

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s¹

MIROSLAV ŠEDIVÝ

The presence of Prussia's military officers in the Ottoman army in the late 1830s has usually been narrated according to the accounts of one of these officers, Helmuth von Moltke, who achieved splendid glory in the European battlefields later in the century, and whose published letters have served as the principal and almost exclusive source of information for historians dealing with this topic. Other documents like the reports of a Prussian envoy in Constantinople have been almost entirely omitted, even during attempts to explain not only the military significance of the mission but also its diplomatic origins. Consequently, no study analysing the topic from a broader diplomatic spectrum exists, and there remains much to be said and some errors to be corrected in what has already been written.

The diplomatic background cannot be ignored due to the simple fact that the Prussian military mission was closely associated with the European Powers' struggle for influence over the sultan's court, in other words the Prussian officers' presence in the Levant was an integral part of the so-called Eastern Question. Moreover, it has almost been forgotten that the second German Power, Austria, was also extensively engaged in this respect. Though the Viennese cabinet failed to establish its own military advisers in Sultan Mahmud II's service, at least during the time spent there by those from Prussia, it also contributed to the reforms in the Ottoman army, though in a different way. Its diplomatic role was far more important than that of Prussia because the joint Austrian-Russian diplomatic intervention in Constantinople frustrated the employment of French and British officers in the Ottoman army and navy in 1835/36 and opened the door for the Prussians. Despite Austria's significant role, the reports of an Austrian representative in Constantinople as well as other archival documents housed in Vienna have also remained unnoticed by historians, and if several brief surveys have been written on Prussia's military assistance to the Ottoman Empire during that period, one can claim without exaggeration that barely a few words have been dedicated to that of Austria's role.

¹ This study has been published as a part of the research project *Metternich a Východní otázka 1821–1841* (Metternich and the Eastern Question 1821–1841) financed by the Czech Science Foundation (GA ČR P410/10/P027).

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

The primary goal of this paper is to put the assistance of the two German Powers to the Ottoman military reforms into the context of diplomatic relations within the Eastern Question, to explain why the Sublime Porte asked Prussia as well as Austria to supply their officers and why only the Prussians were finally employed in 1837. I would also like to point out the fact that the collaboration of the two German Powers with Mahmud II in his reformatory effort must be viewed not only in the diplomatic but also in the social context – the changes in the Ottoman army had been attentively observed by Austria's and Prussia's diplomats, and by Metternich in particular. In fact, they paid considerable attention to developments within the Ottoman army long before the employment of the two Powers' officers in the Near East was officially discussed with Ottoman leaders, and the Austrian cabinet had even provided the education of several Ottoman youths in the Viennese Technical military academy. The paper is finally intended as a brief contribution to the relations between Central Europe, represented in this case by the two most important members of the German Confederation, and the Ottoman Empire, as well as to the Ottoman reform movement itself, in the 1830s.

From the diplomatic and social point of view, the course of events presented here cannot be started in 1835, when Sultan Mahmud II decided to ask Prussia and Austria for their military officers, but already in 1826 when the same sultan dissolved the Janissaries and launched a vigorous reformatory process² particularly affecting the Ottoman army, which could not go unnoticed by Austrian and Prussian representatives in Constantinople. Their reports contained scepticism identical to that expressed by Moltke during his later stay in the Levant; they pointed out on the one hand the sultan's sincere wish to create a functioning regular army as well as on the other his lack of knowledge in how to achieve this goal. The monarch's inexperience would not have mattered if he had been surrounded by skilful and capable advisers familiar with the European art of war and the reasons for its superiority over the Ottoman warfare, but this was not Mahmud II's case. The Austrian internuncio in Constantinople, Franz von Ottenfels, wrote in July 1832:

“This is not at all the time when Sultan Mahmud can hope to realise the project [of reforms]. His intentions are certainly laudable and one cannot praise enough the determination and perseverance with which he pursues his goal. But this sovereign himself is largely inerudite and surrounded by ad-

² Z. ZAKIA, *The Reforms of Sultan Mahmud II (1808–1839)*, in: K. ÇIÇEK (Ed.), *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, Vol. 1: Politics, Ankara 2000, p. 420.

visers who are too ignorant and too interested in flattering him and hiding the truth to know which proper means he ought to choose for implementing his ideas.”³

This criticism shared also by Ottenfels’ successor, Bartolomäus von Stürmer, and several Prussian envoys in the 1820s and 1830s⁴ was particularly held by the man who for a long time was responsible for military reforms and who played an important role in the story of Austria’s and Prussia’s assistance in this sphere: Husrev Pasha. He was no supporter of radical changes in Ottoman society, but he did not oppose the reforms in the army of which he was in charge from 1827 to 1837 as its commander-in-chief (serasker), and he was also able to influence its structure from March 1838 when he became president of the supreme counsel. The main reason for his active role in the military reforms seemed to be his unceasing desire to remain in his monarch’s favour, but, as well as his master, he lacked the relevant knowledge, and consequently he offered rather dubious assistance in the improvements in the Ottoman armed forces.⁵ The Prussian envoy in Constantinople since 1835, Baron von Königsmarck, described Husrev’s character and actions in these unflattering words:

“In all seasons and in all weather he [Husrev Pasha] is seen browsing around Constantinople, the Bosphorus and its environs, in a boat, on a horse, in a coach, on foot; he is everywhere and he meddles with everything. But with all this activity he only dabbles in matters without investigating any; he

³ Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna (henceforth: HHStA), Staatenabteilungen (henceforth: StA), Türkei VI, 54, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 July 1832; Two months later, Ottenfels expressed this opinion again: *“Mahmud wants to do good, but he lacks capable subjects who could put his plans into effect.”* HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 54, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Sept. 1832.

⁴ For all see HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 37, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 14 May 1829, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830; Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin (henceforth: GStA PK), HA III, Ministerium des Auswärtigen I (henceforth: MdA I), 7280, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 4 April and 8 Aug. 1838, MdA I, 7281, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 6 Nov. 1839.

