable. I have not felt at liberty to advise Mr. Brown that such charges have been made. I beg you as a personal favor to myself that no action be taken, adverse to Mr. Brown, until I can have an opportunity of seeing you."  

No action was taken and the report was filed away in Seward's private papers, preventing them from becoming public record.

---
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Brown opened the year, 1867, with a note to Seward, indicating David's progress as a dragoman and his attendance of him at the Porte.\textsuperscript{49} Morris had other concerns. Still overly distressed about the situation in Candia, he and Lord Lyon, the British Ambassador, wanted the Porte to grant the island autonomy in return for tribute, much on the order of Egypt.\textsuperscript{50} His connections with philo-Greek organizations in the United States, did nothing to help Turkis-American relations.

He even held a depreciated opinion of the newly selected Ottoman Minister to the United States. Edward Blacque, although an Ottoman citizen, was of mixed international background. As an attache\' in Paris, he met and married a daughter of Dr. Valentine Mott, America's leading surgeon. For many years a friend of Brown, and once suggested by him for the American post, Blacque seemed the proper representative for furthering friendly relations between the two countries.\textsuperscript{51} Morris, without meeting him, wrote to Seward, "(He) has for his chief merit the fact that he speaks English. He has also the good luck of being a protege of Aali Pacha."\textsuperscript{52} Morris with in two

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49}Letter, J. P. Brown to William Seward, Jan. 1, 1867, \textit{USDD} (Turkey, Vol. XIX).
\item \textsuperscript{50}Letter, E. Joy Morris to William Seward, Jan. 16, 1867, \textit{URRRL}, The William Henry Seward Collection.
\item \textsuperscript{52}Letter, E. Joy Morris to William Seward, April 9, 1867, \textit{USDD} (Turkey, Vol. XIX).
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weeks revised his opinion.

"I fear that influenced by some reports in this calumnious community I may have expressed an unjustly unfavorable opinion of Mr. Blacque the Minister recently appointed by the Porte to the U. S. I have become acquainted with him and I find him quite an accomplished person, of much experience in Diplomatic life, with a correct appreciation of the government and people of the U. S. and inspired by very friendly feelings towards us."  

This was just one more occasion upon which Morris took rumors at face value and then found it necessary to change his mind. Later his mind changed again when he learned that Blacque was working against him.  

With Candia a heated topic, and war pending between Greece and Turkey, Brown asked Seward for a four month leave of absence. His wife was ill and needed the baths of Europe, and he, disgusted with Morris, wanted to get away. Henry Stanbery saw the request and attached a note, for it to be granted, saying, "he is an esteemed personal friend." Three days later Seward had Brown's permission in the mail.  

Morris' preoccupation with the Greek cause put him at loggerheads with Brown. Thirty-one years of Brown's life had been

---
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spent, in service to the American government, in the development of
Turkish-American relations. Morris seemed intent on destroying Brown
and his accomplishments. As Minister Resident at the Porte, Morris
had asked permission to serve as representative to Persia and
Greece.58 Morris was obsessed with the idea of winning the title of
humanitarian and peace maker. He always tried too hard and too long
but found it impossible to co-ordinate good intentions with common
sense. By the end of April, Brown had had enough of Morris' warped
sense of truth and morality. The legation had become a one man show,
or a passion play with Morris suffering for humanity.

On May 1, 1867, Brown addressed a letter to the Assistant
Secretary of State to get $15 a month more for a groom to attend his
horse.59 Morris had denied him the money from his jealously guarded
contingency fund and remarked that a groom was ostentatious and bad
policy.60 Brown claimed that Morris was misappropriating money from
the contingency fund for his own use then explained the need for a
groom.

"As Dragoman I must go to the Porte three or four times a
week, and sometimes elsewhere. In the Summer, I go to the
residence of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, on the Bosphorus,
by steamer. From my house in Pera, to the Porte is about as
far as it is from the Capital to Georgetown; I must have a man
to look after my horse when there, and for this purpose keep a

58 Letter, E. Joy Morris to William Hunter, July 3, 1865,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. XVIII).

59 Letter, J. P. Brown to Assistant Secretary of State,
May 1, 1867, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XX).

60 Letter, E. Joy Morris to J. P. Brown, May 30, 1867,
USDD (Turkey, Vol. XIX).
groom. I must also pay a bridge fare of . . . . 14 cents each time, so that all of the outlay beyond the $15 per month given me, is out of my own pocket. Besides this, I am frequently under the necessity of giving some bakshish to servants; and as the Minister indulges in grossly offensive remarks on the subject, when I charged these items, I have performed to pay them also out of my own pocket. In the hope that the Minister would relieve me of some of this, by allowing me the pay of a groom. I asked for it, and received in reply a most unsettling letter, . . . .

Brown also decided to tell the Department that Morris had cut him off from the dispatches to and from the legation.

"As there is no Legation Office, I (its Secretary) never see a Dispatch written to or by it! Nevertheless, I have particular printed instructions from the Department, which require me to have charge of, and attend at such an office. I am, therefore, cut off, entirely, from the Legation, and fill a position as disagreeable as yours would be, if whilst holding the office of Assistant Sec. of State, you had no access to the Department.

I do not write all these facts to the Hon. Sec. of State, for the reason that I do not wish ever to be known as a complainer against the Head of the Legation, I believe, however, that few other Secretaries of Legation, would be silent under similar circumstances, - or continue to hold office. The latter alternative open to me, and I feel that my career must soon terminate, if, Morris continues . . . to deal so unfairly towards me. It would be a great satisfaction to me to know the opinion and intention of the Department, as early as possible, so as to shape my conduct accordingly. M. is excessively disliked by all of the Turkish Ministers; and even the Greeks, whose cause he openly adopts against the Ottoman Government, (the Candians . . .) him for having deceived them with false hopes of affective interference on their behalf, by the U. S. Government."62

On May 15, Brown notified Morris of his leave, and on the 30th, departed for Europe.63 Morris was peeved that the Department had not

61Letter, J. P. Brown to Assistant Secretary of State, May 1, 1867, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XX).

62Ibid.

notified him of Brown's plans, and he complained of being left without a secretary or a dragoman. He even suggested separating the offices held by Brown so he would not be left without an assistant in the future. The Department ignored Morris' letter, but on June 24, Seward responded to Brown's by granting him $15 a month, from the contingency fund, for a groom.

Brown announced to his readers in the Scioto Gazette that he would be absent from the "Streets of Stamboul" for a while, but would keep them informed of his travels in Europe. These articles on Europe outlived his vacation by five months, and their termination marked the end of his regular correspondence. The Gazette received a total of three letters during the last four years of Brown's life.

Reading these letters is like intruding upon Brown's fond reminiscences. Their deeply personal quality gives the reader a sense of knowing the inner man. With the conflict in mind between Morris and Brown the following passage shows Brown to be philosophical about the whole situation.

"You will miss my letters, for some months at least from Stamboul. I have left it and its streets, on a conge' of four months, in search of health and relaxation, and am now a wanderer over the more civilized, and, consequently more pleasant parts of Europe.
In the course of my prolonged residence abroad this is the first time that I have enjoyed such a privilege as that

---
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which has now been granted me. 'All work and no play,' says the nautical adage, 'makes Jack a dull man,' but when Jack has once 'shipped and signed the articles' he is no longer his own master, and must obey the Captain and do his share of navigating the vessel, without any regard to his own views and private wishes. I have been attached to the same 'ship' for no less than thirty-five years, and having now been allowed to 'go on shore' for a 'land cruise,' feel somewhat as Jack would under similar circumstance.\(^67\)

The trip provided needed rest and a change of scenery. The family was present at the coronation of the Emperor of Austria as King of Hungary and in Vienna when Sultan Abdul Aziz passed through that city on his return to Constantinople, after visiting the capitals of Europe. In the town of Ofen, Brown visited the tomb of a Moslem dervish named Gul Baba (Father Rose), accompanied by Mr. Vambaras, the author of, Travels of the False Dervish to Bokhara, Samarcand, and etc.\(^68\)

The vacation was slightly marred by an eye condition, as related by Brown.

"I could scarcely see when both (Pest and daylight) at last came ... I could scarcely open my eyes; they were highly inflamed and so swollen that I was quite alarmed by it, and imagined that it must be an attack of ophthalmia, as during the whole night we had been traveling over the low sandy plains, for which much of Hungary is remarkable. On reaching the terminus of the R. R., I made my way as best I was able, to a pump and bathed my face and eyes with cool pure water, and this somewhat improved them, though they continued swollen and inflamed during the whole of my subsequent stay in Pest."\(^69\)

The joy of living was not dulled by Brown's momentary discomfort. His

\(^{67}\)Ibid.


\(^{69}\)Ibid.
His enthusiasm for life is nowhere better displayed than in the final letter of the European series. Viennese children playing in the Prater evoked feelings of youth and innocence. "Who would not, indeed, be the children's friend, and draw inspiration from the primitiveness of their angelic faces?" Music, royal zoos, and alcoholic beverages were topped off with comments on the Austrian government. The pleasant sojourn ended, on September 20, 1867, with Brown once again becoming lost in legation business.

The two and a half years following Brown's conge are the most obscure in his public life. The legation files contain very few of his letters, and very little indication of his activities. The only recorded information concerning Brown, during this period, comes from the jaundiced pen of Morris. Brown's continued interest in Turkish-American relations accompanied by Morris' greater embroilment with Greek interests caused Morris to focus all his animosity and frustration on Brown. The purely personal quarrel was fed by Morris' paranoia, unfounded rumors, and personal tragedy.

Morris believed in the right of intervention. A more civilized country had the right to straighten out the affairs of a less civilized country. Morris' philosophy, though not expressed in relation to Turkey, was a philosophy detrimental to the sovereignty of

---
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that Empire. After discussing the "unexampled barbarity" of the Turkish forces on Candia, Morris made the following observation to Seward.

"A general expectation and desire is entertained here that the United States shall interfere in Mexico and restore order and peace to that troubled country. This is now considered to be our duty, as it is mainly through our course of policy that European intervention there has been brought to an end. The sooner all Mexico is brought into the United States, the better for it and the World at large. Is there not a probability that a majority of the people of Mexico are now ready to elect themselves members of the Republic of the United States? What an honorable page it would be in the history of the present administration if such a result could be accomplished during its existence!"72

He also spoke of friendship with Russia.73 With dispatches of this nature open to the scrutiny of foreign ministers, one can easily imagine the uneasiness felt by the Porte.74 The American Minister, in one brief dispatch, had expressed friendship with two of the Ottoman government's foremost enemies, and a philosophy, detrimental to its existence.

In October, Morris objected to the new British Ambassador.

"Mr. Elliott unfortunately for his government is so fanatically Turkish as to be unable to furnish it with any reliably correct information of the state of things here. Lord Lyons was too great a lover of truth to permit himself to be deceived, or to be the instrument of deceiving others."75


73Ibid.

74Letter, Edward Blacque to William Seward, Feb. 7, 1868, U. S., Department of State, Notes from the Turkish Legation to the U. S. Gov't.

There was no doubt of Morris' animosity towards Turkey, or that Mr. Blacque knew what Morris was writing. Blacque sent a copy of Morris' letter of April, 1866, concerning the Sultan's mental condition to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Morris embarrassed by the confrontation of his own words, told Seward that Blacque was a troublemaker and that his first impression of him was correct. Seward apologized to both Morris and the Porte but warned Morris to be more careful in his appraisal of events. Morris still in pique, lashed out at Fuad Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, for publicising the letter and especially for complaining to him through Brown. The incident was still receiving newspaper coverage, as late as mid-April, 1868. The New York Herald stated, "The Porte does not relieve Mr. Morris from a suspicion of his hostility to the Porte, and his unjust appreciation of the intelligence of the Sultan." It was especially critical in that the writer claimed that Morris had never conversed with the Sultan to know his mental condition.

Morris' mental health was not the best, at the time, nor would it improve for several years. On March 23, 1868, Mrs. Morris died of

---
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Bright's disease. The brief illness and sudden death of this brilliantly accomplished woman, who had been both wife and confidant, left Morris alone in his battle with the windmills. With his own fears closing in around him, and two infant daughters tugging at his trouser legs, Morris began to lash out at everyone within reach.

Needing reassurance and a confidant, he turned to William J. Stillman and Julius Bing. These two liberal cause carriers tied him more closely to the philo-Greek element in the United States. The Greek Relief Committee with its office in Boston served as the nucleus for anti-Turkish feeling in the United States. Its president, Samuel G. Howe, and one of its secretaries, Horatio Woodman, accompanied by Stillman and Bing, kept in close contact with Mr. Rangabe, the Greek Minister to the United States, and Senator Sumner, chairman of the committee on foreign relations.

The Greek Relief Committee was a highly vocal group determined to aid Greece, and the Greeks, to the detriment of Turkey. Woodman wanted Sumner to have arms sent to Greece for a conflict with Turkey. Howe told Rangabe that the Greeks are America's natural allies and hoped that they would take over the Danube basin from the Turks.

---
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On May 21, 1868, Morris accused Brown of maintaining a secret correspondence with newspapers for the purpose of misrepresenting the head of the mission of which he formed a part, and added, "... he corresponds with three European papers on behalf of the Turkish government." The vague unsubstantiated charges were not pursued, and as the year progressed the conflict in the legation seemed to lessen. In late December, the wounds began to open again. Morris, as the passive party, merely reported events that might reflect badly upon him, if unexplained. He asked permission to use the consular dragoman for legation business in case of need, saying, "(this) will obviate the necessity of an additional Dragoman for the legation." He was officially hinting that he did not want David Brown as legation dragoman. Privately and confidentially Morris spoke more candidly.

"I most respectfully in view of the public interests urge compliance with the request in the accompanying despatch. It will be impossible ever to make the adopted son of Mr. Brown an assistant Dragoman. As a man of honor I say he is totally unfitted for such a duty. He is a public scandal by his debaucheries, and his profligate and abandoned course of life. He does not study and is demoralized to the last degree. I regret to say this, but it is the truth. The $600 given him annually by your liberality is a money thrown away. Last week one of the girls who sing at the cafes here, made a complaint against him before the Consul for assault and battery, he having seriously maltreated and abused her in a midnight brawl."

---


David Brown was a very weak point, in his father's official armor, but Brown's own behavior did not strengthen it any. On December 30, Morris made accusations against Brown in the Trotta case. The incident involved a note presented, in Mr. Trotta's behalf, by the American Legation, to the Porte, for payment of a debt owed by the Ottoman Ministry of War. The note stated Trotta to be an "American subject" for whom "the Legation begs and demands" payment. Morris knew nothing of the demand even though it bore the legation seal. Although unsigned, Morris declared it to be Brown's handwriting. General T. P. Mott, son of the surgeon whose daughter married Edward Blacque, brought the affair to Morris' attention but informed him that a satisfactory explanation had been given. Mott was temporarily residing in Constantinople as the representative of "certain speculating interests." 86

This was one of many serious accusations made against Brown, upon which no charges were made, and the evidence was destroyed with the knowledge of the claimant. Brown's enemies were interested in putting his character in sufficient doubt to merit his removal, without placing themselves in jeopardy. Mott, while professing friendship for Brown, may have been interested in his removal, in order to pursue an arms deal with the Ottoman government. No proof exists that Brown was working with Mott, although heavy imputations to that effect were made by Bing in a letter to Sumner. Bing

referred to Brown, as a member of a philo-Turkish conspiracy composed of Stanbery, Blacque, Senator Ney, and Mott.\textsuperscript{87} It was a case of guilt by association, and with Brown, as the common denominator, guilt rested heaviest with him. Stanbery kept Brown in office; Blacque opposed Morris for the same reason Brown did; Senator Ney had met Blacque, Brown, and Mott on a visit to Constantinople and had spoken in Brown's behalf several times; and Mott was a soldier of fortune who may have met Brown as early as 1836, when his father visited the Sultan, (possibly to remove a brain tumor). Three days later, Bing wrote to Sumner about a "Turkish-American Ring" trying to remove Morris. He specifically named Hiram Walbridge, a well known stump speaker, as their nominee for Minister to Turkey.\textsuperscript{88} Bing also asked to Brown's dismissal, equating anti-Greek feeling with anti-Americanism. He waved the red shirt vigorously.