⁵ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 37, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 14 May and 5 Sept. 1829, Türkei VI, 50, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 May 1830, Türkei VI, 57, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 30 March 1833; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7257, Miltitz to Frederick William III, Pera, 10 May 1823, MdA I, 7264, Miltitz to Frederick William III, Pera, 10 Feb. 1827, MdA I, 7267, Stiepovich [?] to Royer, Pera, 22 June 1829, MdA I, 7281, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 26 June 1839, MdA I, 7279, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 28 March 1838, MdA I, 7281, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 26 June 1839.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

starts everything but he finishes nothing. A skilful courtier, he would always like to have something new and pleasant to tell his master, to propound several new inventions to him, to propose improvements in military organisation or civil administration, but he immediately abandons his projects, some of them even wise and beneficial, as soon as he notices that they no more amuse the fickle humour of His Highness. The serasker seriously cares only for topics that flatter the vanity of the sultan.'⁶

Mahmud II's and his advisers' lack of *savoir-faire*, their ignorance of the real reasons for the technological and economic superiority of the West over the Levant, the monarch's impatience, in other words his wish to see the results of his reformatory effort during his lifetime, and his advisers' incompetence and liking for intrigues often contributed, according to German speaking diplomats, to the wrong implementation of Western patterns and entirely unnecessary and pointless measures like the orders concerning the implementation of European-style clothing or the shortening of traditional long male beards.⁷ This was also manifested in the Ottoman army, where the attempts to come closer to the West brought changes that did not meet with the approval of European experts like French General Lieutenant Count Osery, brother-in-law of Marshal Jean Victor Marie Moreau and a hero of the Napoleonic wars in which he lost an arm. Osery had stayed in Constantinople in the late 1820s where Austria had supported his employment in the Ottoman army, which finally did not happen owing to Moreau's family's good relations with the tsar who was waging war with the sultan during that period.⁸ He discussed the conditions of the Ottoman armed forces with Ottenfels; his views were identical or very similar to those of Austrian and Prussian diplomats or later those of Moltke.⁹ Osery was very critical and, for example, he could not

⁶ GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7278, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 19 Oct. 1836,

⁷ A. von PROKESCH-OSTEN, *Über die dermaligen Reformen im türkischen Reiche, 1832*, in: Kleine Schriften, Bd. 5, Stuttgart 1844, p. 401; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7278, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 5 Oct. 1836, MdA I, 7279, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 4 and 11 Jan. 1837; HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 66, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 18 Jan. 1837.

⁸ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 39, Metternich to Ottenfels, Vienna, 3 April 1829, Türkei VI, 37, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 25 May 1829.

⁹ For all see GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7276, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 25 Nov. 1835, MdA I, 7278, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 5 Oct. 1836, MdA I, 7279, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 4 Jan. 1837.

understand why at that time the excellent Ottoman cavalry had been re-structured according to the European model and had thus lost many of the characteristics that had previously made this component of the sultan's army a respected enemy even among the Cossacks:

“The Turkish cavalry was one of the best units of the Ottoman Empire; it always was superior to the Russian cavalry; what it lacked was good direction and to be employed in an appropriate way effectively. Instead of leaving it as it was and adding brave and intelligent officers who would know how to lead it into combat where it could offer useful and decisive service, attempts have been made to transform it into a European cavalry and to replace their [the Ottomans'] traditional Turkish or Cossack saddles to which they have been accustomed since their childhood with saddles of European style with stirrups in which they do not know how to remain seated.”¹⁰

Though these words are hard to believe, their validity were confirmed by Russian diplomat Alexej Fedorovic Count Orlov staying in Constantinople in late 1829 and early 1830, who, after seeing a military parade of an Ottoman cavalry recently organised after the European fashion, told Ottenfels that several riders unable to remain in their new saddles had fallen off their horses:

“I would desire to know the name of the foreign instructor who directs the exercises of these troops in order to be able to propose to the emperor [tsar] that he should decorate him with one of his medals because he taught the Turks to fall off their horses, which would not have happened if they had ridden on their traditional saddles.”¹¹

The unknown foreigner training the Ottoman troops mentioned by Orlov is important for this paper's topic because it points to one of the most serious problems concerning the new Ottoman regular army – the lack of well trained officers. Mahmud II, who often declared that *“one of my eyes is fixed on my son, the other on my soldiers,”*¹² was well aware of

¹⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 37, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 14 May 1829.

¹¹ Hrvatski državni arhiv in Zagreb (henceforth: HDA), 750, Obitelj Ottenfels (henceforth: OO) 18, F. von Ottenfels, *Memoari Franze Ottenfelsa*, p. 222.

¹² HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

this fact. He had two possibilities with regard to the training of his troops: to send Ottoman youths to European military schools or train them in schools that would be established in his Empire and led by European military instructors. In the 1830's he decided to adopt both methods, which, however, attracted the attention of some European Powers, and their rivalry in the Near East showed itself even in this affair, making the European assistance to the Ottoman military reforms a part of the Eastern Question. Prussia generally stood apart, but the Viennese cabinet was fully involved in it from the very beginning.

In late 1829, Mahmud II occupied himself with the project to send Ottoman students to France to obtain a technical and military education. He was influenced by news of Egyptian students having been successfully sent to France by his Egyptian Governor Mohammed Ali some years before. With his characteristic impatience, Mahmud II wanted to follow the example of his powerful vassal as soon as possible and was strongly supported in this plan by Husrev Pasha, whose pro-French sympathies were well known. Mahmud II took it a step further, wanting to send the students not only to France but also to Great Britain and Austria. His Private Secretary Mustafa Bey discussed this topic with Ottenfels, who readily assured the Ottoman dignitary about the readiness of Austria to satisfy the request.¹³ This was completely true because the Viennese cabinet was more than willing to welcome Ottoman students. In Metternich's and Ottenfels' opinion, Vienna was an ideal place for the young Ottomans to obtain a solid education without the danger of being influenced by what they considered to be improper ideas. Austrian Emperor Francis I did not hesitate to offer his capital for this purpose, and Ottenfels was instructed in early January to convey the proposal to the sultan's court.¹⁴

The offer was sincerely meant, but its main goal undoubtedly was to offer an alternative to the idea of sending Ottoman students to France, which did not please the cabinet in Vienna. Though Metternich supported the idea of acquainting young Ottomans with the sciences as studied and practiced by Europeans, he criticised the choice of the destination and considered it one of the many mistakes frequently committed by the sultan in his effort to reform his declining empire. Because of the revolution and because of Napoleon himself, Metternich – and many Europeans – considered France to be a country corrupted by dubious ideas, which, if brought

¹³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 49, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Dec. 1829. More on Husrev Pasha's pro-French sympathies HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 50, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 25 Jan. 1830, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7269, Royer to Frederick William III, Pera, 12 Jan. 1830.

¹⁴ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 51, Metternich to Ottenfels, Vienna, 2 Jan. 1830.

back to Istanbul by students influenced by those ideas, could disrupt the government and society and potentially damage the Ottoman Empire as well as the Danube Monarchy.¹⁵ Consequently, the chancellor instructed the internuncio in early January to thwart the French aspect of the project and did not forget to mention a month later that “*sending men to us will always be less dangerous for the Porte than dispatching them to other places. The young Turks, like the officers, will find in our country a useful direction or, what is equal, a Mohammedan direction.*”¹⁶

In this respect, Ottenfels skilfully acquitted his task. He had often opposed the sultan’s intention to send Ottoman youths to France for training before the arrival of Metternich’s January instructions, and these provided him with the additional needed support for his objections. Consequently, he succeeded in persuading the Porte not to send Ottoman students to France, at least for that moment.¹⁷ As for sending the youths to Austria, the Emperor’s offer was accepted positively by the sultan and his retinue¹⁸ but it was not put into effect until late 1834 when five Ottoman students were sent to Austria for training in the Technical military academy (*K. k. Ingenieurakademie*) situated in the building of the Savoy Riding Academy (*Laimgrube*) in Vienna.¹⁹ They formed, in Metternich’s words, something like an “Ottoman military academy”²⁰ under the direction of Captain Franz von Hauslab, an extraordinarily learned absolvent of the same academy, who was an instructor at this institute and who had also been the personal educator of Archduke Charles’ children since 1833 and the next Emperor, Franz Joseph I, after 1843. Hauslab had lived in Constantinople for two years, learned Turkish and later visited the city to personally bring the students to the Austrian capital.²¹ Nevertheless, the sending

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 51, Metternich to Ottenfels, Vienna, 3 Feb. 1830.

¹⁷ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 50, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 25 Jan. 1830.

¹⁸ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 50, Ottenfels to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 Jan. 1830.

¹⁹ Just a few words on the topic can be found in three books, unfortunately with some factual errors. M. BRUNNER, H. KERCHNAWE, *225 Jahre Technische Militärakademie 1717 bis 1942*, Wien, 1942, p. 44; F. GATTI, *Geschichte der k. u. k. Technischen Militär-Akademie. Bd. I: Geschichte der k.k. Ingenieur- und k.k. Genie-Akademie 1717–1869*, Wien 1901, p. 554; H. SCHALK, *250 Jahre militärtechnische Ausbildung in Österreich*, Wien 1968, p. 101.

²⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 20, Metternich to Mustafa Reshid Pasha, Vienna, 10 Nov. 1840.

²¹ HDA, 750, OO 18, *Memoari Franze Ottenfelsa*, p. 224; HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 8, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 Feb. 1835, Türkei VIII, 24, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 17. Sept. 1834, Türkei VIII, 10, Mavrojény to Metternich, Vienna, 23. Oct. 1837; GSStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7275, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 21 July 1835, MdA I, 7276, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 30 Dec. 1835, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 17 Feb. 1836;

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

of the young Ottomans was not a real diplomatic success for Austria because other groups were sent in 1835 to Great Britain, Prussia and France.²²

The youths arriving to the city on the Danube in 1834 and 1837 finally graduated from the academy and, moreover, demonstrated many skills and abilities.²³ This is proved by their very good schoolwork and exam results²⁴ as well as the report about their education written some months after Mahmud II's death by the Bavarian envoy in Vienna, Maximilian Emanuel von Lerchenfeld-Aham, in late November 1839:

“Of all the measures that the late sultan [Mahmud II] undertook for the civilisation of his nation, the sending of young people abroad for their studies and to learn the military sciences has been the most successful. Many young Turks sent by their government are here to experience military service and master the art of war. These youths do the service together with the troops. They ride in the ranks, command the drills of their platoons in Turkish uniforms, and distinguish themselves by their zeal and their diligence. In the past autumn during an artillery exercise, these young Turks operated their cannon and fired with such an accuracy that assured them the praise of all the General officers. In the examination at the school of artillery, the professor of astronomy, Mr Litzow, invited to assist, gave them some very difficult problems, which they solved in an excellent manner. There are some students among them who are attending the technical school and who are making very good progress. All these students speak German and French and they can be often seen at the theatre.”²⁵

Lerchenfeld's favourable evaluation reflected the positive attitude of the involved Austrian elites towards the practice of sending Ottoman

Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich (henceforth: BHStA), Ministerium des Äußern (henceforth: MA), Wien 2408, Lerchenfeld to Ludwig I von Bayern, Vienna, 29. Nov. 1839; SCHALK, p. 101.

²² N. BERKES, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, Montreal 1964, p. 128; K. KREISER, *Türkische Studenten in Europa*, in: G. HÖPP (Ed.), *Fremde Erfahrungen. Asiaten und Afrikaner in Deutschland, Österreich und in der Schweiz bis 1945*, Berlin 1996, pp. 385–400.

²³ Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 5 July 1837, HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 66.

²⁴ Brunner, p. 44; Gatti, p. 554.

²⁵ BHStA, MA, Wien 2408, Lerchenfeld to Ludwig I von Bayern, Vienna, 29 Nov. 1839.

students to the Habsburg Empire. For example, Archduke Johann told the Bavarian envoy in late 1837:

*“If thirty military cadets to Vienna for training, they will be sufficient in number in a few years to organise and discipline several exemplary battalions. These in their turn would instruct other officers and petty officers, who could be later deployed in different regiments. The adoption of this system will lead to good results. The young Turkish officers who stay here for their education for a couple of years effectively display the best motivation and natural abilities. They take part in the training of the troops, they even command the platoons, in a word they seek to educate themselves, and some of them already speak German well enough to be able to successfully watch theatrical performances.”*²⁶

There is no reason to doubt that this view was sincere, but the effort to obtain further students under Austria’s supervision was undoubtedly increased by the opportunity for Austria to have influence that it could later exert through them in the Ottoman Empire. Leopold von Haan, who accompanied Archduke Johann to Constantinople in October 1837, explained the reasons for such an expectation: *“There have to be future political benefits for the state where such people are trained because next to the love for one’s native country there also remains the affection for the country where one was educated.”*²⁷ Metternich naturally was well aware of this fact, which is evident in the attention he paid to the presence of the Ottoman youths in Vienna and the supervising role of Hauslab, who was the man who deserved the greatest merit for the students’ swift progress. Unsurprisingly, Mahmud II rewarded him in early 1835 with words of praise and a box ornamented with diamonds,²⁸ and when Hauslab was promoted to a squadron leader and his duties were to take him away from Vienna, Metternich intervened and ensured his continued tutorial role at the academy and in the higher rank because Hauslab was in a position to play an important role in the Porte’s decision making whether to send more students to Austria.²⁹

²⁶ BHStA, MA, Wien 2407, Lerchenfeld to Ludwig I von Bayern, Vienna, 31 Dec. 1837.