"I hope that early measures will be taken for the dismissal of Dragoman Brown, a notorious partisan who if it had not been firmly for the support of his former political godfather, Jeff Davis and others . . . would never have been permitted to hold for a whole generation an office which he has only used for misrepresenting Republican American ideals, and for playing into the hands of the worst enemies of liberty any where and every where and for intriguing against his official Chief."\textsuperscript{89}

On January 17, Morris added what should have been the coup de grace but failed as one more in a long series of vicious

\textsuperscript{87}Letter, Julius Bing to Charles Sumner, Jan. 1, 1869, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 144, Item 108).

\textsuperscript{88}Letter, Julius Bing to Charles Sumner, Jan. 3, 1869, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 144, Item 109).
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attacks against Brown. All the old charges were exhumed and elaborately draped with the proper adjectives. Brown was accused of having a "perverted mind" in his prosecution of Goddard and being branded by the Department as a "false accuser" by Goddard's exoneration. Morris quoted Mott and Blacque as speaking against Brown, which would indicate that they were not in league with him, yet Morris made that contention in a later passage.\(^9\) Morris was bitterly afraid that he would be replaced before Brown was struck down by justice and as a result wanted to be assured of a high quality successor.

"I pray to God that Gen Grant will not send any such tool of despotism, wrong and outrage to this court. When my successor is named, let him be a sterling American, pure in mind and morals, a man of impregnable virtue, a Republican, and a friend of liberty and I will rejoice to welcome (him) to this field of labor, trial and suffering. 

I do not my dear sir, write thus to invoke your influence to retain me in this office. I am ready at any moment to respond to an invitation to give my resignation (to) Gen. Grant, if you and other true friends of the country think with him that a change in my office is expedient."\(^9\)

In dispatches that followed, shortly, Morris contended that the American journals were wrong in saying he was on bad terms with the Porte. In this communication he blamed Blacque for the articles, whereas, Brown had received it in a previous dispatch.\(^9\)

On January 31, 1869, following the severing of diplomatic relations between Turkey and Greece, Morris wrote one of his classic

---
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"In accepting also the charge of Hellenic interests conditioned on your sanction, as committed to me by the retiring Greek Minister, I did it in the hope of being able to serve both Turkey and Greece, by becoming a neutral channel of communication between them, and of thus facilitating a return to a good understanding. I have never, during my residence here, in any way permitted myself to intermeddle in political questions out of my legitimate sphere, and have been scrupulously careful compromising directly or indirectly the interests of the United States . . . .

... In thus acting, I shall perhaps be the means of yet further increasing the moral influence of the U. S. upon the general affairs of the world." 93

Morris was hasty and short tempered, in contrast to Brown, who had grown up in the bureaucratic lethargy of the East. Indicating that Brown was still serving the legation is a letter by him to Morris dated March 13, 1869, in which he attempted to soothe Morris's impatience. "I believe that up to the present time, H. H. has not had leisure to read the report of the Commission, and has not submitted it to any Council or Tribunal. Perhaps a few lines from yourself, or a personal visit tomorrow, would keep him to his word," 94

On March 17, 1869, Brown sent a petition to both houses of Congress asking, that his salary be raised to that of the dragoman and secretary in China ($5000). 95 On the 22nd, he sent a record of his
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service to President Grant and asked that he receive a promotion. At the same time, Bing was urging Senator Sumner, chairman of the committee on foreign affairs, to replace Brown and separate the offices of secretary and dragoman. He assured Sumner that the Porte was satisfied with Morris. In April, Bing notified Sumner that Morris wanted to warn him that Messrs. Hunter and Chilton, in the Department of State, were friends of Brown. He claimed that the Turkish ring was pressing for Senator Nye's appointment as Minister. Brown was ridiculed by Morris as being pretentious. Having seen Blacque in the President's anti-chamber, Bing began the rumor that he was there to oppose Morris. A few days later Bing asked Sumner if Morris' letter, on the Trotta incident, should be published. There was no doubt of a conspiracy at work, but Morris and Bing were at the head of it and not Brown.

Hope for Brown appeared dim without the events of April, May, and June. For the first time the missionaries turned against him, but his salvation was that they turned against Morris also. In April,
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one of the Protestant Armenian congregations suffered a split. The dissenting group staged a sit-in, at the church, refusing to allow the conformists to hold services or use the premises. The missionaries refused to listen to arguments, feeling that the dissenters were wrong in dividing that the missionaries had established. Brown, not convinced of the correctness of the missionary position, asked the Ottoman magistrate for a cooling off period, during which time the dissenters were left in charge of the church. When the case was adjudicated, the missionaries lost. The missionaries held Brown and Morris responsible. Rev. Schauffler, a long time resident of the Empire, and a close friend of Brown told Rev. N. G. Clark, corresponding secretary of the Board of Missions, that Morris and Brown were at loggerheads and should be replaced. A few days later, Schauffler wrote a similar letter to the same gentleman, in which he asked that his request be kept secret. "It would be unfortunate for Brown to know that we specifically complain of him. It would likely make it utterly impossible for us to get him to do another thing for us."

Morris, Bing, and Stillman refused to give up, Brown had to be

---
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remove:. In May, Bing carried the following quote from Morris to Sumner. "My own dear wife partook too deeply in my sorrow and troubles. May her persecutors Blacque, Brown, etc. . . . . He . . . from the suffering to which they subjected her gentle nature."

Morris' mental condition was blaming Brown for his wife's death. 104

Throughout June and July, Morris' letters, professing innocence of all charges, friendship with the Porte, and misrepresentation by Blacque, assailed the Department. One of particular interest was to ward off the charges of C. W. Goddard, who had sent an abusive letter concerning Morris to the Department. Morris was upset that Goddard, of all people, would prove his enemy. He characterized Goddard, in every way, as being an offensive, objectionable and dishonest individual, who was given every benefit of the doubt by him. Morris contended that he literally bent over backwards to be nice to him, and it was he who prevented him from being convicted, when Brown brought charges against him for improper use of funds. 105 It seems impossible that Morris could have considered Brown perverse in trying to convict such a man.

During the summer, Stillman visited Morris and was supplied with venom for a widely circulated article in The Nation, entitled "Our Diplomatic Service in the Levant." Brown and his son were

104 Letter, Julius Bing to Charles Sumner, May 5, 1869, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 145, Item 56).

105 Letter, E. Joy Morris to Hamilton Fish, June 8, 1869, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXI).
depicted as worthless, and their dismissals called for, at the
ever earliest date.\textsuperscript{106} Three weeks after the article appeared, George P. Marsh wrote Sumner one of the most noble defenses, ever written in Brown's behalf. Although not aware of the people involved in the conspiracy, and suspecting Dainese, Marsh objected to the separation of the offices of dragoman and secretary, or the use of a Levantine dragoman. He exhibited complete faith in Brown.

"Brown . . . is among the most devoted faithful and useful - I am sorry to add most ill used - public servants I have ever known in the employment of our government. The charges against Brown referred to by Stillman I never heard of before and know nothing of, but I would . . . on the proposition that they are either absolutely false or capable of satisfactory explanation."\textsuperscript{107}

To Stillman's remarks about Brown's language ability and the worthlessness of his son, Marsh answered simply and honestly.

"It is true that Mr. Brown's early advantages were imperfect, but he has been a most diligent student of Turkish, infinitely better French than most American diplomats and is not only well versed in the Turkish language and customs, but is a respectable Persian scholar and has at least a tolerable acquaintance with Italian, and I think Greek. His adoptive son I only knew as a child, but he was especially in the acquisition of languages extraordinarily gifted and I have not a particle of doubt that his knowledge of Turkish is far superior to that of the shallow swindler who has been so long trying to secure a position at Constantinople."\textsuperscript{108}

Unfortunately it was not David Brown's language ability to which Morris objected. It was his immoral reputation. On


\textsuperscript{107}Letter, George P. Marsh to Charles Sumner, Oct. 26, 1869, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 94, Item 349).
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November 5, 1869, Morris was faced with another of David Brown's escapades. Antonie Kessidji, an Ottoman subject, had words with David in a restaurant, and by Morris' report David once outside the restaurant murderously attacked Kessidji with an ax-headed riding crop. David Brown was placed in a Turkish prison, from which he was released, in his father's cognizance, and fled to Syria for a month. In the meantime, Brown supposedly bought-off Kessidji, to enable his son's return.

A month later Morris notified the Department that Brown was by personal avowal a correspondent for the New York Herald. Although he credited Brown with discussing public questions and attacking the policy of foreign governments in his articles, Morris was not interested in making a formal complaint. He merely wanted the Department to sent the legation a strongly worded circular against such activities on the part of diplomatic officials.

In January, 1870, after eight years of being associated with Brown, Morris asked him what official seals he had in his possession. It turned out that Brown held five, of which the government had paid for only one. Morris feeling that Brown had no right to any of the
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seals, requested the Department's comment. Hamilton Fish, secretary of state, approved Morris' action and agreed that Brown had no right to the seals. Times were changing and what had been customary was no longer so. As a young man Brown had found it necessary to seal rather than sign letters for official purposes, and the seals had accumulated as he held one office after another. Having purchased the seals with his own money, he had been under no compulsion to leave them at the legation office, when there was none. Besides, at any moment, he might have been thrown into another situation for which the seals would again be needed.

While the seal dispute brewed, David Brown, once again, got into trouble. This time he challenged a twenty-four year old Armenian gymnasium owner to a duel, over an anonymous picture in the latter's possession. The duel was fought with slight injury to both men but Morris reported to the Department. Knowing that dueling was a felony in the United States, Morris wanted the Department to tell him what to do. On the same day, he wrote to Bing.

"I have written fully today to Mr. Fish about David Brown's doings, and the duel, and as I am determined to discharge myself of all responsibility for the conduct of that precious son of a precious father."

---
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The Secretary of State, informed Morris in the return mail that there was no Federal law against dueling and, having taken place in Turkey, it would not apply anyway. "I am not disposed to recommend any further action on your part."\footnote{Letter, Hamilton Fish to E. Joy Morris, Feb. 26, 1870, \textit{USDI} (Turkey, Vol. II), p. 272.}

The closing days of the Morris ministry were at hand and Morris wanted to take everyone with him. He was especially enraged by Blacque, who presented the President with a letter from Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, Halil Bey, demanding Morris' removal.\footnote{Letter, E. Joy Morris to Julius Bing, Jan. 26, 1870, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 96, Item 74).} Aali Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, denied having anything to do with the letter.\footnote{Letter, E. Joy Morris to Hamilton Fish, Feb. 23, 1870, \textit{USDD} (Turkey, Vol. XXI).} This assured Morris that Halil Bey and Blacque were trying to get back at him, for exposing a shady arms deal, in which Oscanyan and Blacque made $12,000 out of a $20,000 sale. He had no respect for Halil Bey, who had spent one million dollars in debauchery and gambling at Baden Baden and St. Petersburg.\footnote{Letter, E. Joy Morris to Julius Bing, Jan. 26, 1870, HUHL, The Charles Sumner Papers (Box 96, Item 74).} Always the man of morals, never the man of prospective, Morris confided in Bing, upon receiving a telegram requesting his resignation. An article on Turko-Russian-American affairs signed by Blacque, and published in 	extit{La Turque}, was in his mind written by Brown. Anger having blinded him, he tragicly wrote, "(I am) sorry to leave Brown..."
and his debauched worthless villain of a son behind me." It ought to be noted that in spite of Morris' feelings toward Brown, the son rather than the father received the harsher indictment.

Resigning in June, but remaining at his post until his successor arrived in November, Morris made two more attempts to remove Brown and his son. In late June, he asked Fish to withdraw the $600 from David Brown's educational allotment, and in October of the following year, after Morris returned to the United States, the money was cancelled, (Morris suffered a mental breakdown on his way home and spent a year in Italy, under a doctor's care).

Just prior to his departure, Morris sent a formal complaint to the Department, concerning Brown's alleged correspondence with the New York Herald, which was substantiated by rumor of Brown's personal avowal, and by admission of Messers J. W. Tooley and H. N. Stanley of the New York Herald staff. His reason for waiting, so long, before bringing charges is no more satisfactory than any of his other explanations for actions in relation to Brown.

"I have forborne calling the attention of the
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Department, to this illegal correspondence of Mr. Brown, until on the eve of retiring from office, lest it might be supposed that I acted on personal motives. I deem it my duty now, however for the purpose of correcting such an abuse, and out of regard to my honorable and immediate successor in office, to report the facts to the Department. I am satisfied, that such a correspondence, is every way pernicious in its tendency, and that it cannot be continued without injury to the government interests.\footnote{124}

Before Brown could be notified of the charges, his new chief, Wayne MacVeagh had already put in for a leave of absence giving health, a four hundred client legal practice, and small children at home as the reason.\footnote{125} When the charges finally reached Brown, he denied them flatly, providing the testimony of two witnesses. The widowed Mrs. A. B. Churchill testified that her husband had been the correspondent for the \textit{New York Herald} for several years past and had been paid by the editor\footnote{126} During his last illness, a relative, William R. Page, had served as correspondent and later Mr. Guanacine.\footnote{126} Nathan Hawley, Editor of the \textit{Levant Times and Shipping Gazette}, made a statement accusing Morris of the very crime for which he had charged Brown. Morris had frequently supplied the \textit{Levant Herald} with articles on political news or ideas and puffs about himself. His line during the Crete crises was welcomed, because the paper was pro-Greek. Morris actually served as a messenger for the publication of Stillman's

articles on Crete. Brown's personal testimony made Morris look even worse. Messers Tooley, Stanley, and Stillman were friends of Morris, Brown was not personally acquainted with any of the three; yet each spoke ill of him in articles published after their departure from Constantinople. Brown declared, "I have never been the correspondent of any N. Y. newspaper, nor indeed of any other; and am too well aware of the regulations of the Department to become one. Although never a paid correspondent, Brown was a frequent contributor to numerous publications in both Europe and the United States. In an age of anonymous articles it is difficult to trace the writings of any specific individual without a definite citation. In the case of Brown it is well established that he wrote for the Levant Times, the Scioto Gazette, the National Intelligencer, Hunt's Merchants' Magazine, and Knickerbocker Magazine. The fact that the vast majority of his articles were of a non-political nature may have encouraged him to avoid taking the wrap for an act which, although illegal, was common practice among most American diplomatic personnel. The law which prohibited members of the diplomatic corps from corresponding with news publications was instituted to prevent international political

---
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incidents. Brown's denial was a lie, seemingly not so much to cover up wrong doing (in light of known articles), as to prevent another long involved and taxing investigation resulting in no more than a slap on the wrist. Although the visible facts do not support the contradictory possibility, if convicted Brown could have lost his position and thereby all means of support. The fact that he lied on this occasion places his credibility in doubt to the extent that Morris' charges against him bear greater validity than previously. Yet, Morris' irrational and totally puzzling attitude toward Brown, and his behavior in dealing with him, in turn, seem to justify Brown's lie. Whatever the case the unsuspecting Department of State was quick to acknowledge and accept Brown's statement, thus telling MacVeagh not to doubt Brown's innocence. \(^{130}\)

On June 10, 1871, MacVeagh left Constantinople, and Brown became Charge' for the last time. Within days of taking charge, Brown became the host for Captain Stevens and family and the officer of the frigate Guerriere. They made special visits to the sights of the city and their tour was topped by a private audience with the Sultan. Brown, serving as interpreter, held a lengthy conversation with the Sultan in Turkish. \(^{131}\) Not more than a week later, William Seward, on a world tour, arrived in the capital and received greater honors. The Sultan was much impressed with Seward, whose name as a


\(^{131}\)Letter, J. P. Brown to Hamilton Fish, June 29, 1871, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXII).
statesman had preceded him. The two men sat together on a divan, conversing through the medium of Brown. Pleased by Seward's invitation, for him to visit the United States, the Sultan could not accept the offer because he suffered badly from sea voyages. On leaving, Seward was given the high honor of shaking hands with His Majesty.132

In August, when the missionaries were working for accreditation for the Syrian Protestant Medical College, Brown mentioned that it would have been an easier matter, had the founders deleted the word "Protestant," from the name of the institution.133 He also asked the government to sign the property law convention being prepared by the Ottoman government to allow foreigners to hold property. Brown felt that this would be better than trying to get the same rights in a treaty which would stir memories of capitulations.134 Morris had righteously refused to be a party to it.135 In October, Brown made another stand that Morris would have found objectionable. He made it known that he approved of foreign citizens, Americans included, paying taxes on real property to the Ottoman government as long as they were
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fairly levied and administered.  

Brown's Turkey was changing; the great leaders with whom he had shared an interest in reform and a personal feeling of kinship were dying, first Reshid Pasha, in 1858, then Fuad Pasha, in early 1869, and then Aali Pasha, on September 6, 1871. In the last of these leaders, he may have seen himself. "Having had the happiness to enjoy the friendly consideration of the deceased, for so many years, I personally, feel deeply pained by his death, especially as it occurred at an age when most men, are best able to serve their country."  

At fifty-six years of age, he was a year younger than Brown, whose age was already showing. No matter what his age, he could not get along with members of the legation. He and Consul General Goodenow were discussed, in the Department, as being on bad terms, but Secretary of State Fish understood the problem, and that was all that mattered. "His long residence abroad has familiarized him so thoroughly with the habits of the Turks, that he seems, perhaps not unnaturally to underestimate all new comers."  

Although difficult to get along with as a fellow American official, Brown was entirely different out of office. He was a man who knew the value of laws but never felt constrained by them when

---
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necessity deemed otherwise. When a destitute American seaman was found near death in the cold December streets of Constantinople, the American Vice-Consul refused to provide for him, on the grounds that the Department would not allow it. Brown, who as consul during the Crimean War had provided for hundreds of men in similar circumstances, could not let this young man suffer and die without attention. He furnished him with a room, a doctor, new clothes and shoes, and then presented part of the bill to the Department.\(^{139}\) The man lived, the bill was allowed, and Brown had again done as he pleased with no more than a warning not to make a habit of the practice.

MacVeagh resigned, in September, 1871, and his successor, George Boker, arrived in Constantinople, on March 8, 1872. Boker was pleased with the way Brown was operating the legation\(^{140}\) and two months later was regretting that he had not known him longer.\(^{141}\) Following a twelve day visit of the Sultan and the capital, by General Sherman, and President Grant's son, Brown died of a heart attack. His last letter to Senator John Sherman, dated April 24, indicates that personal difficulties were mounting beyond endurance. Conflict with Goodenow was a lesser problem. The major ones were of a financial nature. His plans for his son to succeed him as Dragoman were no

\(^{139}\)Letter, J. P. Brown to Hamilton Fish, Jan. 16, 1872, \textit{USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXIII)}.  
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longer assured, and rumor had it that the offices of dragoman and secretary of legation were to be separated and the latter joined with that of consul general. Back home his brother-in-law, Dr. Bouldin, had lost Brown's entire savings. For the first time, Brown was no longer flexible in his position. He could not threaten to quit for fear of being dropped with nothing to fall back on. He earnestly wanted to return to Chillicothe, but there was no way for him to make a living there, and as he said, "yet, here, I may be useful to my country, for some years to come."

Brown, dying on April 28, 1872, was given a large funeral befitting the head of the American community. The last paragraph of his obituary, from the Levant Herald, best explains the man, who Morris hated for reasons of jealousy and the man who had done so much for Turkish American relations.

"An old and earnest Freemason, Mr. Brown has been the local head of the craft since the departure of Sir Henry Bulwer (Lord Dalling), whom he succeeded in 1869, as District Grand Master for Turkey. In this office, as indeed in his private relations, the extent of his practical philanthropy was only equalled by its modesty — neither counsel nor pecuniary help being ever refused by him in any deserving case. In general society his courteous and kindly manner made him a universal favorite, while in public life he was equally esteemed and respected by all who knew him. Of his integrity, nothing more need be said than that he has died poor, leaving to his widow and only son little beyond the heritage of a named on which not even forty years of Levant official life has left a stain. Not alone the American colony, therefore — to which his loss will be great — but Turks, Armenians, Greeks
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and Europeans of nearly every nationality will hold in kindly respectful remembrance the name of John Porter Brown."^{144}

^{144} Editor, "Mr. John P. Brown," The Levant Herald, (Constantinople, Turkey) April 30, 1872, enclosed in a letter, George Boker to Hamilton Fish, May 2, 1872, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXIII).
"... After so long a residence in this remote part of the
world. I sometimes venture to indulge in the hope that my office
career would some day be terminated, at least by a promotion. But
alas! I am not even so well off as Poor Jack, to look after whom
(it is said) an Angel 'sits up aloft.' Such is destiny, and I believe
men are made in accordance with the theory of my Islam friends, that
every human being has this written on his brow, at his birth, and from
it there is no appeal."

By J. P. B., "Letter from
Constantinople, Turkey - December 4, 1871," Scioto Gazette,
January 24, 1872.

Even in death Congress upheld Brown's desire to keep the
offices of dragoman and secretary of legation together. The State
Department had been under severe pressure to remove Brown and make way
for a new dragoman and secretary, but not wishing to injure him the
Department decided that splitting the offices would allow him to
remain. Congress did not follow the State Department's directive,
as though it realized such a demotion would have serious effects upon
Brown. Congress' action gave hope to Brown's destitute widow and son.
David Brown was the only American citizen qualified to be dragoman,
and whereas the dragoman was not required to be an American citizen
the secretary was. David Brown's application was well received by
Secretary of State Fish and President Grant, but practically no one


1Letter, Hamilton Fish to George Boker, May 30, 1872, LCMD,
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Boker hired Mr. Garguilo, the consular dragoman to fill Brown's vacant position, as dragoman, until a new appointment was made. When Fish notified MacVeagh of David's nomination to the Senate, MacVeagh protested the action. This was followed by Boker's threatened resignation, on the basis of David's character and education. George Washburn led the missionary protest by telling Boker of David Brown's dismissal from Robert College. There was no record of the reason because Dr. Hamlin had kept it off the books, to save the family's face, or to keep missionaries and college authorities on good terms with Brown, their tireless defender. No longer able to use Brown the cause was made known to do what it would to the defenseless family. It was the practice of sodomy.

---


3Letter, George Boker to Hamilton Fish, May 8, 1872, LCMD, The Hamilton Fish Papers (Container 87).

4Letter, Wayne MacVeagh to Hamilton Fish, May 31, 1872, LCMD, The Hamilton Fish Papers (Container 87).

5Letter, George Boker to Hamilton Fish, June 17, 1872, LCMD, The Hamilton Fish Papers (Container 88).

6Letter George Washburn to George Boker, June 19, 1872, attached to a letter, George Boker to Hamilton Fish, June 20, 1872, LCMD, The Hamilton Fish Papers (Container 88).

7Letter, George Boker to Hamilton Fish, June 20, 1872, LCMD, The Hamilton Fish Papers (Container 88).

8Letter, Missionaries to Boker, June 20, 1872, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXIV).
Mrs. Brown, always the overly protective mother and wife, was greatly distressed by the missionary petition. Washburn's note of June 22, was not comforting. "Brown's missionary friends were few in later years due to a misaprehension of the facts." However, neither he nor anyone else would explain.

Believing that the facts had been distorted once again, concerning her son, she was determined to see his name cleared and the position of dragoman awarded him. On July 9, 1872, David Brown's nomination was withdrawn, but Mrs. Brown's determination was not curtailed. The last fourteen years of her life were fruitlessly spent in trying to get her son the position of dragoman, while struggling against a financial whirlpool.

Destitute in Constantinople, with no means of returning to the United States, the Sultan took pity on her with a gift of $250 for passage home. The Brown's left Turkey and their debts behind them, to seek a new life in the United States. The transition was difficult, and Mrs. Brown immediately asked for financial assistance from the government. Several months passed without results, but in March, 1873, with the aid of Admiral David Dixon Porter, Congress awarded her

---
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ten thousand dollars. Its generosity was a combination of Brown's backpay, and a token of appreciation for her husband's service. Lacking wise financial advice, she was again destitute within a matter of seven years. Having used up her claims of sympathy from the government and most of her relatives, her only hope rested with her son, whose way of life promised very little in the way of prosperity.

By January, 1880, Mrs. Brown had sold all of her jewelry and silver and was making crocheted "fancies," as if for her own home, to be raffled at fifty cents a ticket. This enabled her to meet monthly board and room expenses of twenty-one dollars. Her last letter to Hamilton Fish was written, on April 10, 1886, from the House for Incurables. Having suffered a severe stroke of paralysis that had impaired her sight, she once again in a clear hand and cogent style, asked that her son be assisted in getting the job of Dragoman at Constantinople. This would have enabled him to support her, and provide his father's unmarked grave with an appropriate stone. Neither wish was fulfilled and she died without notice.

David Brown fared no better than his mother. After returning

---
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to the United States, in November, 1872, he waited for the government to give him the Constantinople position but then sought a livelihood as a common laborer. For a short time he worked for the Pensacola-Louisville Railroad in Florida but quit when he saw no possibility for rapid advancement. Wandering about the country, until 1881, he got a copyist's job, in the Census Office, and returned to Washington, D. C. from St. Louis, Missouri. When census work ceased he took employment as a clerk in the medical division of the War Department, and in 1891, transferred to the Records and Pensions Office of the same department.

The Records and Pensions Office, housed in the Ford Theater building underwent remodeling, in 1893, to provide extra space for records. The contractors in excavating the basement failed to shore up the upper floors and as a result the Ford Theater Disaster occurred. David Brown was in the building with five hundred employees when the first and second floors fell into the basement. Twenty-four men were killed outright; Brown was among one hundred and five who suffered shock and permanent disability. Having been

---
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trapped in the building for half an hour, Brown, whose lungs were never strong, breathed a great quantity of lime dust. Although suffering a permanent impairment of health, he returned to work for eight months, at the end of which he was fired for drunkeness.

Eight months later, on January 16, 1895, David Henry Porter Brown died of deterioration of the lungs, age forty-seven years. He was buried in a pauper's grave provided by the Masonic order in the Congressional Cemetery in Washington.

Although one of four men found entitled to receive the full sum of $5,000 for injuries sustained in the disaster, his sole heir, a cousin who had nursed him in his last illness, could not collect it. The Secretary of War ruled that having been fired, neither Brown nor his heirs had any right to the money.
Conclusions

Historians have either slighted or totally ignored Turkish-American relations for the period 1832-1872, due to the difficulty of assessing personal relations as opposed to commercial statistics. American trade with the Ottoman Empire was negligible, but American activities in the Empire were not. No group of people contributed so much to the eventual reform and rejuvenation of Turkey as did the Americans, who entered the Empire as missionary teachers. Their accomplishments in all probability are directly attributable to the security provided them by American neutrality as applied by John Porter Brown.

Although the missionary community and the American Legation possessed men of great capability and even greater educational and social attainment than Brown, no American was his equal in dealing with the Ottoman Government and its people. Brown was unique in that he was the only American trained and educated to fill the position of Dragoman at the Legation in Constantinople, and although this was the single most important factor is his long diplomatic career there were others. He was the sole member of the American community, in Constantinople, born and reared west of the Allegheny mountains and he alone among the leaders of the community did not possess an academic degree. Being a strong, self educated individualist with a
simplicity of manner and a dignity of bearing which rapidly won him recognition, Brown tried to wed the East with the West. Being a combination of frontier editor and international bon vivant, he understood all the subtleties of sophisticated society and yet enjoyed the simple humor of the uncultivated mind. As a warm humanitarian, who found equal joy in giving of himself as of his substance, there was no better bridge for uniting two so seemingly diverse civilizations. Christian ethics and morality often stumbling blocks in the missionary character were for Brown the tools of life judiciously applied with common sense. He was the perfect arbiter of Turkish-American differences, not only did he understand both sides, but both sides were aware of his concern for them and depended upon his impartiality.

Brown found it more difficult to resolve the differences that arose between the Dragoman and the Minister, and the Dragoman and special entrepreneurial interests. The personal characteristics that placed him at the head of the American community, operated against him in his relationship with American Ministers and speculators. His position of prominence in the American community put him in direct competition with every American Minister for leadership of the community. The degree of conflict depended entirely upon each Minister's degree of self confidence. The greater their own insecurity the greater their animosity toward Brown. The latter's survival depended not only upon his ability as Dragoman but his strict adherence to the motto "know the Secretary of State and the President and serve your country." His job rested with the political administration in Washington, not the Minister in Constantinople.
Although he would answer charges brought against him by minister or speculator, he did so with a degree of reluctance, believing the government had faith in him and that an answer would merely dignify the accusations. Following this pattern and with the help of well placed friends in Washington, Brown was able to weather all opposition.

Speculators of every nationality viewed the position of American Dragoman as one of the most potentially lucrative foreign jobs in the Ottoman capital. Wholly unsupervised by fellow dragomans, with as direct a channel to the Porte as any of the great powers of Europe and under less suspicion, the American Dragoman could act as a commissioned broker in arranging government contracts with the Porte. The object being to take the Sultan for as much money as possible, Brown refused. The Ottoman Government's financial condition was grave enough without additional burdens being foisted upon it, and besides it would be a disservice to the United States for an American official to disgrace its name. Thwarted in their attempts to corrupt Brown, the special interests turned to disgruntled American Ministers and newspapers for assistance in wresting the "sinecure" from Brown's grasp. He was publicly accused again and again by anonymous sources, but the government remained firm in its support of him.

However, the same government failed to recognize his financial needs, or his service to the republic. Although hurt by this, Brown had no alternative but to remain in his position and hope for the best. He was educated as a dragoman and saw no future for himself elsewhere. Being too old to change occupations and
insufficiently financed to retire he continued in government service until his death.

Brown's contribution to Turkish-American relations, was an atmosphere of cordiality and understanding, that needed the nurturing of each succeeding generation to survive. Neither he nor the great Turkish Ministers with whom he worked lived long enough to introduce their successors to the ongoing relationship. His most lasting contribution although lost to researchers for the past one-hundred years, is a correspondence with the Scioto Gazette spanning thirty-six years. It is the only personal American commentary on general life in Constantinople and the surrounding areas during the peak years of the "Eastern Question." The spontaneous nature of these letters make them more valid sensors of the times than the books and memoirs written by missionaries and others long after the passage of events. Not only do the articles provide the historian with greater material for a more balanced appraisal of the period, but furnish the general reader with literature of a highly animated style, and lasting interest.

A considerable cloud rests over Brown's name in relation to the many charges brought against him during his life and some made following his death. Most of the charges can be explained through reasonable explanation, but a question lingers. Was Brown the honest incorruptible official he would have people believe, or did he indulge in the same practices as Levantine dragomans? During a period of forty years, only two letters written twenty-three years apart give any credence to the latter possibility, and even they are
suppositional. The first was an offer made by Samuel Colt, in 1850, for Brown to serve as an arms broker, for which there is no corroborating evidence that Brown accepted the offer. The second and most damning was the testimony given by Brown's destitute widow six months after his death. Boker explained in a letter to Hamilton Fish that Mrs. Brown wanted him to collect three thousand pounds owed to her husband for arranging the sale of the "Stevens' battery" to the Turks. Both letters along with several unsupported accusations are included in the appendix in order that the reader may judge for himself. Perhaps best fitting the situation are the words of George Boker in relating the disagreeable information to the Department.

"I do not know what view you may take of these revolting secrets of my office. It cannot but pain you to know them; and unless I considered it to be my duty to disclose everything connected with the mission to you, it would be far more agreeable to me to bury these foul things out of sight."