²⁷ V. von HAAN (Ed.), *Erzherzog Johann von Österreich, Leopold von Haan. Eine russisch-türkische Reise im Jahre 1837*, Wien 1998, p. 183.

²⁸ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 8, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 Feb. 1835, Türkei VIII, 8, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 3 March 1835.

²⁹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 24, Metternich to Rifaat Bey, Vienna, 28 July 1838.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

Consequently, when Johann announced during his stay in Constantinople in 1837 that Austria was prepared to receive further Ottoman students,³⁰ Hauslab was already a member of the archduke's retinue and probably contributed to Mahmud II's decision to send another group of six young Ottomans to Vienna for a military education. Hauslab personally escorted them from Constantinople on 27 November.³¹ This perfectly dovetailed into the policy pursued by Metternich, who continued to attach importance to the presence of Ottoman students and encouraged the increase in their number in following years. He repeatedly advised the Porte to make the best of the functional "institution" producing capable officers.³² He repeated in 1840 what he had declared ten years earlier, that the students sent to Vienna would return home

*"as good Moslems, well trained and competent in all kinds of service that one would want to assign them. They will not introduce into their homeland fantastic ideas incompatible with the spirit and customs of the country. These men will know what is useful and practical and nothing in their way of thinking will be altered."*³³

According to Metternich, Johann and most of other involved Austrians, the Ottoman students' studies abroad were much more useful than the employment of foreigners in the Ottoman army. Moltke and Prince August of Prussia, the latter staying in Constantinople for a while at the same time as Johann, also shared this view. Prince August stated in his essay on the Ottoman army written in late 1837 or early 1838 that the Prussian officers functioning in the sultan's service at that time were entirely insufficient for the implementation of useful reforms, that increasing the number of foreign officers would not prove more successful, for example owing to the language barrier, and that sending young Ottomans to

³⁰ B. SUTTER, *Die Reise Erzherzog Johanns 1837 nach Russland, Konstantinopel und Athen*, in: W. KOSCHATZKY (Ed.), *Thomas Ender (1793–1875)*, Wien, 1964, p. 38; HAAN, pp. 201–202.

³¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 66, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 Oct. 1837, Türkei VIII, 10, Mavrojény to Metternich, Vienna, 23 Oct. 1837, Türkei VIII, 10, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 29 Nov. 1837; GSTA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7279, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 29 Nov. 1837.

³² HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 20, Metternich to Mustafa Reshid Pasha, Vienna, 10 Nov. 1840, Türkei VIII, 15, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 10 Nov. 1840, Türkei VIII, 15, Ahmed Fethi Pasha to Metternich, Constantinople, 8 Dec. 1840.

³³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 20, Metternich to Mustafa Reshid Pasha, Vienna, 10 Nov. 1840.

Europe was far more reasonable.³⁴ However, Mahmud II was of a different opinion and he also wished to improve his army through the knowledge and skills of European officers employed in his service.

As well as in the case of the plan to send Ottoman youths to Europe, the idea of a foreign military mission in the Ottoman Empire also had its Egyptian example. The employment of French officers by Mohammed Ali had proved itself to be beneficial and the Egyptian troops trained by them demonstrated their superiority over the Ottoman troops in the war between Constantinople and Alexandria in 1832/33. Though some French and Italian military adventurers, particularly those of lower ranks without the knowledge necessary for the vast reforms, had already been employed in the Ottoman army, their impact on the troops to which they were detached with limited powers was extremely questionable.³⁵ Consequently, in mid 1830s, Mahmud II decided to follow Mohammed Ali's example again, this time in hiring a larger number of French officers. He planned to send them to a military academy in Constantinople established in 1834, in other words to ask for a French military mission.³⁶ The Ottoman plenipotentiary in Paris, Mustafa Reshid Bey, was instructed to discuss this matter with the French government. This was the revival of a project of the former French ambassador in Constantinople, Armand-Charles Count Guilleminot, from 1830. In that year, the high costs of the proposed school for 200–300 students and the counterarguments of Count Orlov seemed to lead the Porte to put the plan on hold. Four years later, Husrev Pasha revived the idea, attaching great importance to it. As Metternich learned, the Porte planned to hire 30 French officers: 15 for the training of the regular army and 15 for training the imperial guard.³⁷

The chancellor was not naturally indifferent to this project. Though he agreed with the necessity of reforms in the Ottoman Empire, he considered it dangerous to entrust the creation of a regular and disciplined army only to French officers for two reasons: First, it would considerably strengthen the influence of France on the Bosphorus. Something similar had already happened in Egypt, where France increased its influence by placing

³⁴ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 67, August Prince of Prussia, *Mémoire sur l'organisation de l'armée Ottomane*, attached to Klezl to Metternichovi, Büyükdere, 30 May 1838; E. KESSEL, *Moltke*, Stuttgart 1957, p. 120.

³⁵ A. LEVY, *The Officer Corps in Sultan Mahmud II's New Ottoman Army, 1826–1839*, in: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1971, p. 24; HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830.

³⁶ C. V. FINDLEY, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire. The Sublime Porte, 1789–1922*, Princeton, New Jersey 1980, p. 134.

³⁷ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 7 Jan. and 13 March 1835, Türkei VI, 63, Nesselrode to Butenev, Saint Petersburg, 3 Feb. 1835.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

French personnel in Mohammed Ali's service. Metternich worried that France could achieve similar success in Constantinople. The second reason for his negative attitude was concern that the uniforms of the French instructors concealed individuals propagating revolutionary ideas and subversive dogmas threatening the order and tranquillity of the Ottoman Empire.³⁸ He was afraid of the spread of these ideas in the very heart of the Empire:

*“The peace and tranquillity of the capital of the Ottoman Empire could be jeopardized due to such a great number of French officers among whom, one must admit, there will be some who, in the guise of instructors, will try to sow [the seeds of] revolutionary ideas and beliefs subversive to the existing order in Turkey.”*³⁹

For these reasons Metternich ordered the new Austrian internuncio in Constantinople, Baron Bartolomäus Stürmer, to forestall the foundation of the military academy led by the French officers.⁴⁰ At the same time, he informed Saint Petersburg about this plan with the goal of securing Russian support, which was not too difficult given the tsar's shared antipathy towards France and the Russian-French tensions in the Near East. Russian Vice-Chancellor Karl Robert Count Nesselrode made the same arguments as Metternich against French activities in Constantinople and the employment of the French in the military academy.⁴¹ In a letter to the Russian ambassador, Apollinarij Petrovic Count Butenev, Nesselrode presumed that Butenev had surely cooperated with Stürmer *“over the best measures to employ for forestalling the execution of a project with which we disagree with the same force and for the same reason as the court in Vienna.”*⁴² Metternich's determination to thwart the project was strengthened on learning of the identical attitude of the tsar's court, and he even asked for the support of conservative British Prime Minister Duke Wellington, who expressed his regret of the Porte's one-sided pro-French orientation in this affair though nothing indicates that he wished to become involved with the matter.⁴³

³⁸ HHStA, StA, England 214, Metternich to Esterházy, Vienna, 14 March 1835.