Fish did just that in burying them in his personal papers at the Library of Congress. Whether the deal for the sale of the Stevens' battery was Brown's sole deviation from duty there is no way of judging without the discovery of additional information. Perhaps he was driven to such means in order to save himself and his family from the impending destitution that seemed so apparent with the loss of his life savings and the threatened loss of his position. Whatever the verdict all must agree, in some small way, with the words of those who looked back upon him in death, "Poor Brown."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Term Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jackson</td>
<td>March 4, 1829 - March 3, 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Van Buren</td>
<td>March 4, 1837 - March 3, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Henry Harrison</td>
<td>March 4, 1841 - April 6, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tyler</td>
<td>April 6, 1841 - March 3, 1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James K. Polk</td>
<td>March 4, 1845 - March 3, 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Taylor</td>
<td>March 4, 1849 - July 9, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard Fillmore</td>
<td>July 10, 1850 - March 3, 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce</td>
<td>March 4, 1853 - March 3, 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Buchanan</td>
<td>March 4, 1857 - March 3, 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>March 4, 1861 - April 15, 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johnson</td>
<td>April 15, 1865 - March 3, 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses S. Grant</td>
<td>March 4, 1869 - March 3, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Van Buren</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Livingston</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis McLane</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Forsyth</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Webster</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh S. Legare</td>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Derrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel S. Upshur</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nelson</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Calhoun</td>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Buchanan</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Clayton</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Webster</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M. Conrad</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Everett</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Marcy</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Cass</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah S. Black</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Seward</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu B. Washburne</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Fish</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>David Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Dabney S. Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>George P. Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Carroll Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>James Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Edward Joy Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Wayne MacVeagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>George H. Boker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Positions (held or filled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. Consul at Constantinople</strong></td>
<td>April, 1834 - April, 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March, 1838 - Aug., 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept., 1845 - June, 1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. Consul General after 1857</strong></td>
<td>May, 1853 - Feb., 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1859 - Dec., 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dragoman and Secretary of Legation</strong></td>
<td>May, 1836 - April, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 1851 - March, 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1860 - May, 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct., 1867 - April, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charge d'Affaires</strong></td>
<td>March, 1838 - Aug., 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April, 1843 - Dec., 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept., 1845 - June, 1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June, 1849 - Sept., 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec., 1849 - March, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 1851 - Sept., 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 1852 - June, 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan., 1854 - Feb., 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan., 1858 - May, 1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov., 1859 - Dec., 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1861 - Aug., 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1864 - Aug., 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1871 - Feb., 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreter for Turkish Envoy to U. S.</strong></td>
<td>May, 1850 - April, 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leave of absence</strong></td>
<td>April, 1851 - July, 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April, 1860 - March, 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June, 1867 - Sept., 1867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commodore David Porter m. Eveline Anderson  
(1780-1843) (1808) (179-1871)  
Capt. of the Essex 
Cmdr. in Caribbean 
Cmdr. Mexican Navy 
U. S. Minister-Turkey  
Daughter of Congressman 
Anderson of Pennsylvania 
Sister of Thomas D. Anderson 
U. S. Consul to Tunis, 1820's  

Theodoric Porter m. ( )  
(18 -1846)  
Lt. 
Died in Mexican-American War  

Henry Ogden Porter  
(18 -18)  

David Dixon Porter m. Georgiana Patterson  
(1813-1891) (1839) (18 -18)  
Admiral 
Daughter of Commodore 
Daniel Todd Patterson  

Richard Bache Porter  

David Essex Porter  

Carlisle Patterson Porter m. ( )  
(1847-1914)  
Major 
Lt. Col.  

David Dixon Porter m. Winifred Mattingly  
(1878-1944)  
Maj. Gen.  

Miss Porter m. J. S. Simmons  
(18 -1945)  

Carlile Patterson Porter  
(1918-1949)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Death Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hambelton Porter</td>
<td>1818-1840</td>
<td>Died as a Midshipman in the Navy off the coast of Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imogene Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died in childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Died in Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Porter</td>
<td>1815-1826</td>
<td>Died of fever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Glasgow Farragut</td>
<td>1801-1870</td>
<td>Foster son of Commodore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Porter and first admiral in the U.S. Navy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Porter                |         | Died in Childhood                                |
|                       |         | Died in Childhood                                |
|                       |         | Died in Childhood                                |
|                       |         | Died of fever                                     |
|                       |         | Died in Childhood                                |
|                       |         | Died of fever                                     |
|                       |         | Died in Childhood                                |

| Miss Porter m.        | Leavitt C. Logan (1846-1921) | Rear Adm.                                    |
| Miss Porter m.        | Charles Campbell              |                                                |
| Theodoric Porter      | (1849-1920)                   |                                                |
| m. Bettie Mason       | (1873-1909)                   |                                                |
| Navy Lt. m. Mrs.      | Henrietta                      | Cheston                                      |

| Georgianna Porter     | Marguerite Porter m. Carlos V. Cusachs | Commander                                   |
| Rosalie Porter m.     | Carroll Van Ness               | Bessie Porter                               |
|                       | (1818-1941)                    |                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carroll Van Ness Jr.</th>
<th>David Porter Van Ness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Died from burns incurred in a boiler explosion</td>
<td>Commodore U. S. Consul at Dublin and Tunis Consul Gen. at Constantinople</td>
<td>Commodore U. S. Consul at Tunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consul at Tripoli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William G. Porter Miss Porter Miss Porter</td>
<td>David Porter Heap Miss Heap m. W. O. Sharrer (1843-1910)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samuel Davies Heap m. Margaret Porter
(1781-1853) (1810) (18 -18)
Navy Surgeon
U. S. Consul at
Tunis (1825-42,
1845-50, 1853)

David Porter Heap m. (E. L.)
(18 -1867?)
Medical Doctor
U. S. Consul Gen.
At Constantinople
1861

Margaret Heap m. Adolphus Fielu
(1836)
Rebecca Ann Heap m. Mr. Cunningham
(1836)

Consul for King
of Norway-Sweden
in Tunis in 1830's
Charge d'Affairs
at Constantinople

Evelina Heap m. Albert Gleaves
(18 -1946) (1858-1837)
Admiral

Anna Gleaves m. Thomas Earl Van Metre
( -1940)

Miss Gleaves m. Albert M. Cohen

( ) Cohen m. ( )
( ) Cohen ( ) Cohen ( ) Cohen
John Porter m. Eliza Chauncey Clarke

Naval Capt.

Fitz-John Porter m. Harriet Pierson Cook
(1822-1901)
General
Court martialed
during Civil War
exonerated later.

Holbrooke Fitz-John Porter m. Rose Smith
(1858-1933) (1888)

Robert Henry Porter
Evelina Porter m. Walton Hall Doggett
(1864-1952) (18)
Reverend

Fitz-John m. Florence M. Kitching

Porter Doggett

Margaret Porter m. Nicholas Vedder Poole

Fitz-John Porter Poole
Lewis Rosenmiller m. Rebecca Culbertson Porter (1804) (1786-18 )

Joseph E. Rosenmiller m. ( )

Lucia Porter

William Frederick Orick Rosenmiller m. Annie Smyser

Joseph Lewis Rosenmiller m. Dorothy Sybil (1897-1962) (1925)

| Elizabeth Bowman (1927) |
| Elizabeth Eyster (1954) |

Joseph Lewis Rosenmiller m. ( )

William Frederick Orick Rosenmiller (1955- )
Rev. David Porter Rosenmiller m. ( )
(18-1880)
Lived in Lancaster, Pa.

David Porter Rosenmiller
Susan Rosenmiller
Rev. Geo. F. Rosenmiller m. ( )
(1879)
(two half brothers)

District Attorney
Member of Pa. Legislature
Mayor of Lancaster, Pa.

Miss Rosenmiller
Miss Rosenmiller
Miss Rosenmiller
(1881-196)
(1883-196)
(1885-196)

Neice of
Chief Justice
Mercer of Pa.
lived in
York, Pa.
Ann Porter m. William Porter

A cousin of his wife
(1824) Alexander Boulden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status/Role</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Henry Porter</td>
<td>Vice Commander of the Mexican Navy</td>
<td>Died in battle as Capt. of Libertad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Porter</td>
<td>Died serving as Sailing Master in U. S. Navy off coast of Africa</td>
<td>Died as Captain of a merchant vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Porter</td>
<td>Died as Captain of a merchant vessel</td>
<td>U. S. Consul at Morroco, 1831; Consul at Constantinople, 1837-1852;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. Porter</td>
<td>Died as Ottoman Consul to Washington and Baltimore 1858 to death</td>
<td>U. S. Consul at Morroco, 1831; Consul at Constantinople, 1837-1852;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. P. Boulden</td>
<td>Died as Medical Doctor</td>
<td>Honeymooned in Constantinople after closing short practice in Chillicothe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lived most of life in Baltimore where he was a Correspondent for the Baltimore Sun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Porter m. Samuel Brown (1790-1862)(1813)

Mary Ann Porter m. John Porter Brown (1814-1872) (1840) (1814-1872)
Daughter of William and Ann Porter

David Henry Porter Brown (1848-1895)
Adopted from a foundling home in N.Y.C. His parents were Irish immigrants who died while he was an infant.

Joseph Brown m. ( )

Mary Porter Brown m. Frederick Price
Lived in Cleveland

Nancy Brown m. Mr. Kelly
Child
Child
George Brown m. ( )

(1840) Samuel's son gave her $100 a year after her husband died.

Joseph Porter Brown m. ( ) George Brown James Brown Maria Jane Brown Rebecca Brown m. Mr. Stoman
(1825-1897) (1826-1856) Murdered in New Orleans Willed Samuel's son $800.
A prosperous merchant and real estate man in Bainbridge, Ohio

Margaret Brown m. Thos. C. Campbell John P. Brown Effie Brown m. Mr. Woolgar Perrill Brown m. Ella Rhodes

Winifred Campbell m. Mr. Roche William Campbell m. ( ) Joseph S. Brown Leslie Brown Bessie Brown
(1886-19 ) (1871- ) (1898- ) (1896- ) (1894- )
Lived in Washington Lived in Lived in
Washington Courthouse, O. Courthouse, Ohio.

Colen C. Campbell Joseph W. Campbell
Appendix I

The following articles and letters sent by Christopher Oscanyan to John Hay, President Lincoln's private secretary, are in the R. T. Lincoln Collection at the Library of Congress. They serve as an example of the intense interest others had in the position of Dragoman at the American Legation in Constantinople, and the equally keen hatred expressed for John Porter Brown.


"I herewith take the liberty to send you a synopsis of the reasons why Mr. Brown should be recalled, and also a copy of Mr. Carr's letter, our former Minister to Turkey, the original of which you have already perused. The enclosed slip embodies nearly all the charges against Brown, every one of which can be proved. His recent letter from Constantinople to the Tribune, published on the 17th ult. shows plainly how insolent and abusive he is, and has even been against his chiefs, all of whom have had good reason to complain of him.

In the last correspondance of the N. Y. Herald, of which I send you a copy, you will see how bitterly he is complained of.

I beg that you would be kind enough to r a a l t e known all these facts to the President at an opportune moment, so that His Excellency may thereby be able to do justice both to him and to you humble servant."


"We see, by the reports from Washington, that another officer of our government, J. P. Brown, the United States Dragoman at Constantinople, and the Barnum of the Amin-Bey show, has been called to account.

Public attention has, on several occasions, been directed to the delinquencies and deceptions of this individual, some of which have been of the most glaring character, and we are therefore glad to perceive that steps have been taken to bring his successful and disgraceful career to a close, and that he is actually in Washington to answer the charges preferred against him."
Brown fully merits this overhauling at the hands of our government, for he has labored long and hard to attain this culminating point; public sentiment has been strong against him for years, and it can no longer be stifled.

In consequence of his connection with the late Commodore Porter and his descendants, he has been able to obtain favor with distinguished and influential men near our government, all of whom he has succeeded till now in blinding to his own chicanery, and the effects of his domineering career; at the same time persuading them that the rumors against him were instigated by malignity, and that there was no other person capable of filling the post of interpreter to our legation at Constantinople.

Thus, family influence and misrepresentation have long maintained him in an office which might have been advantageously and honorably filled by others; and with the same reliance he still boldly shows his face in Pennsylvania avenue, and defies those whom he has, on account of his official position, been able to injure and malign.

But since he has been brought to a standstill, we take the liberty of furnishing those intrusted with the investigation of his conduct, as well as the public in general, with some data, as displayed in a brief memoir of the man himself, which will be found in another column of this paper."

C. Newspaper article: Anson Herrick, "Who is J. P. Brown, the Dragoman?" The New York Atlas, June 17, 1860.

"When Commodore Porter, our first diplomatic representative to Turkey, established himself in the Capital of the Sultan, he was, by his domestic solitude, induced to send for his sister, Mrs. Brown, who was at the time residing with Mrs. Dr. Heap, another sister, and the wife of our Consul at Tunis.

By this arrangement, young Brown, then about twenty-one or two years of age, found a shelter under the roof of his uncle; and the diplomatic atmosphere which he there breathed suited his peculiar idiosyncrasy so perfectly, that he soon developed his character as an intrigant, as the sequel will show.

In the callow days of Brown's diplomatic apprenticeship under his uncle, he first began to intrigue against a most honorable citizen and an efficient officer of the United States Government, viz.: William B. Hodgson, of Savannah, who was then Secretary of Legation and Interpreter.

He created such a discord and enmity between the Minister and his gentleman, by enacting the go-between, that the government was obliged to recall either one or the other.

When Mr. Hodgson retired from the service, his place was filled by a certain Asker-Oghloo, an Armenian gentleman of a distinguished family of Constantinople, wealthy, independent, and noted for his superior literary attainments.

This person now became the object of Brown's envy, and he accordingly visited the United States, to secure for himself the post of interpreter, (then occupied by the individual,) without having any of the necessary qualifications, but simply on the score of his own
nativity.

Upon his application to the State Department, in order to test him, a document was given for translation, and it was only the late Professor Turner's superior requirements that enabled him to pass this ordeal; and thus the appointment was secured, much to the displeasure and surprise of his uncle, who was ready to protest against this proceeding, and expose the deception. Yielding, however, to the entreaties of his sister, the commodore retained him, with the order not to show his face in his presence, till he had learned Turkish enough to be able to translate; but the actual and indispensable Dragoman was still kept, dividing the salary with Brown.

Thus it was Mr. Brown's earliest policy to intrigue against whoever was in the path of his ambition, and by degrees he aspired to the entire control of the Legation, till he has been able proudly to say "l'état, c'est moi!"

He could not even brook his cousin, George A. Porter, of Baltimore, whose consular duties brought them into constant collision, so that they were always on bad terms, until Mr. Porter left the Consulate, transferring the same to a certain Mr. Dainese, now in Washington preferring charges against Brown.

It was the same spirit of domination which caused the rupture between Brown and Dainese; for the latter desiring to serve the United States government faithfully, by protecting the rights of its citizens, incurred his displeasure.

A certain Mr. Reeves was being unjustly prosecuted by a Turkish woman, and Mr. Brown could not, or would not protect him. Dainese is appealed to as acting Consul, and he takes the matter in hand and obtains justice for Reeves. Brown is highly indignant. But as the case was justly within the Consular jurisdiction, and his interference as Dragoman in no way necessary, Mr. Dainese speaking the language as a native and being more proficient in Turkish usages, Mr. Brown was discomfited.

In order, therefore, to revenge himself he undertook to dispossess Dainese of the Consulate, on the ground of being Charge' ad interim, and when frustrated in this, for Dainese would recognise no authority but that of the State Department, Brown resorted to the high handed measure of seizing the archives yi et armis, for which purpose he appealed to the Porte, asking for official aid; but the Porte refusing to interfere between two foreign officials, he sought the intervention of the Austrian embassy, on the plea that Dainese was born of Austrian parents, consequently an Austrian subject. The Austrians, glad of the chance, for they were sorely piqued by the assistance and protection which Dainese had afforded the Hungarian refugees, promptly preferred the required aid, and accordingly, marines from the Austrian man-of-war in the harbor were placed at the disposal of the United States Charge' ad interim, J. P. Brown, by whom the premises of the United States Consulate were violated, and the property therein seized -- the particulars of which shameful transaction have already been made public by the action of Congress.

Success naturally emboldens; and though Mr. Brown frequently happened to act in the multifarious capacity of charge, consul, secretary and interpreter, all at one and the same time, yet he was
determined to become the United States Resident Minister.

And it was only to enhance his popularity at home, that he devised the plan of exhibiting a live Turk to the citizens of the New World, thus paving the way to future honors, a graphic expose of which appeared in the columns of the Boston Traveler, of June 19, 1858.

It is evident, also, that misrepresentations have been made by the same individual to the Turkish government, from the very letters with which the Rear Admiral was provided on his recent visit to America. Mr. Brown trusted that the construction of the vessel would be accomplished in some way or other under the auspices of our government, and expected that as negotiator in so public an affair, he would add a certain eclat to his former triumphs.

But it is not ambition alone that instigates this zealous servant of the government. How available he has made his various positions is evident from the numerous presents he has received, the donors of which were doubtless reminded that a diamond snuff-box would be acceptable "to my mother;" shawls, furs, jewelry and silver plates "to my wife," &c.

It is no wonder that an individual with such proclivities and privileges, should have neglected the interests of American citizens, especially when they clashed with his own.

Mr. John Reeves, on whose account Brown has been summoned to Washington, was employed by the Turkish government, as naval architect. When dismissed, he claimed arrears, which were not insisted on by Mr. Brown, because he did not wish to deteriorate his own pacific relations with the Turkish functionaries.

Mr. C. Oscanyan, now of New York, had in 1845, chartered a steamer. His charter party was violated by a Sardinian subject, and his property seized. No redress was obtained by Brown, either from fear of offending the Sardinian legation or from a desire to conciliate the aggressor.

And others of our citizens, who have attempted to establish themselves in Turkey, have been forced to relinquish their projects through the inefficiency of this servant of the United States government.

Yet we are told by the Honorable Senator from Virginia, (Mr. Mason,) that

"As to what the Senator (Mr. King, of New York) may have heard of complaints of Mr. Brown, I know very well that Senator would prefer no complaint unless he knew it to be properly founded. Of the particular instance, I know nothing nor have I the good fortune of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Brown; but I do know, that not only has he had the confidence of the Department of State in the successive administrations of that Department for years past, but of all our ministers, who have been there, three or four in number, within the last eight or ten years; and in every instance, where Mr. Brown has been brought into personal or official communication with any individual or official personage of our government, they have spoken of him always in terms of respect and confidence, and of his zeal, ability and diligence in the
discharge of his office.' - (See Congressional Globe, June, 1859.)

Doubtless the State Department may have been misled like the Honorable Senator himself; but that 'all our ministers, who have been in Constantinople have always spoken of Brown in terms of respect and confidence' may be questioned.

For, commencing with Commodore Porter, whose nephew Mr. Brown is, the Commodore thoroughly disliked him, as may be seen by a record, which he has left in the archives of the legation, warning his successors against the intriguing proclivities of his nephew, J. P. Brown! He only tolerated him for his sister's sake.

Mr. Carr could not brook his insolence, nor his slanderous tongue, and with a complaint against him, he forwarded to the State Department a copy of the above cited document, as a just and reliable appreciation of the individual.

Mr. Spence thought it best to acquire the language of the country to be independent, for seems to have understood the man.

And how he has merited to be highly spoken of by 'individual or official personages of our government' may be appreciated, when it is known that he expressed a reluctance to present the Hon. Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas,) when in Constantinople, to Reshid Pasha, assigning as a reason, that he was too rowdy?

By general testimony, Brown is disliked by the people of Constantinople, distrusted by the officials, and ridiculed at the Porte, where he has been dubbed Turkjeh-Bilmez-Teruman, the 'Don't know Turkish Dragoman!'

Travelers lament his indiffERENCE, and our citizens who have had the misfortune to need his interference in affairs of business, complain bitterly of his imbecility, so much so that one of whom, piquantly observed - 'if you wish to have a project killed outright, employ Brown!''

D. Letter: Dabney S. Carr to C. Oscanyan, Feb. 7, 1852.

"Almost ever since I wrote you last, one of my children has been ill, so that your letter, which I received in due course of the mail, has been neglected. The course of conduct which you tell me has been pursued by certain parties against you is what I can very readily believe, because I know the parties. But you will probably be surprised to learn that the head of the Legation was as bad as any of the set. Why, when Brown was in this country and very soon after he arrived here, he discovered that his chief had been writing to Markoe, a clerk in the State Department to be on his guard against Brown, who, he said, had come to this country to intrigue against him, and wrote to Brown by the same mail, to prevent you, by all means from being appointed to the Consulate. The consequence was that there was very little intercourse between Brown and Markoe while here, which one would have supposed from the active correspondence they had been keeping up with one another while I was at Constantinople, they would have been inseparable companions when they got the opportunity. But the Chief before he went to Constantinople was a friend of Markoe, and I suppose that he and
Brovra did not agree very well and Markoe found he could make nothing of Brown. The truth I suppose was that they all three found each other out. Well, since I received your last letter from Washington I have heard from Constantinople, and as I had predicted, Brown and his chief are at loggerheads. I don't know what is the difference between them; but that precious rascal Hombes and the Chief are spending the winter at Bebek and Brown at Pera. I don't know whether you are sufficiently acquainted with the political language of this country to understand it; but the Chief says he's a Winthrop abolitionist - he says that he is coming home - that Cass will be President, etc. Cass, I recollect Brown said was the Turkish for Goose; but he managed to humbug Gen. Cass when in this country, with that miserable creature Amin Bey or as he was called when they began the game, Amin Effendi. It was indeed a precious humbug. But Amin got tired of Brown long before he left here, and Brown at the end of the game was tired of him. So they quarrelled at Baltimore, and Brown wrote an abusive note and directed it to him by what he (Brown) said was his proper title. Rojah, which, I believe, in Turkish means, teacher. But I only took up my pen to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, which I had been prevented from doing sooner by the illness of my child, who is just pronounced out of danger, and I write with so much difficulty that I must put off what I have to say till I see you, which I hope to do when I go to Washington, which I hope will be some time in the month of March. You will know how intimate it may be well to be with Markoe. He is a conceited, vain, shallow fellow, and you might learn a good deal from him. I have had to memorialise or rather petition Congress for the items stricken from my accounts among the rest $92. per month paid Porter for .... I hope they will grant it, for I am much in want of it. I shall be glad to hear from you always."


"SYNOPSIS OF THE REASONS WHY MR. BROWN SHOULD BE RECALLED AND MR. OSCANYAN APPOINTED SECRETARY-INTERPRETER AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

I. With every new administration changes are made in the government employees both at home and abroad saving a few extraordinary instances. There is no reason why Mr. Brown should be an exception. For, in the first place he is by no means the only American citizen qualified to act as Secretary-Interpreter at the Porte, and in the second place, Mr. Brown has rendered no essential service to our government, on account of which he should be retained in office. He has neither approximated us to the East, nor advanced our commercial interests in those regions; the only distinguishing act of his long service has been to palm off upon our government and the public, a counterfeit official representative of the Porte, in the person of Amin Bey, without any credential.

II. Mr. Brown has been in government service at Constantinople for more than twenty five years, during which time he having officiated not only as Secretary-Interpreter, but frequently as Consul General and Charge d'Affaires, received extra compensation for these
services.

Besides, few men have resisted the prerogatives of long occupation of office, and there is every reason to believe that Mr. Brown has been tempted beyond his loyalty to his own, and the Turkish government. For he has made his position available on many occasions by demanding remunerations for favors which his official relations have enabled him to bestow.

Consequently, Mr. Brown is now able to retire on a full competency, whereas he entered upon the service with absolutely no property at all.

III. It is not true that Mr. Brown has been liked by all our Ministers at Constantinople. For by his long retention in office, the Minister's post has become secondary, or rather the Secretary-Interpreter has become a sort of Dictator; which fact has often been the source of difficulties in our Legation at Constantinople.

IV. Although Mr. Brown enjoys the patronage of the Missionaries, the policy of this government not being based upon religious propagandism his continuance in office cannot be maintained on that ground; and we have other merchant and naturalized citizens in Constantinople whose interests have also claims upon our government; nor is Mr. Brown the only person who could sustain and defend the rights of Missionary citizens.

V. Mr. Brown enjoys unaccountable patronage in this country. Virginia has claimed the honor of his birth and nomination until very recently, when owing to the political demise of his secession patrons Messrs. Mason, Hunter, and others, he has been passed over, birth and nomination, to the state of Ohio. Ere long, by the same mysterious process, as of Homer, seven states may dispute these honors.

On the other hand, Mr. Oscanyan should receive the appointment of Secretary-Interpreter at Constantinople because:

I. He is sustained by the most eminent men of the United States.

II. He is universally acknowledged to be eminently qualified for the post.

III. On account of his thorough knowledge and appreciation of both countries the United States and Turkey - he infinitely surpasses the present incumbent in all the facilities for promoting mutual diplomatic relations, and also for the extension of general knowledge of Oriental peoples and affairs."
Appendix II

The following private letters, written by Edward Joy Morris, contain most of the accusation he made against John Porter Brown.


"I regret to trouble you about a matter of a personal nature, but as I understand that Mr. J. P. Brown intends through his friend Attorney General Hon. Mr. Stansberry to represent the inability on his part of continuing in official relations with me, I beg to make a few explanations in advance of an official answer should you require one.

I frankly admit my official relations with Mr. Brown have been for a considerable time quite strained, & for reasons which are well appreciated here. When I came here I found that previous Ministers had been accustomed to leave everything in Mr. B's hands to spare themselves trouble. I found that this system would involve me in unpleasant responsibilities & I felt it my duty, to assume to myself all the prerogatives & duties of the office which I have had the honor to hold with the sanction of the President & your own approval to the present moment.

First, I took into my own hands the issuing of protections so long as they were allowed, depriving Mr. B of that privilege, for it was virtually surrendered to him by my predecessors. I did this because I discovered that persons of disreputable character were protected, and that even in contravention of the Treaty some of the subjects of the Porte were protected. I struck off not a few names from the list of proteges. Finally a crisis was produced through a complaint of the Greek Patriarch of an aggravated assault made on a Greek in the house of one Madame Anika, who claimed to be an American protege. (Since) no such name was registered on the list, I denied her rights to American protection. Upon being brought before the Consul Mr. Goddard it appeared that she was privately protected by Mr. Brown & that she kept a brothel - a notorious one. This was proven in trial before the Consul. Again I found that with the cognisance of Mr. Brown a house of prostitution at Hunkiar Iskelessi on the Bosphorus opposite Buyukdere - the summer residence of the Diplomatic Corps - was under the protection of the Legation. Having my suspicions excited I investigated the case & found it true. Seeing the impossibility of correcting these abuses, without assigning reasons, I wrote to you a despatch asking that the power of granting protections should be taken away from both the Legation & the Consulates. I could not with my views of propriety and of American dignity permit that the American government should be implicated in maintaining houses of prostitution in Turkey. I have never till this moment assigned the true motive of
government should be implicated in maintaining houses of prostitution in Turkey. I have never till this moment assigned the true motive of my action on this subject of protection.

Secondly, I found that passports were improperly issued & that persons received such who had no right to them whatever. The issuing of these I also took charge of myself.

Thirdly, it became known to me that the sum charged for Exequaturs to the Consuls were double that paid to the Porte & that Mr. Brown received the excess over the actual expenses. This also I broke up, by ordering that in future none but the actual expenses at the Porte should be charged for these documents to the Consuls & also that none but the actual expenses should be charged for the Firmans for vessels passing the Bosphorus & Dardanelles.

Fourthly, I made known that no gifts would be permitted to be offered to or received by myself or any member of the Legation from the Porte, although in violation of the rules some of my predecessors had received valuable shawls &c. & the Secretary also similar presents for his wife. In the East presents to foreign functionaries are a most corrupting influence & should not be countenanced in any shape.

Fifthly, I required that all business should be initiated before the Minister, & that nothing should be transacted without his concurrence. These and similar departures from the practices of my predecessors soon produced a coolness on the part of Mr. Brown & I may say mortification of spirit, because he was shorn of his ancient prestige and significance. Either I was to be Minister or not. A reform was necessary, for crying abuses existed, & unfortunately it fell to my lot to correct them. Since I have thus acted, I flatter myself that no one has been able to breathe a whisper of suspicion against the integrity, honor or dignity, or business capacity of this Legation.

It was another cause of offence that I did not recommend the allowance of an annual payment to the adopted son of Mr. Brown, for the purpose of preparing him for the office of Dragoman. I did not, because in conscience & honor I could not & the American colony here I am sure agree with me in the opinion that he never can become fit for such an office. He has passed all his youth in this foul & demoralised social atmosphere & he is depraved before his time. He is disliked by all Americans for his insolent, impudent manners & for his profligate morals & they with me regard all the money spent on him as so much money thrown away. It would have been very easy to gain favor with Mr. B. by endorsing this boy for qualities which I knew he did not possess, but that I would not do. During the civil war this boy at Mr. Hamlin's school from which he was expelled for bad conduct, disgusted the professors by his rampant enthusiasm for the chiefs of the rebellion. Mr. Brown himself on a steamboat in the Bosphorus had the audacity to curse the American government in loud & violent language to Mrs. Morris, who was annoyed to indig nation at such treasonable language when the existence of the Union itself was at stake. My heart sank within me in the dark hours of that desperate struggle at this tone of speech of Mr. Brown. Part of his vexation was in part to be
ascribed to the condemnation of Gen. Fitz John Porter. It was with
great difficulty I could keep up the American tone of the Legation
throughout the war as is well known here.

Last summer, I received many letters from Mr. Stillman, U. S.
Consul in Candia urging the removal of Ismael Pacha Governor of that
island to avoid the now existing war there. He was a bad, corrupt &
obnoxious governor of the extremest Turkish type. Month after month, I
used all my influence here to produce his removal. It was all in vain
till the war broke out. When he was recalled to Constantinople, he
bitterly denounced Mr. Stillman & this is the key to the suspicions &
denunciations of Aali Pacha. I have felt it my duty to defend
Mr. S. from unjust assaults & to insist that he merits the confidence &
thanks of the Turkish gov't. Since the war has assumed its present
proportions, Aali Pacha has become extremely sensitive to any remarks
impugning the reports of the Turkish government on the subject.
Mr. Brown reported to me by note some observations of his on a
conversation of mine at a soiree at the Russian Ministers. Some
mischief-maker distorted the purport of my remarks altogether, as I was
very guarded. Mr. Brown reports them without preface or apology in a
very blunt & disrespectful manner at the tail end of a note on
miscellaneous business, the original of which I enclose. As I knew
Mr. B. was anxious to ge me into some false position on the Cretan
troubles, I felt doubly indignant, both for the want of any polite
formalities on his part such as are usual between functionaries of
different grades, & also because of the attempt of Aali Pacha to
control my rights of private speech & responded immediately in a note
of which I hope he will send you the whole text. Some general
allusions he applied to himself, which were intended strongly to
express my contempt for double dealing & upon the misconstruction he
addressed me a most insulting note, the purport of which is known to
be false by all who are cognisant of my manner of life here. In this
note he recites some depreciating remarks which he made to Aali Pacha
on being charged with this offensive communication. Had he affixed
them to his first note no misconception would have arisen. Any other
Secretary would have used some polite conventionalities in conveying
such a message to his Chief. I sent Mr. Brown the enclosed reply to
read to Aali Pacha which upon assuring me that he had, & upon declaring
also that His Highness had confirmed Mr. B's report of his remarks to
me, I at once by note to a mutual friend an American citizen and the
physician of both families, Dr. Stamatides, released Mr. B. from any
responsibility for them & withdrew all the allusions in my notes. I
could not of course reply to Mr. Brown's vulgar & denunciatory abuse.
If a man charges me with all the crimes in the catalogue (sic) I am not
bound to defend myself against such - nor if I am assailed by vile
epithets am I obliged to degrade myself to the use of the same.

The truth is Mr. B. has so long been accustomed to domineer &
rule here, that he cannot brook contradiction & his manners have
become so offensively insolent & overbearing, that he has gained the
ill-will of almost all the U. S. officials here & in the provinces.
Because too that I have gained some little local reputation here &
have single-handed almost managed successfully the affairs of the
Legation he is yet more vexed. Not a man lives in this community who
can utter a word against my private life. Upon this I defy a comparison with that of Mr. B. & we will see who will stand or fall by the test.