³⁹ Ibidem.

⁴⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 7 Jan. 1835.

⁴¹ HHStA, StA, Russland III, 105, Metternich to Ficquelmont, Vienna, 10 Jan. and 13 March 1835, Türkei VI, 63, Nesselrode to Butenev, Saint Petersburg, 3 Feb. 1835, Russland III, 104, Ficquelmont to Metternich, Saint Petersburg, 6 April 1835.

⁴² HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 63, Nesselrode to Butenev, Saint Petersburg, 3 Feb. 1835.

⁴³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 13 March 1835, England 214, Metternich to Esterházy, Vienna, 14 March 1835, England 209, Esterházy to Metternich, London, 27 March 1835.

Husrev Pasha and some other Ottoman dignitaries denied the existence of the project and assured Stürmer that they understood the danger in young Ottomans being instructed in an academy led by French officers. In contrast, Reis Efendi (Foreign Minister) Mehmed Akif recognised its existence but declared he was against it.⁴⁴ Akif was in good relations with Stürmer and Butenev and it was he who helped them to persuade the Divan at the beginning of March to devise new instructions for Mustafa Resid Bey. According to these instructions, if Mustafa Resid still had not made any arrangement concerning the delegation of the French professors and officers to Constantinople, he was to quietly abandon the plan. In the event that a preliminary agreement had been arranged, he was to take no further steps and conclude nothing definitive. If the whole affair had already been settled beyond recall, the French were to be allowed to come to the Ottoman capital but not be employed in the army. The sultan gave his full consent to the instructions and they were immediately sent to Paris.⁴⁵

In April 1835, the tensions arising from the planned foundation of the French military academy were finally averted. Mustafa Resid Bey received instructions before he had a definite settlement with the Parisian cabinet and abandoned the project without any difficulty. No French officers were employed in the Ottoman military academy during Mahmud II's lifetime, including the two or three French officers who were signed on by Resid before he obtained his counter-order and who arrived in Constantinople in March 1836.⁴⁶ Stürmer and Butenev undoubtedly deserved the lion's share of the credit for making this happen.

Nevertheless, Metternich's vigilance was also important. In addition, he continued to observe the employment of foreign officers by the Ottomans and he did not hesitate to oppose other French assistance if and when it was necessary.⁴⁷ As to other French officers serving in the Ottoman army from earlier periods, their sacking *en masse* in late 1836 can be hardly ascribed to anything other than the concentrated Austrian-Russian diplomatic pressure.⁴⁸ In the mid-1830s, Metternich also supported the Russian effort against Palmerston's attempt to deploy British officers in

⁴⁴ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 63, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 28 Jan. and 25 Feb. 1835.

⁴⁵ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 63, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 4 March 1835.

⁴⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 8 April 1835, Türkei VI, 63, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 22 April 1835, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 30 March 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7275, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 21 July 1835, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 30 March 1836; BERKES, pp. 111–112.

⁴⁷ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 26 and 27 Jan. 1836.

⁴⁸ The National Archives, London, Kew (henceforth: TNA), Foreign Office (henceforth: FO) 78/278, Ponsonby to Palmerston, Therapia, 28 Dec. 1836.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

the Ottoman army and navy, and particularly against Polish General Wojciech Chrzanowsky in Eastern Anatolia, whose posting was instigated by the British foreign secretary. As with the French military instructors and officers, Metternich was also successful in the case of Chrzanowsky and the British officers: the former had no significant influence on the Ottoman army and was soon removed, and the latter were never employed by the sultan.⁴⁹

Some of these Austrian-Russian victories were undoubtedly achieved with the help of, first, the Churchill affair from the late spring and summer of 1836 when the maltreatment of the British citizen by Ottoman officials led to the rather hostile and menacing conduct of the British ambassador, John Lord Ponsonby, towards the Porte,⁵⁰ and, second, the tsar's decision made in the same year to forgive a part of the sultan's war indemnities from the last Russian-Ottoman war and evacuate Silistria occupied by Russian forces since 1829.⁵¹ The former definitely made the employment of the British in the Ottoman armed forces an impossible task and, together with the latter, probably strengthened the sultan's decision made earlier to look for officers in the conservative countries.

Mahmud II's acquiescence under the Austrian-Russian pressure did not mean that he gave up his plan for the employment of foreign military advisers, but rather he only planned to modify his choice. Already in July 1835, Husrev Pasha informed Königsmarck about the sultan's wish to employ several Prussian artillerymen,⁵² but since Königsmarck obtained no answer from his king, he thought that Frederick William III was unwilling to grant the request and did not discuss the affair any more. How-

⁴⁹ HHStA, StA, Russland III, 106, Ficquelmont to Metternich, Saint Petersburg, 5 Jan. 1836, Türkei VI, 65, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 26 and 27 Jan. 1836, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836, HHStA, 64, Türkei VI, 65, Adelburg to Stürmer, Pera, 6 July 1836, Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 6 July and 14 Dec. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 27 Jan. and 17 Feb. 1836; F. S. RODKEY, *Lord Palmerston and the Rejuvenation of Turkey, 1830–41: Part I, 1830–39*, in: *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1929, p. 578; M. TODOROVA, *British and Russian Policy towards the Reform Movement in the Ottoman Empire (30-ies – 50-ies of the 19th c.)*, in: *Études Balkaniques*, 1977, p. 19; L. MAIER, *Reformwille und Beharrung. Das Osmanische Reich 1835–1839 aus der Sicht Helmuth von Moltkes*, in: J. MATEŠIĆ, K. HEITMANN (Eds.), *Südosteuropa in der Wahrnehmung der deutschen Öffentlichkeit vom Wiener Kongreß (1815) bis zum Pariser Frieden (1856)*, München 1990, p. 44.

⁵⁰ Sir Ch. K. WEBSTER, *The Foreign Policy of Palmerston 1830–1841. Britain, the Liberal Movement and the Eastern Question*, Vol. 2, London 1951, pp. 530–534.

⁵¹ V. J. PURYEAR, *International Economics and Diplomacy in the Near East, 1834–1853*, Stanford 1969, p. 48.

⁵² GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7275, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 21 July 1835.

ever, the Porte itself raised the issue again at the end of the year and made a formal request at the beginning of 1836. It asked for 15 Prussians instructors – 11 officers and 4 non-commissioned officers – to be sent to Constantinople for three years: 1 officer for teaching military geography and military history; 1 officer for teaching the art of mapping; 1 officer for teaching mathematics; 2 officers for teaching French; 2 officers as artillery instructors with 2 non-commissioned officers; 1 officers as a cavalry instructor with 2 non-commissioned officers; 1 officer with the knowledge of the art of war and light fortification; 2 officers for teaching military economy. At that point, Frederick William III gave his consent to their employment in Ottoman service.⁵³

What were the reasons for the sultan's swing to Prussia? Historians have generally explained this decision by, first, Prussia's limited activity in the Eastern Question being more palatable to the sultan than the other Powers' active struggle for the predominant influence over his court, second, Moltke's presence in the Ottoman Empire since October 1835, and third, the delivery of Marquis Caraman's work *Essai sur l'organisation militaire de la Prusse* from 1831 of which the Turkish translation gripped Mahmud II because it described the Prussian effective military reform carried out at minimum possible expenses.⁵⁴ One must add, however, that particularly the second and third factors merely increased the already existing reputation of excellence of the Prussian army held by the Ottomans; it was no accident that they were so interested in Prussian artillerymen because they believed in the superiority of Prussia's artillery and nicknamed all Prussians "those artillerymen".⁵⁵ *Celui d'artilleurs* Mahmud II himself thought a great deal not only of Peter I the Great or Napoleon Bonaparte but also Frederick II the Great,⁵⁶ and Husrev was after 1835 as much pro-Prussian as he had been earlier pro-French.⁵⁷ Stürmer even attributed the

⁵³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7276, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 30 Dec. 1835; HHStA, Staatskanzlei (henceforth: StK), Preussen 162, Trauttmannsdorff to Metternich, Berlin, 15 March 1836.

⁵⁴ J. HAJJAR, *L'Europe et les destinées du Proche-Orient (1815–1848)*, Paris 1970, p. 174; R. WAGNER, *Moltke und Mühlbach zusammen unter dem Halbmonde 1837–1839*, Berlin 1893, p. 15; KESSEL, p. 115.

⁵⁵ The Ottomans also used these nicknames for other nations: the French were "*the people without religion*"; the British "*those without faith*"; the Austrians "*those who like fur coats*", and the Russians "*the fishermen*". GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 20 April 1836.

⁵⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*; HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 24 Feb. 24 1836, Türkei VI, 65, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 May 1836, Türkei VI, 65,

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

project of the employment of the Prussian officers to him: *“The demand for the Prussians is above all the work of the serasker, who is not especially partial to us and has always had a particular preference for the Prussian army.”*⁵⁸

It is less known that the Porte also asked Austria for its officers. Stürmer was first informed about this plan in January 1836 by Akif Efendi, who declared that his monarch would like to obtain some professors and instructors from the country where the Ottoman students had made such great progress in their studies in such a short time.⁵⁹ The formal request for six military experts was delivered to Stürmer in February; Mahmud II desired to employ 1 professor of geometry, 1 professor of fortification and relevant sciences, 1 instructor for the organisation of the military academy, 1 instructor of the horse artillery, 1 instructor of the foot artillery and 1 hussar for the organisation of a hussar regiment that the sultan had long wished for. An affirmative answer came immediately from Vienna.⁶⁰

Why did the two German Powers agree to the sultan's request? In fact there was no alternative for the cabinets in Berlin and Vienna in early 1836 other than to satisfy it. After Mahmud II had been prevented from employing French and British military advisers, it was no surprise that he would turn to other countries with the same demand. A refusal would undoubtedly have moved him to turn again to the two liberal Powers, turning the victory of conservatism into defeat.⁶¹ The tsar convinced the Prussian king to agree, but Metternich did not need persuading since he was the prominent player in this matter and more than willing to send Austrian officers to Constantinople. His desire is evident from the fact that while firstly Prussia was not only absolutely passive during the other Powers' struggle for the employment of their own officers in the Ottoman service but also rather restrained towards the Porte's original attempt to obtain

Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 24 August 1836, Türkei VI, 66, Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 19 July 1837.

⁵⁸ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836.

⁵⁹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Adelburg to Stürmer, Pera, 24 Jan. 1836, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 27 Jan. and 4 Feb. 1836, Türkei VIII, 9, Ahmed Fethi Pasha to Metternich, Constantinople, 4 April 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 6 and 27 Jan., 27 April 1836.

⁶⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Reis Effendi's Note to Stürmer, 8 Feb. 1836, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. and 10 March 1836, Türkei VIII, 9, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 16 March 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 16 March and 27 April 1836.

⁶¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7276, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 30 Dec. 1835.

Prussian artillerymen, and secondly it did not agree to the sending of the officers until the moment when the king realised that the tsar really wanted them,⁶² Metternich had tried since the very beginning to influence the sultan's choice of the most suitable country for contributing to his military reforms. According to Königsmarck, and there is no reason to disbelieve him, when Austria and Russia succeeded in preventing the project of the Military Academy led by the French, they recommended that the Porte appeal in this matter to the governments "whose citizens" morality and the principles of order in which they have been brought up would offer better guarantees of reliability.⁶³

The different roles played by the two German Powers in the affair also are clearly evident in the speed of Austria's answer to the request, the enthusiastic style of this answer and finally its willingness to cover almost all the expenses of its own officers, which was in sharp contrast to the expenses incurred by the Prussians, which were to be completely paid by the Porte.⁶⁴ Other evidence that Austria insisted on the success of this project much more so than Prussia can also be found in the behaviour of the Viennese court and chancellery towards the extraordinary Ottoman ambassador, Ferik Ahmed Fethi Pasha, sent in the summer of 1835 to congratulate new Emperor Ferdinand I on his accession to the throne.⁶⁵ This influential dignitary and officer with the rank equivalent to a division general (*ferik*), about whom Mahmud II once said that "he is my Orlov",⁶⁶ was welcomed with exceptional warmth, was accommodated in a hotel at the expense of the emperor from July to September and was favoured with attention far above that required by protocol.⁶⁷

As for the honours accorded Ahmed, for example, a military parade took place in his honour on 14 August, during which a command and the rank

⁶² J. L. WALLACH, *Anatomie einer Militärhilfe. Die preußisch-deutschen Militärmissionen in der Türkei 1835–1919*, Düsseldorf 1976, p. 19.