Had I sought to injure Mr. Brown I would have sent to you a note of Aali Pacha suspending him from all relations with the Porte until he had made an apology for grossly insulting language to an officer of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs at the Byram fete some three years since in the presence of the Sultan, the Diplomatic Corps and the high officers of State, when he attempted to introduce an English Governess of doubtful reputation into the Court Circle. And I might also have transmitted the records in Madame Anika's case.

For a time I allowed him to keep the Archives, until I discovered they were kept in a house of bad reputation, which his own wife would not enter, & where proceedings of such a disgraceful nature took place as to provoke written complaints to me by one of the inmates. I could not enter such a house without compromising my reputation & I ordered the Archives to my own residence where they properly belong as the seat of the Legation.

He has accused me of claiming the allowance of sixty-dollars per month for horses which was allowed in the contingent expenditure to my predecessor, while I do not habitually keep horses. I have uniformly stated to the Department that I make this charge cover all expenses of official visits which were previously charged extra. When I was in America on conge' during the war he not only charged my allowance of 60 dollars but added his own of 15 dollars & added besides 29 dollars for attending a fete at Aali Pacha's, & 9.29 for a Fourth of July fete! So there is not much consistency in his complaints on this head. I may say that all of this monthly allowance of mine is spent before the year is out in carriage hiring &c.

Mr. Brown has got up the impression in the U. S. that he is an indispensable fixture here. Everybody here knows this to be absurd. From my own official experience I undertake to say that the interests of the government would be promoted by his removal, & that he is in many cases a serious obstacle to business. The present system of Dragoman & Secretary in one person ought to be broken up. There ought to be a Secretary appointed by the U. S. Gov't. & a Dragoman appointed by the Minister & holding office at his pleasure & then every thing would go on well. The union of the Dragomanship & Secretaryship in one person is very dangerous, & very pernicious to the public interests, of which I am ready to give abundant proof.

When President Johnson was universally assailed here on his entrance on the Presidency, I was his almost sole defender. The enclosed will show how I stood up for what I know to be the sterling qualities of a true man and trustworthy Executive. I issued circular instructions to the Consuls in a similar spirit, & my position has a salutary influence on public opinion in Turkey. For yourself, respected Sir, my feeling ever since I have had the honor to serve under you, has been not only one of respect but I may say of sincere personal affection.

Jealousy & detraction have been my reward from Mr. B. for an honest attempt to serve the country, and it has now assumed such a violent type that he presumes to dictate to the government alternatives of his resignation or my removal. Next he will demand that no Minister be sent here whom he does not approve of first. Can arrogance or
presumption go farther?

This is not the first time Mr. B. has made false accusations to the Department against U. S. officials. He has in fact been at this generally since he has been here. His charges against Mr. Goddard late Consul General were all pronounced to be without foundation. One of them he attempted to sustain by quoting a dead man Mr. Van Lennep as having made certain observations impugning the integrity of Mr. Goddard. Whoever heard of the evidence of a dead man against a living one being admitted on the mere ipse dixit of the accuser! What a perversion of moral principle!

I desire to live in peace with all men & I believe I have not an enemy here, & hosts of friends, but I will not consent, even for the sake of peace to sacrifice my personal rights, the dignity & interests of my government & the honor of the American name. Whenever the President shall see fit to recall me, I shall return to the U. S. without a murmur of complaint, but I have too much faith in his sense of justice or in your own noble highminded character to believe that my name will be allowed to be tarnished by a condemnation founded on malicious baseless & here known to all Americans, to be entirely false & unscrupulous accusations."


"I understand that Mr. J. P. Brown in his own effort to injure me intends to represent to you that the public interests suffer because of his feelings towards me, & my alleged 'incompatibility of temper' &c. This most absurd of all his charges, justifies me in exposing for the first time his gross neglects of duty. For eleven months of year before last he resided with his family at St. Stephano about 16 miles from Constantinople, on the Sea of Marmara. By land owing to the bad roads, access is almost altogether broken off with this place during five months, commencing with November, & there is very irregular steamboat intercourse, because of the heavy seas & bad weather in the Sea of Marmara. From November 1864 to June 1865 when all the Diplomatic Corps & the Imperial Ministers were in town, I was left alone in town to conduct the business of the Legation without Secretary or Dragoman. In such a country as this the Dragoman should always be within hail of the Minister, as serious need of his services may arise at any moment. Sometimes Mr. Brown during this period was not in town for a week at a time. In one instance, in consequence of an illegal invasion of the premises of an American citizen by the Police, requiring instant action, I was obliged, in the absence of Mr. Brown to avail myself of the services of Mr. Garguilo the Dragoman of our Consulate General. The action required was such as could not properly be performed by a Minister. Mr. G. acted under my written instruction & clothed with this authority succeeded in arresting a most illegal & outrageous violation of the treaty-protected rights of an American citizen. This was the affair of Mr. Minassian's magazine of which mention was made in a despatch at the time now I ask with what propriety or even decency can Mr. B. venture, after such a flagrant dereliction of duty, to accuse me of neglect of business."
He is moreover accustomed to go off on hunting excursions of a week or several days, without permission from me, & without even advising me in advance of his absence, or of his whereabouts in case of any sudden necessity for his services. Any other officer of his class of any other Legation would be dismissed from service because of such conduct. Owing to Mr. B's insolent temper and for the purpose of avoiding a quarrel, I bore all these indignities (for such they are) and default of duty & subjected myself to great inconveniences & an amount of hard work that no other Minister here would perform. I necessarily became my own Secretary writing out as well as recording my despatches to the Department & the Consuls & my notes to the Porte. The Russian Minister Gen. Ignatiefi has on several occasions expressed his astonishment at the labor which I have thus imposed on myself.

Almost all my predecessors have occupied a considerable portion of the period of their mission here, in travelling. Mr. Marsh & Mr. Williams both made extensive journeys in Syria, Egypt &c. with the permission & I believe at the expense of the U. S. Government. I might plead their precedent & ask a similar indulgence but I have preferred to rest at my post of duty continuously except for three months during the war, when on the death of my father, you permitted me to visit the United States to regulate certain property interests of my family. And such was my anxiety to return here, that I remained only two weeks in the U. S. With the exception of this brief congé of duty & not of pleasure I have been steadily resident at Constantinople during all the duration of my mission, now nearly five years & a half. A similar instance of continuous residence & devotion to duty is not on record in the history of this Legation.

I will give another instance of Mr. Brown's way of doing business. In September last, I instructed him to procure a vizerial letter to Mithad Bey the Governor of the Vilayet of the Danube, relative to a claim of Messers Azarian, sending him at the same time their letter on the subject. He returned the letter, with the endorsement in his own handwriting, that he had Sept. 20 demanded the vizerial letter. In November of this year Mr. Azarian informed me that on asking Mr. B. for the vizerial letter in question, he denied ever having received any communication from me on the subject, or their letter. I took the letter from the Archives & requested Mr. A. to show it to him with his own endorsement of Sept. 20. Of course such a point-blank refutation by himself in September of his assertion in November was humiliating. After a few days I requested without comment, the return of this document. Mr. B. replied that he had sent it to the Porte. I then directed him to withdraw the original & substitute a copy. Seeing he was cornered (& I doubt if the paper ever went to the Porte for it is quite unusual to send private letters there) he returned the document with that portion torn off which contained my instruction to him in Sept. to procure the vizerial letter in question. I might have made some reproachful reflections on this subject to Mr. B. but I forbore for the sake of peace. Such a transaction needs no comment. The mutilated document I retain in the Archives. This & similar transactions render me very cautious in accepting Mr. B's declaration that he has obeyed my instructions in official business.
The Consul General here & other officials know the difficulties I have had to encounter about business with Mr. Brown & it has been a matter of surprise that I have not brought them to the attention of the Department. I have not done so, because I did not wish to injure him, or to give him causes of quarrel, preferring to work sometimes like a galley slave, rather than to distract my time & attention with personal disputes.

Mr. Brown has been in hot water with hosts of people since I have been here & he has hardly a single friend among all the U. S. Consular corps in Turkey. Myself & family have adopted the rule of never interfering in other peoples private affairs. This is not the rule I know in this evil-tongued community, where Mr. B. has passed some 40 years of his life, He would have enjoyed much more peace of mind & would have had fewer enemies, if he had not fallen into this characteristic local habit.

If I know myself, I have had but one ambition since I have been here & that was to discharge all the duties of my office & to maintain the influence & political power of the U. S. I think without flattery I may say owing to your own statesman policy in the first instance & my own humble efforts in the second, that the prestige of the U. S. was never so high in the East as it is now. I have given to all my public action the strongest American tone & it has had effect of the most salutary character on the Turkish government. Had Mr. B. been less philo-Turk. I could have accomplished much more & all within the limits of a proper diplomatic discretion.

I have no desire to put Mr. B. out of office, even if it were in my power, but I undertake to say, if I had a Dragoman dependant on me for the tenure of his office & appointed & paid by me, as the Consular Dragomans are by their chiefs, I would have a much more effective cooperation & support & could despatch the public business with infinitely greater success & celerity. This is well known here. Most accomplished Dragoman can be obtained here infinitely more conversant with oriental & European tongues than Mr. B, for he knows but Turkish, & is an exceedingly indifferent Turkish scholar both in literature & speech. With any other language he can hardly be said to have an acquaintance except with the Italian, in which he cannot converse & which he does not write. Poor as my own acquisitions in a linguistic sense are they are better than his, as I speak & write French, Italian, Spanish, & German & Greek, can converse with the Sultan's Ministers (not like Mr. B. of course or like a Turk) in Turkish, have studies Arabic & Persian & can make myself quite-well understood in the former. You will see I have not wasted the opportunities the U. S. government has placed at my disposition.

Mr. B. is now I believe about 60 years of age. He aspires I know to prepare his adopted son as his successor. But I do not believe that the American colony desire that he should ever occupy such a position from the moral disqualifications referred to in my previous note. Indeed in my opinion it would be injurious to the public interests that he ever should. He is now such a mischievous & dangerous character that I can have no personal intercourse with him. I repeat in my opinion & I express it without reference to my extention in
office, it would be a much better arrangement if instead of a Secretary & Dragoman combined in one person which is attended with many inconveniences, there was a division of these two offices, to be filled by two separate incumbents - the Secretary nominated from Washington & paid by the U. S. Government & the Dragoman to hold his office at the will & pleasure of the Minister & receiving his pay from the U. S. Government through him. He would thus be held to a strict responsibility & the Minister would also be held to a stricter account for the actions of the Dragoman for he would be responsible for them to his government. In case the U. S. Gov't. should not appoint the Dragoman, the Minister could be allowed to do it. I am certain such a system would work infinitely better than the present, which makes the Dragoman virtually independant of the Minister, rendering it next to impossible to secure perfect execution of the duties which he assigns him. This system in the Consulates with dragomen of local origin has always worked admirably & my experience here satisfied me it would have equal success in the Legation. A most accomplished Dragoman can be obtained for from $1500 to $2000 a year. If necessary for economy's sake even, the office of Secretary might be abolished, though one might live here on $1500, if he were a single man. A seriously disposed young man might as Secretary qualify himself as Dragoman by the study of languages.

I have lived in harmony with people here & am in perfect relations with all my colleagues of the Diplomatic corps & have had no trouble but with my Dragoman & Secretary & that for public reasons I regret it, but my ideas of public duty have led me to adopt the rules of action which have guided my conduct. I owe him no malice & desire him no harm, here or elsewhere.

Before leaving this subject I beg leave to remind you of the great inconvenience arising from the illness of the Dragoman. Being Secretary also that fact deprives the Minister of the services of two offices.

The salary & allowances received by me from government are all expended in keeping up the respectability of the Legation. My house rent costs over $2000 a year. I might live in a mean way if I thought of saving money, but that is inconsistent with my views of what is dignified & proper in my office.

These observations I have ventured to trouble you with, Sir, not for the ignoble purpose of begging for place & honor, but that I may justify myself to you (as one whose good opinion is more precious than gold to me) against accusations everyone of which proceeds from a distempered imagination, & a morbidly proud & jealous nature."

(Letters A. and B. are from The University of Rochester, Rush Rhees Library, William Henry Seward Collection.)


"If I am to credit certain reports in the American press, the Senate may be called on to consider the propriety of my removal from office, on the ground of accusations made against me by Jno. P. Brown,
the Secretary & Dragoman of the Legation. Under such circumstances, I venture to crave your indulgence to allow me to address you a few observations in your character as Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in refutation of the infamous slanders disseminated against me, by a person whose proverbial characteristic is a *mania* for assailing the reputation of other officers of the government. When I first came here, in 1861, I found that the privilege of issuing protections had been abused to such a degree as to dishonor the Legation & the American name, & that it had become a source of corruption. In one instance, I found that a brothel was protected secretly by Mr. Brown. This brothel was kept by a certain Madame Annika. An affray having occurred in it, in which a Greek subject was seriously wounded, the Greek Patriarch brought the affair to the attention of the municipality. When the officers went to the house to arrest Mme Annika, they were refused admission on the ground that she was under American protection. The Municipality upon this referred the matter to our then Consul General, Mr. Goddard, he having learned from me that the person in question was not among the proteges authorized by me, called Mme Annika before him, when she produced a paper signed by Jno. P. Brown, by which American protection was accorded to her. All this was done surreptitiously & without my knowledge. The Consul, at my request, deprived her of the protection & informed the Municipality that she had ceased to be under our protection, and that no such places of infamy in future would be permitted to claim American protection. Mr. Goddard was naturally vexed at such an atrocious prostitution of the American authority, & he had determined to send all the papers on the subject to the Secretary of State. In a spirit of amiable & I fear inexcusable weakness, I persuaded him to desist from this intention. The papers I have reason to believe were subsequently destroyed, by Alexander Thompson, who acted as Vice Consul between the departure of Mr. Goddard & the arrival of Mr. Goodenow his successor. It is not improbable however, that when he left here, he presented copies to the Department of State.

On another occasion, I renewed the protection (protection papers running for a year only) of a certain person residing at Beicos on the Bosporus who represented himself as from Sinigalia in the Pontifical States & as engaged in business. Mr. Brown knew the real occupation & standing of this person but concealed it from me & he even introduced him into my house on a 22nd of February, when the resident American families were my invited guests. I accidentally discovered this deception also. Residing one summer at Buyukdere, a woman came from Beicos on the opposite shore of the Bosporus, to complain that her house had been assailed by some Turkish soldiers & that although she was an American protegee she should (sic.) not get redress from the authorities. She said in reply to an inquiry of mine, that she was the wife of the person to whom I had given a protection at Beicos. Suspecting nothing, I directed Mr. Brown to arrange the affair, which he reported he had done & that all was right. Some ten days afterwards on going over to Beicos, I was curious enough to inquire into the real character of the house inhabited by this person. I found that it was a notorious brothel of the lowest kind, resorted to by Turkish soldiers & others, & occupied chiefly by Wallachian strumpets under the
management of this so called American protegee. Her husband so named proved only to be her pimp & partner in business. Mr. Brown was cognisant of all this, but he concealed it from me, thereby rendering himself a party to the degradation of American honor. On returning to my residence at Buyukdere, I ordered the Cavass to proceed forthwith to Beicos, and coute coute to enforce the delivery to him of the protection paper by the woman & to inform her that henceforward she must not at her peril assume to be an American, or I should proceed with the utmost severity against her. In this case also, I made no complaint, leaving Mr. Brown to the painful consciousness of being exposed by his chief in another shameful deception. Being well assured from my experience in these & other cases, that the honor & dignity of this Legation required the suppression of all protections, I asked Mr. Seward (without assigning any reasons connected with Mr. Brown by name) to deprive the Legation & the Consulates in this Empire of further power to issue protections. This he did, & since that time a source of corruption & infamy has through my intervention ceased to exist. Of course these proceedings of mine were not agreeable to Mr. Brown & they led to ill-feelings on his part, which has been continued with increasing bitterness to this day, which has been manifested in secret attacks in private letters & in anonymous correspondence with American newspapers. I have suffered patiently but as I now see that my reputation & honor are at stake it is time that I should expose the truth.

A few years ago, Mr. Brown took a woman to the annual baise-main ceremony which is held every year in the open court yard of the olf Seraglio at Stamboul. As the tickets of admission permitted only one person on one ticket, he was so informed by the chief introducer of Ambassadors & was requested to observe the rule. Upon this he fell into a great rage & repeatedly in a loud voice insulted this officer by him a polisson &c., and all this in the presence of the Sultan, the great officers of State, and the members of the Diplomatic corps present. This affair of course excited much scandal. The Minister of Foreign Affairs next day sent me an official note referring to the gravity of the offence & demanding an apology from Mr. Brown. He (Mr. B.) hesitating to give it, I was informed by another note that he was suspended from all relations with the Porte & no further intercourse would be resumed with him until a proper apology was rendered. This he finally give (sic.) & was thus allowed to resume the exercise of his functions. Some months afterwards, Mr. B. tremulously inquired if I had sent the notes in question to Washington adding he hoped not, as it would ruin him. I replied that not wishing to do him harm, I had even violated a regulation of the Department to save him, & that I had taken the responsibility of destroying all evidences of their existence. He was very grateful for my action on this case. How short lived his gratitude his subsequent conduct to me shows.

After Mr. Goddard had retired from here as Consul General & while he was on his way to America, Mr. Brown made a formal accusation against him of malversation in office. In order to sustain his accusations he committed the supreme infamy of quoting against him what he said Mr. Van Lennep then in his grave, had said to him, while
living of his transactions with Mr. Goddard in the negotiation of his
treasury drafts. Does this not show a sadly perverted mind. Whoever
heard of the testimony of the dead being quoted on hearsay evidence in
an earthly tribunal to blast the reputation of the living! Such
evidence would be ruled out in the court of Khadmantus himself. The
Department instructed me to make a judicial examination on the subject
which I did in due form & submitted without comment all the evidence
given to sustain the accusations of Mr. Brown. Upon a careful review
of the same, the Department dismissed the accusations as groundless &
Mr. B. was again branded as a false accuser.

Not long after this he made, without consulting me or asking my
cooperation, an application to Mr. Seward for an annual allowance to
enable his adopted son to educate himself for the office of Dragoman &
as his successor. Mr. Seward consented on the false representations of
the character & qualities of the boy to grant $600 per annum for this
purpose out of the contingent fund. I protested against it on account
of the unfitness of the boy for such an avocation &c. & Mr. Seward
afterwards allowed the sum out of the secret service of the Department.
It has been regularly paid on drafts on Barings since that time. I
refused to countenance this allowance on public grounds. This boy
named David Porter Brown is notorious here as one of the most vicious
& depraved youths in this notoriously depraved town. A few weeks ago,
one of the cafe chantants girls lodged a complaint against him at our
Consulate for having beaten her at midnight in the public street. He
has been not only complained against by fathers of families, but he has
been punished by them for acts of indecency. He spends the money
allowed him on debauchery to the dishonor of his foster father & to the
disgrace of the Legation of which he is supposed to form a part. He
was adopted out of a hospital in New York I believe & is supposed to be
the son of an Irish emigrant. He does not study, he has no habits of
application, he is morally & intellectually disqualified for the
employment for which the U. S. Treasury is enlisted annually $600 per
annum. On account of his character & conduct I cannot admit him to
my house. The money paid him is money thrown away & it is a shame that
it should thus be misapplied. Every body here knows these facts.

Another transaction lately came accidentally to my knowledge
illustrative of the conduct of Mr. Brown. Of this I have been obliged
lately in self-defence to inform the Department. A few months since a
deposit of over 400 Turkish pounds was made in our Consulate addressed
to Mr. Brown & accompanied with a Takrir (Turkish note) which he had
addressed to the Department. As the Takrir bore the seal of this
Legation & spoke in the name of the Legation the Acting Vice Consul sent
it to me as a paper belonging to our archives & the money he paid over
to Mr. Brown against his receipt. On reading it as translated, I
discovered it was another illegal & surreptitious proceeding of Mr. B's.
The following is a copy.

'To The Minister of War.
Mr. Trotta an American subject has been employed for several
years in the Imperial establishments of Zeitoun & Tophane with
a salary of & Tr. 22 per month. In May last his services not
being required he was discharged having yet to receive as
arrears eighteen months and nine days viz. & Tr. 405.

Although he has applied to the superintendent of said
establishments, Said Bey & afterwards to the Grand Master of
Artillery for the recovery of said sum, his request has not as
yet been complied with.

Mr. Trotta is now without money, & has been waiting at
Constantinople for three months without being able to leave it
for his native country.

The matter now having been submitted to your Excellency,
you are now requested & demanded by this Legation to send an
order to the Grand Master of Artillery with the necessary
instructions to settle as soon as possible the above affair.

Seal (American Embassy)  Djemazi-ul-Envel 1285'

The above is the form of mere business notes in Turkish. They
are not signed, being only sealed with the official seal in Turkish of
the Legation. Now it happens that this Trotta is not an American
subject, but is I believe an Italian. The Legation so far as I direct
its affairs, did not 'demani' the payment of the said sum & the whole
transaction is surreptitious & disingenious & discreditable. The
Secretary of this Legation (this general assailant of other men's
reputations) in this note puts the official seal of this Legation to
what he knows to be a falsehood & that falsehood he addresses to a
Minister of the Imperial Cabinet. Is such a man's aspersions of
myself or other honorable men worthy of credit. The original papers of
this affair were sent to the Department a fortnight since. Mr. Brown
will in despite of all my protestations to the contrary engage in such
proceedings, compromising the reputation of the Legation for truth &
honorable dealing. Indeed he has become a sort of attorney for
strangers before the Turkish tribunals. Is this proper I ask.

For these & other reasons he has so crippled his influence that
he cannot carry any question through of an important nature & I am
obliged to do in great part both ministerial & dragoman business.
Gen. Mott now here told me that Blaque Bey the Turkish Minister at
Washington said to him that Mr. Brown on account of his servility to the
Turkish government had lost his influence with it. I am not surprised
at this remark when it is known that Mr. Brown, by his own confession
to several persons here, writes in European & American papers apologetic
articles in behalf of the Turkish government & some of which he has the
ineffable meanness to boast have received the special approbation of
Aali Pasha the Grand Vizier & of the Turkish Ambassador at Paris.
Mr. Page is the regular correspondent of the N. Y. Herald but Mr. Brown
also writes to that paper for the purpose of misrepresenting my actions
& disparaging me in public estimation. The same he has done & does to
other papers. How can one live in amity with an enemy of one's own
official family. It is known here that he calumniates me in the public
press & it is regarded as a great scandal in the diplomatic corps.
Under any other government he would be immediately dismissed from
office.
When the affair of the publication of my dispatch by the Department which contained a line referring to the mental condition of the Sultan he took every occasion to ruin me. What I wrote under that date was strictly true as the Sultan's mental health was then seriously impaired. To publish the same was a grave indiscretion. When however Mr. Seward sent an apologetic note here & settled the affair, Mr. Brown took it up afresh, sent the documents in a letter to the N. Y. Herald & in violation of the Department regulations published an official dispatch simply to damage me. When this infamous proceeding came to my knowledge I was yet weeping over the freshly covered grave of my dear wife. My soul was stung to the quick by such baseness. I sent word to him that hereafter I could only have official relations with him. Am I obliged to tolerate even for official reasons such an inveterate enemy & calumniator in my household.

Now I see by the American papers that he accuses of me of being in ill feeling with the chief dragoman & other officers of the Sublime Porte. It is an atrocious falsehood. I am in the very best of terms personal & official with all the members of the Imperial Ministry & the Chief Dragoman of the Porte & it is for this reason that I am able to do business so successfully with them. With reference to the manner in which I have discharged my duties here I beg leave to quote from a letter of Rev. Geo. Washburn of Feb. 17/68 on retiring from here as agent of American missions.

'I cannot allow this opportunity to pass not that I am leaving Constantinople for a time without expressing to you my grateful appreciation of all your kindness to me personally & as a representative of the American Missions in Turkey.

For a number of years I have had occasion to call upon you very often for your official aid in securing our rights & for your official aid in securing our rights & for your unofficial aid in protecting the suffering & persecuted. Sometimes the circumstances have been trying & delicate.

I have always without exception found you ready to listen patiently to every thing I had to say ready to give your sympathy, your advice & your official support. I have always been more than satisfied with the personal attention which you have bestowed upon these cases, & the energy with which you have pressed them to a conclusion. I believe that since you have been in Constantinople no foreign residents have been so fully protected in all their rights as the Americans.'

Such an opinion from such a source is of itself a refutation of the calumnies of Mr. Brown.

I am aware that the Turkish Minister at Washington is in league with Mr. B. to assail me. If his standing here & reputation were as well known at Washington as at Constantinople his power to injure any one would be harmless. An eminent member of the Diplomatic Corps here said to me that the Porte would not have dared to send a man of such antecedents & character to any European court. The animus of his hostility is chiefly because of my former position towards the Porte in demanding justice in all cases where Americans are concerned, & because as everyone else with his eyes open. I see & appreciate the
vices of the Turkish government & because of my sympathy with the wronged and oppressed Christian populations. Whatever may be my views in these heads, I have not in any instance violated Diplomatic usages or propriety. Blacque Bey wants an American here who will be a vassal of the Porte - whose ear will be closed to the cries of the oppressed & who will not expose wrong & vindicate justice. In the name of our interests & of the general interests of Christian humanity and as an American citizen, I pray to God that Gen. Grant will not send any such tool of despotism, wrong & outrage to this court. When my successor is named, let him be a staiing American, pure in mind & morals, a man of impregnable virtue, a Republican, & a friend of liberty & I will rejoice to welcome to this field of labor, trial & suffering.

I do not my dear Sir, write thus to invoke your influence to retain me in this office. I am ready at any moment to respond to an invitation to give my resignation from Gen. Grant, if you & other true friends of the country think with him that a change in my office is expedient.

While here I have endeavored to do my duty without fear or favor. All I desire is to leave behind me an untarnished reputation. I defy any man to adduce any act of mine which in the slightest degree is calculated to impair my estimation among such honorable men as yourself & your colleagues. My private & my public life, while here will stand the test of the most rigid scrutiny, I venture to declare in the full confidence of the truth of the assertions.

I have always cherished a high regard for the moral courage which has characterised your public life & for the virtues of your private character. Appreciating as I do your reputation & standing as an American statesman, I have ventured in self-defense & in refutation of a most wicked system of slander to impose upon your patience this extended letter, begging that you will excuse me, in the natural desire that every man feels for his honor & his ambition to enjoy the opinion of the wise, the good & the brave." (Harvard University, Houghton Library, The Charles Sumner Papers, Box 144, Item 117).
Appendix III

The following two letters indicate that John P. Brown may have been involved in certain illegal financial activities, but do not substantiate the possibility.

A. Letter: Samuel Colt to John P. Brown, May 7, 1850.

"I suppose ere this you will have cast me off your books as an unworthy and ungrateful friend and correspondent, but I hope that when this reaches you my excuses may have a reading, and a consideration of my case may again place me within the scope of your good graces.

When in England on my way home I dropped you a note announcing the progress of my trip and enclosed from Liverpool (are of Mr. J. Miller) some papers from Mr. Geo. Law on the subject of Naval steam ships which I hope have reached you in safety, I also dropped you another note shortly after my arrival in this country since which time I have been constantly on the wing and so much absorbed in business as scarcely to think of anything else for you must know I have now over 200 men employed in making my arms and they require constant attention. I have also been sick for the last six weeks but have now quite recovered and improve this my first available hour in apologizing to you for my long silence and neglect.

I have occasionally sent you a newspaper with notices of the Sultan's beautiful present and you will I am sure be no little surprised to find how long the box was in reaching me it having only arrived about a month since and no less so to find that our generous collector of customs in New York and the Secretary of the Treasury could not find law for allowing the same to be entered free of duty consequently I was compelled to pay . . . on its valuation besides about $100 charges for transportation insurance etc. before receiving it. I care nothing for this expenditure of money and were it ten times the amount I should have paid it to possess myself of so splendid a compliment from the generous Sultan, yet as a matter of principle I did object to paying the duties charged by government and I am confident that when I go to Washington and show the box to our distinguished governing functionaries I will be able to shame them into a remission of the duties. You can judge something of the opinions of the newspaper press upon the subject by reading the articles I have enclosed. These and similar comments have been published by nearly all the papers in the United States. I have now
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had the box in my possession about a fortnight and I assure you it has been much admired by the many thousands who have seen it. Many has been the fair and delicate hand that has taken a pinch of snuff from it in compliment to its generous donor.

About the 20th of last month I forwarded to you through Messrs Livingstone and Wells a box containing two U. S. muskets - one of them a percussion and the other a flint lock. The expenses on them to Constantinople I have paid here. They are fair samples of the 100,000 U. S. muskets that I have for sale. They cost our government between twelve and thirteen dollars to make them and have been laid aside for the new model percussion guns now being made at our national armories. These are the same arms of which we conversed when I was in Constantinople. The flint locks can be altered here if required into percussion like the sample and can be furnished with either light (height) or honn (fromm) barrels. I have made such arrangements since I returned home as to be able to sell them at a considerably less price than asked by me when in Europe and I will authorize you to make a sale of any number from 5000 upwards at four and a half dollars each for those with flint locks and for five and a half dollars each for the percussion locks, and will deliver them to the government at Constantinople as soon as the same can be done after receipt of any contract you may make in my behalf and I will allow you five per cent commission for attending to the business. These prices you will perceive will allow some little leeway to grease the fingers of the knowing ones, and be still less than what the government of Turkey is now paying for arms of a greatly inferior character. Whatever may be the price named for the arms in the contract is unimportant if above that I have named. I will furnish them on the terms proposed less the commission and forward them to Constantinople."

(USMC3 (Turkey, Vol. 1850-1854).

B. Letter: George Boker to Hamilton Fish, October 31, 1872.

"I dislike to try your already overtaxed patience with my personal notes, although I promise you in advance never to touch upon a question in a private note that should properly form the subject of an official despatch. Upon rereading your late note to me, I observed a passage which at once fixed my attention. You say that you know of but one person qualified to fill the joint offices of Secretary and Dragoman, and that he would probably be unacceptable both at Washington and Constantinople. I conjecture that your reference is to Mr. C. Oscanyan. Whatever might be Mr. Oscanyan's fate before the Senate, you are right in concluding that he would not be acceptable, if received at all, to the Turkish Government. At Constantinople Mr. Oscanyan is in disgrace with his government, and it is said that he will not be permitted to return to New York in his former office of Consul General for Turkey. Before the Arms Commission, lately in session here, Mr. O. F. Winchester publicly testified that Mr. Oscanyan said that he was accustomed to pay such bills of the Turkish Government as passed through his hands in paper, and charge the government in
gold; the difference in value being his commission! Some years ago, at the time the statement was made to Mr. Winchester, you may conjecture what that "commission" would have been. Mr. Winchester also stated that Mr. Oscanyan endeavored to make an arrangement on this basis with him (Mr. W.) - the affair growing out of a sale of arms and machinery which Mr. Winchester made to the Turks. Because of this testimony, Mr. Oscanyan brought two suits for slander in our Consular Court, one against Mr. Winchester and the other against his agent, Mr. Azarian. In one suit Mr. Oscanyan suffered a non-suit, and in the other a verdict with costs was rendered against him. All this is a matter of public notoriety, and it would be a bad record for an officer of our Legation to start with. In fact, one cannot trust a man of Levantine birth. Such a thing as ordinary honesty does not exist among them, nor is it considered any shame to be detected in such falsehoods and frauds as would drive a man out of society with us. If one of these people held either the office of Secretary or of Dragoman, he would straight begin to make a job of his position; and such are the opportunities that he would amass a fortune in a few years, without the fear of detection, or the shame of it if he were discovered.