⁶³ GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7276, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 30 Dec. 1835.

⁶⁴ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer's Note to the Porte, Constantinople, 7 April 1836, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 6 and 13 April 1836, Türkei VI, 65, The Porte's Memorandum to Königsmarck, 6 Dec. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 23 March 1836.

⁶⁵ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 63, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 21 May 1835; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7275, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 19 May and 24 June 1835.

⁶⁶ The National Archives in Prague (henceforth: NA), Rodinný archiv Metternichů–Acta Clementina (henceforth: RAM–AC) 2, Box 6, 64-A, Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 27 July 1835.

⁶⁷ Archives Diplomatiques et Africains in Brussels (henceforth: ADA), Correspondances Politiques (henceforth: CP), Autriche 3, O'Sullivan to Meulenaer, Vienna, 3 Aug. 1835.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

of marshal was conferred on him. When Ahmed expressed his desire to visit a considerable number of military places including the fortification of Linz or the Military Academy in Wiener-Neustadt, it was immediately granted and one can hardly suppose that the Austrians did so without ulterior motives.⁶⁸ More than eloquent are the words from a notice on Ahmed's stay in Austria published in the *Österreichischer Beobachter* that his mission would not only strengthen the friendly relations of the two countries but also "*considerably contribute to the foundation of more helpful institutions and useful facilities in the Ottoman Empire.*"⁶⁹

Though the content of discussions between Austrian dignitaries and Ahmed is not known, the former undoubtedly desired to increase Austria's influence in Constantinople by entering into friendly relations with the latter, which could particularly be advantageous in military affairs. The first goal was undoubtedly achieved because after his return to the Ottoman capital in early November 1835, Ahmed demonstrated warm pro-Austrian sentiment. He was very pleased with the way he had been welcomed and treated by the emperor and his court,⁷⁰ in particular by the chancellor and his wife. Metternich purposely stayed in contact with Ahmed to a degree exceeding that of usual diplomatic correspondence, proving that the prince tried to maintain very cordial relations with this dignitary and use him as a pro-Austrian member of the Ottoman government, in particular for the support of the employment of the Austrian officers.⁷¹ When, for instance, Ahmed sent Metternich a gift from Mahmud II the sultan's portrait, in early April 1836, he accompanied a letter with this *post-scriptum*: "*I beg of Y.[our] H.[ighness] to remember me kindly to Madam the Princess and present her with my humble respects.*"⁷² Metternich's answer was no less amicable as it is evident in his own *post-scriptum* of the letter from late April:

"My wife charges me to extend her greetings to you. She is very well and since husbands are always obedient to their

⁶⁸ Sächsisches Staatsarchiv, Hauptstaatsarchiv in Dresden (henceforth: SS, HD), Sächsische Gesandtschaften (henceforth: SG) 10026, Wien 93, Report from Vienna, 22 July, 8 and 19 Aug. 1835; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 6026, Maltzan to Frederick William III, Vienna, 31 July and 7 August 1835; ADA, CP, Autriche 3, O'Sullivan to Meulenaer, Vienna, 15 Aug. 1835; BHStA, MA, Wien 2406, Verger to Ludwig I von Bayern, Vienna, 19 and 27 Sept. 1835.

⁶⁹ *Österreichischer Beobachter*, Nr. 270 (27 Sept. 1835).

⁷⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 Nov. 1835.

⁷¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Metternich to Ahmed Fethi Pasha, 22 Feb. 1836, attached to Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 23 Feb. 1836.

⁷² HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 9, Ahmed Fethi Pasha to Metternich, Constantinople, 4 April 1836.

wives, I had to allow mine to take possession of His Highness' portrait. She has placed it in her study with the expectation that one day it will become part of my beloved son's inheritance and he will convey it in due course to his own son."⁷³

Metternich's effort was undoubtedly successful. Ahmed was pleased with this approach of the prominent European statesman and generally replied to the chancellor's letters or the messages conveyed by the internuncio with much affection and open-heartedness. In late April 1837, for example, he wrote to Metternich:

*"As for me, My Prince, every hour that rings reminds me of your goodness, your kindness and your constant friendship of which Y.[our] H.[ighness] has furnished me with so much evidence, and I eagerly wait to be informed about the state of your good health always hoping that Y.[our] H.[ighness] will never want to cross me out from the top of the list of your good servants and friends."*⁷⁴

A month later, he explained an "order," to the chancellor expressed earlier as a joke *"because there is no ceremony between us and, consequently, we believe we can speak openly to one another."*⁷⁵ Besides the cordial attitude towards Metternich accompanied by these almost curious expressions of friendship and affection, Ahmed really did provide practical support in the sultan's project for the employment of foreign officers and sided with Austria in this affair.⁷⁶

Nevertheless, Ahmed's activities finally did not help Austria to succeed in supplying military assistance to the sultan and this was finally provided only by Prussia. The reason for this shift in the Porte's attitude is not clear. German historian Georg Rosen claimed that it was due to Rus-

⁷³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Metternich to Ahmed Fethi Pasha, Vienna, 26 April 1836, attached to Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 26 April 1836.

⁷⁴ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 20, Ahmed Fethi Pasha to Metternich, Constantinople, 27 April 1836.

⁷⁵ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 20, Ahmed Fethi Pasha to Metternich, Constantinople, 30 May 1836.

⁷⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 9 March 1836; NA, RAM-AC 2, Box 6, 64-A, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 20 April 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 17 Feb. 1836.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

sia's secret opposition to the presence of Austrian officers in the Levant.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, he did so without quoting any relevant documents and this view seems to be rather precarious. Though the tsar undoubtedly preferred the Prussian military mission, the Austrians were still a much better choice than the French or British and, moreover, he urgently needed the support of the Habsburg Empire in the Near East; any plots against the employment of its citizens could have serious consequences if they were revealed, which was almost certain in the conditions of the sultan's court crowded with corruptible and devious people. If this happened, it could have serious consequences for the Russian position in Constantinople where the British tried to undermine it with a strong anti-Russian policy⁷⁸ and, second, Russia was in an uneasy situation towards the Viennese cabinet owing to the publication of some Russian diplomatic documents from the late 1820s containing anti-Austrian views in the British anti-Russian journal named *Portfolio*.⁷⁹

The Austrian, Prussian and other diplomatic correspondence studied offers no evidence for Rosen's theory, and the instructions to Butenev from 2 February 1836 in which Nesselrode conveyed the tsar's pleasure at the Porte's decision to hire Prussian and Austrian military instructors instead of those from Great Britain and France, even prove the opposite. As for Austria, Nesselrode called Butenev's attention to the necessity of maintaining a close alliance between Saint Petersburg and Vienna at the very moment British Foreign Secretary was trying to weaken it or at least give the impression that this entente was crumbling. Consequently, there was only one possible order for Butenev from Nesselrode in the case of Austrian instructors:

“Particularly in the matter of the choice of the Austrian officers, convey to the Porte that sending them will arouse neither the envy nor the suspicion of the emperor [tsar]. You can even stamp onto the declaration

⁷⁷ G. ROSEN, *Geschichte der Türkei von dem Siege der Reform im Jahre 1826 bis zum Pariser Tractat vom Jahre 1856*, Leipzig 1866, p. 234.