Since poor Brown's death, it has been forced upon my knowledge that he took pay for his official services; but he did this in a moderate way, thereby enabling himself to live in a style that he could not possibly have done on his salary. After his death, Mrs. Brown told me in the most innocent way, that if a certain Mr. Saint Laurant received the contract for arms, Mr. Brown was to have been paid a large sum, and that if the same person sold the "Stevens' Battery" to the Turks, Mr. Brown was to have received three thousand pounds. She also said that Saint Laurant had continued his engagement to her; and begged me, in her absence, to receive the possible payments, and to remit the money to her. This she said was for work done and influence used in Saint Laurant's behalf with the Turkish government by Mr. Brown. That there was any wrong in the matter; she had not the slightest suspicion; or, of course, she would not have mentioned the affair to me, of all men. I let the thing pass without comment; for I knew that there was little probability of her receiving anything, knowing as I did the character of Saint Laurant. It pained me greatly however; for I could not but remember precisely how Mr. Brown had endeavored to use me in order to effect a purpose for which, if successful, he was to be paid roundly. After all Brown's little corruptions came to a bad end, for he either spent or lost the money which he made, and died not worth a piastre. Death caught him in the midst of a fresh harvest, upon which he might have grown fat had time been given him.

I do not know what view you may take of these revolting secrets of my office. It cannot but pain you to know them; and unless I considered it to be my duty to disclose everything connected with the mission to you, it would be far more agreeable to me to bury these foul things out of sight."
Appendix IV

The following are obituaries of John Porter Brown from the Levant Times, the Levant Herald, and the Levant Times and Shipping Gazette forwarded by George Boker to Hamilton Fish, May 2, 1872, USDD (Turkey, Vol. XXIII).

A. Levant Times: "The Late John Porter Brown, Esq.," April 30, 1872.

"Within less than a week after our community had sustained such a shock through the unexpected death one of its leading members, Mr. H. Harvey, solicitor, a still more sudden visitation has carried off one who had for many years enjoyed, perhaps without exception, the most extensive circle of friendship — we do not add "acquaintanceship," for to know him at all was to be his friend — among every class of society in this capital, native as well as foreign, and who was a universal favourite among them all. Mr. John Porter Brown, whose death we have today the sad duty of recording, had lived in Constantinople for about 40 years uninterruptedly in the service of the United States' legation, filling, for a great part of that time, the important posts of Secretary of Legation and of first dragoman, and at intervals, during the absence of the Minister Resident for the time being or the vacancy of that office, acting as charge d'affaires for his Government. Amid all the vicissitudes of parties in his native country, he possessed the confidence of every successive administration, as he had acquired the respect and esteem of the Turkish Ministers and functionaries with whom his official duties brought him into contact. The Washington Government will find it difficult to replace him, particularly in the post of dragoman, in which it had the rare advantage of being represented by a countryman of its own, and one as fully qualified as any native that could be found, while of unimpeachable loyalty and fidelity to the interests it was his duty to serve. To tact, discretion and savoir faire, and the advantages of a long experience and wide official and social intercourse, Mr. Brown united a kindly and obliging disposition, with an affable amenity of manners which well became a naturally dignified presence. Having settled here at an early age and long before Turkey had been so Europeanised as he had lived to see it become, Mr. Brown evinced his intellectual bent by devoting himself to a study of its languages and of the manners and customs of its people, especially
the Osmanlies, his predilection for whom was very marked and was no slight recommendation for him in the eyes of those native functionaries with whom he had business to transact. He was a copious and fluent writer on Turkish subjects, and was the author of a learned and exhaustive work on the Dervishes, which describes with great minuteness and accuracy the distinctive tenets, traditions and observances of the several branches or sects of that ancient religious order. Oriental scholarship has lost in him one who, had he lived, had yet no doubt, much valuable and interesting material to contribute, but some, at all events, of which will it may be hoped, be found to exist among his MSS. He was a frequent contributor -- generally an anonymous one -- to the columns of the Levant Times, in which he took a kind and warm interest from the time of its establishment, and his services to which, it need hardly be said, greatly add to its Editor's sense of the loss he has personally sustained in this painfully sudden severance of a dear friendship.

The deceased belonged to a family of historical connexion with the United States, being first cousin to Admiral David D. Porter, Commander-in-Chief of the United States' Navy, whose father, the deceased's Uncle, the celebrated Commodore Porter, was the first United States' Minister accredited to the Sublime Porte, and the author of an interesting and even now useful work on Turkey. Mr. Brown was a native of Chillicothe, in the state of Ohio -- the same state as General Sherman, the Sultan's late guest, was born in -- and when a youth entered the United States' Navy, as a midshipman on board the frigate Constellation, sent out for a cruise in the Mediterranean, one of his shipmates being the present Admiral Porter and the vessel being commanded by Commodore Porter. Mr. Brown abandoned the naval career for the diplomatic service on his Uncle, the Commodore, accepting the post of Minister at Constantinople.

Mr. Brown's career extended over the greater part of what may be called the modern era of the Turkish Empire, dating from the reign of Mahmoud the Second, father of the present Sultan, and in, at least, one notable historical incident he figured prominently in his official capacity. It was in the year 1855, during one of the periods that he happened to be acting as charge d'affaires that a certain Hungarian refugee, Coszta by name, who had intimated a desire to become an American citizen, went from here to Smyrna and got a passage on board of an American merchant ship which was loading in that port for New York. There was an Austrian frigate, the Huzzar, in Smyrna Bay, and the Austrian Consulate forcibly took Coszta out of the American ship, took him on board the Huzzar and put him in irons. As to what his fate would have been once he had been got back into Austrian territory, there can be no doubt. There are at the present day leading statesmen in the Austro-Hungarian Empire-Kingdom, who owe their lives and consequently their present distinction to the asylum they found in Turkey. It so happened that besides the Austrian frigate there was at the time anchored in Smyrna Bay an American corvette -- a vessel of much smaller size and armament -- and the moment her commander, Capt. Ingraham, heard of the affair, he communicated with Mr. Brown. The correspondence between the two is so laconic and characteristic --
once upon a time it would have been considered characteristic not of a Yankee but of a British captain and diplomatist — that it well deserves reproducing textually, for it will not occupy much of our space. Capt. Ingraham wrote:

'If the captain of the Huzzar refuses to give Coszta up, what shall I do?'

Answer from Mr. Brown:

'Take him out, Sir,'

Captain Ingraham thereupon notified to the captain of the Huzzar that if he did not hand over his captive at noon — two hours after the notice was sent — His (Capt. Ingraham's) ship would attack the Austrian. The latter making no sign of compliance up till 11 o'clock, Capt. Ingraham made very intelligible signs of his intention to enforce his demand by clearing his decks for action, taking down his light spars, and slinging yards, etc., the result of which was that the Austrian commander thought better of it and at half past eleven he caved-in, but, to save the national dignity, adopted the expedient of sending the person in question on board the boat of the French Consul, who handed him over to the American ship. The incident made considerable noise at the time, and Mr. Brown's fellow-citizens of the State of Ohio were much delighted at his pluck and presence of mind — which happened to rebound the more to the honour of the Stars and Stripes from the fact that the very day after this coup there turned up in Smyrna Bay two Austrian line of battle ships which would scarcely have stood being 'cheeked' as the captain of their frigate was by the captain of only a corvette. A handsome service of silver plate was presented on the occasion to Mr. Brown with the following inscription:

'The citizens of Ohio to J. P. Brown, in admiration of the courage and decision he displayed in the Coszta affair at Smyrna, June, 1853. Ohio remembers her son.'

Mr. Brown, who had not reached his 59th year, was a man of apparently good constitution — tall and well-built; had never had any serious illness; led an active but tranquil life, and never seemed in better health or spirits than up to within an hour of his death on Sunday. He had spent part of the morning with his countryman Capt. Edenborough, (engaged in the Ottoman service in superintending the manufacture of torpedoes and other submarine means of defence) and after lunching with his wife, paid a visit to the Austrian Embassy, and afterwards, at about 3 o'clock, went to see his chief, Mr. Boker, the American Minister, who is at present staying at the Hotel de Byzance.

There, after some conversation, he had a spasm in the region of the heart and felt faint. He seemed to attribute the sensation to the heat, which has set in during the last week, and said he would go home and lie down. On his way, the feebleness returning, he went into the shop of Mr. Canzuch, the chemist, which is not far from his residence, and was given an ether pill, with the view of relieving the feeling of congestion he complained of. Mr. Canzuch accompanied Mr. Brown home, and on arriving there it was deemed advisable to send for a doctor. The medical gentleman, a foreigner, pronounced it a case of neuralgia. Within a few moments, Mr. Brown, who had partially
undressed and was lying on his bed, expired, neither his wife nor son both of whom were present, having any presentiment whatever of the imminence of death, any more than the apothecary or the doctor, or, as far as could be judged, the patient himself, who died away as quietly as he had lived.

The news of Mr. Brown's death spread fast on Sunday evening, and the suddenness of the event increased the gloom which, under any circumstances, the loss of so estimable and widely known man could not fail to have caused throughout society at the capital. Among the masonic body, especially, the deceased having occupied the highest position in the Craft in Turkey - that of District Grand Master -- and having been eminent for his zealous devotion to the interests of the order and his unswerving maintenance of its principles, not only by his influence in the distinguished office he held in it but by the example he set in his own fraternal goodness and worth -- over all, in his charity, in speech and even thought as well as in act -- the sad intelligence spread with a rapidity which in itself evidenced the emotion it caused to those who heard it and communicated it to others. Sympathising instinctively with the wishes of the members of the Order, the Deputy District Grand Master, Bro. A. Thompson (himself an official of the American Consulate) summoned a meeting of the District Grand Lodge to consider what proceedings should be adopted with regard to the funeral of the lamented Right Worshipful Brother. The meeting, held on Monday evening in the Masonic Temple, Pera, was attended by representatives of most of the lodges of the capital, including various lodges working under foreign rites. The lodgeroom was draped in black and the brethren wore crape over their badges and scarves of the same material. The Grand Master's throne was left vacant, his gold collar being hung above it, and the badge and gauntlets, all covered with crape being placed on the seat. It was unanimously agreed that a letter of condolence should be addressed in the name of the Grand Lodge to Mrs. Brown the deceased's widow, and to Bro. David Brown his adopted son. The occasion naturally recalled to those present another loss the Order had just a few days before sustained in the person of the late W. Bro. Hingston Harvey Past Master and Past District Grand Registrar, and it was also agreed that a letter of condolence should be addressed to Mrs. Harvey and the members of his family.

The funeral took place this afternoon, the deceased's remains being interred in the English Cemetery at Ferikeui, prior, we understand, to removal to his native place, in accordance with a wish frequently expressed by him."


"In the death of this gentleman, the local diplomatic body has lost one of its oldest and most popular members, and Pera society what may be termed almost an 'institution.' In point of residence, though not in age, Mr. Brown was probably the oldest member of the corps, having come to Turkey so long ago as 1832, accompanying his uncle, Commodore Porter, who was in that year appointed the first American
Minister to the Porte, and whose son is now Admiral-in-Chief of the U. S. fleet. Although then only 18, Mr. Brown had already served for some years as a midshipman in the American navy, but, possessing a rare linguistic talent, he applied himself at once to the study of oriental languages and literature, and with such success that, for many years he has been regarded as one of the most accomplished orientalists in Turkey. Within a twelvemonth of his arrival, he was able to discharge the duties of assistant dragoman, and a few years later was promoted to the joint duties of assistant dragoman and secretary of legation, which he held till his death. During this long term of service, he represented his Government nine times as charge de affaires, first in 1843, during a vacancy in the legation, and, for the last time, during the recent interval between the departure of Mr. McVeagh and the arrival of Mr. Boker, the present Minister. One of these interregna was rendered memorable by the incident of Koszta, the Hungarian refugee, who in 1853 was seized by the Austrian authorities at Smyrna and rescued some days after by Capt. Ingraham of the U. S. corvette Dale, which then happened to be lying in the bay. As Koszta, before going to Smyrna to take passage for the States, had given the usual notice of intended citizenship at the Pera legation, he claimed American protection on being arrested. But the Austrian Consul at once sent him on board an Austrian frigate in the harbour, and thereupon Capt. Ingraham applied to Mr. Brown for instructions, which the latter gave in two words: - 'Take him.' On receipt of this pithy order, the commander of the Dale gave the Austrian captain three hours to deliver up his prisoner, and in the meantime cleared for action. Half an hour before the time expired Koszta was given up to the French Consul, and by him to Capt. Ingraham, who sailed just in time to miss a couple of Austrian line-of-battle ships which entered Smyrna bay the next day. For his pluck and decision on this occasion, Mr. Brown's fellow States-men of Ohio presented him with a massive service of plate, and Mr. Webster, then Secretary of State also warmly approved his conduct.

This long residence was of course broken by several visits on leave to the United States, his home sympathies and associations with which Mr. Brown kept up with singular freshness to the last. Besides the publication of two locally well known works -- one a very learned History of the Dervishes, and the other a translation of Patriarch Constantius's Ancient and Modern Constantinople, with very valuable notes and appendices, the deceased gentleman was a frequent contributor to the American newspapers and magazines.

His death on Sunday afternoon was mercifully sudden. He had lunched with Mr. Boker in his usual health, but shortly afterwards felt slightly unwell, and walked slowly homewards to rest. On reaching Messrs. Canzuchs' pharmacy, he entered and asked for a composing draught; this taken, he proceeded to his house, accompanied by Mr. Canzuch, and while partially undressing, fell over on his bed and died -- evidently from heart disease.

An old and earnest Freemason, Mr. Brown has been the local head of the craft since the departure of Sir Henry Bulwer (Lord Dalling)
whom he succeeded in 1869, as District Grand Master for Turkey. In this office, as indeed in his private relations, the extent of his practical philanthropy was only equalled by its modesty -- neither counsel nor pecuniary help being ever refused by him in any deserving case. In general society, his courteous and kindly manner made him a universal favourite, while in public life he was equally esteemed and respected by all who knew him. Of his integrity, nothing more need be said than that he has died poor, leaving to his widow and only son little beyond the heritage of a name on which not even forty years of Levant official life has left a stain. Not alone the American colony, therefore -- to which his loss will be great -- but Turks, Armenians, Greeks and Europeans of nearly every nationality will hold in kindly and respectful remembrance the name of John Porter Brown."

C. Levant Times and Shipping Gazette: May 1, 1872.

"Yesterday afternoon the remains of the late Mr. J. P. Brown, Secretary to the U. S. Legation were interred in Ferikeui cemetery. The body, in a leaden coffin, was carried there in a richly gilt hearse, surmounted by a large plume of black and white feathers and drawn by four black horses. This was preceded and followed by a procession of mourners numbering altogether about 500, mostly English, and amongst whom were Mr. H. Rumbold, H.B.M. Charge d'affaires, Count Vogue, French Ambassador, Count Ludolf, Austrian Ambassador, M. de Radovitz, Prussian Charge d'affaires, Count Barblini, Italian Ambassador, M. J. A. de Aguilar, Spanish Minister, Count Grimberghe, Belgian Minister, M. M. D. Rhazi, Greek Charge d'affaires, M. S. d'Erhenhoff, Swedish Minister, and M. Koun, Dutch Charge d'affaires. **** The Porte was represented by a secretary from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who attended in Server Pasha's carriage, and Hamdi Bey, Master of Ceremonies, was also present. The chief mourners were Mr. David Brown and Mr. Thompson, Marshal of the U. S. Consulate. The pall bearers were Mr. Goodenow, U. S. Consul, Capt. Edenborough, Mr. Warren Hidden, Mr. Newbolt, Mr. Fred Smyth, and Mr. Charles Grace. The masonic body, distinguished simply by wearing white kid gloves, assembled in strong force to do honour to their departed chief. The burial service was read by the Rev. Dr. Long American Missionary. The remains are to be exhumed and sent to America for final burial, in accordance with a wish frequently expressed by the deceased."

**** "Of course, Mr. Boker, Minister of the United States, was present, although this fact seems to have escaped the notice of the writer of the above paragraph."

(The appended note was written by Boker in pen at the bottom of the article.)
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