⁷⁸ In early 1836, the Russian cabinet even feared an early British-Ottoman rapprochement and asked Metternich for support, but this fear was baseless. HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 3 Feb. 1836. See also Nesselrode's instructions to Butenev quoted below.

⁷⁹ SAINTE-AULAIRE, *Souvenirs (Vienne 1832–1841)*, Paris 1926, pp. 239–241; M. LAMB, *Writing up the Eastern Question in 1835–1836*, in: *The International History Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1993, pp. 256–266.

the character of sincerity and frankness that always carry the assurances that come directly from our noble master."⁸⁰

Butenev dealt then according to this instruction with the Ottomans.⁸¹ This means that there had to be a different external or internal reason for the withdrawal of the request for the Austrian officers. As for the former, it is entirely possible that the formerly unsuccessful Western Powers in return thwarted Austrian ambitions, but this theory can be proved only with the research of relevant documents in British and French archives. On the other hand, the Ottoman documents could throw more light onto the attitude of the Porte that can be only guessed here. One cannot hide the fact that a considerable number of the sultan's advisers were not favourably inclined to Austria, in particular Husrev Pasha.⁸² Stürmer already reported in February 1836 on anti-Austrian intrigues at the sultan's court:

*"They have worked from various angles to frustrate everything that could give Austria an excessive influence over the affairs of this country. As I know from Mr Butenev, at one moment there was even a question of demanding only Prussian instructors. I said that it was all the same to us, considering that it was beneath our dignity to assert ourselves to render an unwanted service to the Porte."*⁸³

Although the personal sentiments of the Ottoman dignitaries might have played an important role in the fact that only Prussian officers were finally hired, Ottoman leaders could also have abandoned the idea of employing the Austrians because they planned to reform the army according to the Prussian model, and for this purpose the Prussians were a logical choice;⁸⁴ moreover, European officers were to deal with Ottoman batteries

⁸⁰ Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi imperii in Moscow (henceforth: AVPRI), fond 133, Kantselariia, opis 469, 1836/43, Nesserlode to Butenev, Saint Petersburg, 2 Feb. 1836.

⁸¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 9 March 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 17 Feb. 1836.

⁸² HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 17, Malaguzziny to Metternich, Vienna, 19 April 1830, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 and 24 Feb. 1836, Türkei VI, 65, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 May 1836.

⁸³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836.

⁸⁴ In early 1841, the Porte refused the proposal of a British ambassador to employ six British artillerymen with the explanation that the Ottoman artillery had been reformed after the Prussian fashion. HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 80, Stürmer to Metternich, Constanti-

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

on the frontier with Austria and it would be illogical for Austrian soldiers to train the recruits that would serve against them in the case of an Ottoman-Austrian war.⁸⁵ The Austrians could also have been refused for the simple reason that the Porte did not know to which purpose they were really to serve because the plans for the use of the "German" officers were changed in the course of 1836; a few Europeans were to be delegated to various Ottoman commanders as advisers. Consequently, 4 officers instead of 15 from Prussia and none from the Habsburg Empire were to be hired. This was announced to Königsmarck in September 1836 and the official request was despatched to Berlin in December.⁸⁶

Here it is necessary to refute the claim raised by German historian Jehuda L. Wallach that the reduction from 15 to 4 was caused by Austrian intrigues resulting from envy; there is no sign of such plots in the studied documents.⁸⁷ Austria did not oppose Prussia's military assistance and although the two Great Powers' negotiations with the Porte proceeded separately, Metternich supported the Prussians against the hostility of the British cabinet who opposed their forthcoming presence in the Levant, as evident from its instructions to the British Ambassador in Constantinople, John Lord Ponsonby, who was ordered to tell the Porte that the officers coming from Berlin could be regarded "*as sent by the Russian government, and for purposes unfriendly to England and injurious to Turkey.*"⁸⁸ However, when Lord Russel asked the Austrian envoy in Berlin, Joseph Count Trauttmansdorff-Weinsberg, whether Austria did not fear that the Prussian officers could be the long arm of Russia, the latter did not hesitate to defend the usefulness of their presence in the Ottoman Empire.⁸⁹

nople, 4 March 1841. It is not, however, the purpose of this paper to deal with the degree to which the Ottomans reformed their army after the Prussian model, which is, moreover, very difficult to do owing to the lack of sources. T. HEINZELMANN, *Heiliger Kampf oder Landesverteidigung. Die Diskussion um die Einführung der allgemeinen Militärpflicht im Osmanischen Reich 1826–1856*, Frankfurt am Main 2004, pp. 105–108. Probably the work of the Ottoman interpreter in Berlin, Carabed, archived in Vienna can serve as research material on the topic: HHStA, StK, Interiora–Intercepte, 28, *Observations sur l'organisation militaire en Prusse et sur son application à l'Empire Ottoman*, attached to Nouri Efendi to Reshid Pasha, Berlin, 1 Jan. 1840.

⁸⁵ GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 20 April 1836.

⁸⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 23 Nov. 1836, The Porte's Memorandum to Königsmarck, 6. Dec. 1836; K. PRÖHL, *Die Bedeutung preussischer Politik in den Phasen der orientalischen Frage: ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung deutsch-türkischer Beziehungen von 1606 bis 1871*, Frankfurt am Main 1986, p. 182; HAJJAR, p. 176.

⁸⁷ WALLACH, p. 19.

⁸⁸ RODKEY, p. 585.

⁸⁹ HHStA, StK, Preussen 165, Trauttmansdorff to Metternich, Berlin, 1 July 1837.

The way in which the Porte informed the Viennese cabinet that it would not employ its officers was typical for Ottoman diplomacy: it did so with complete silence. After the settlement of negotiations between the Porte and Stürmer about the status of the Austrians who were to reside in the Ottoman Empire,⁹⁰ the internuncio was informed in late April 1836 that the discussions would continue in Vienna. For this purpose Ferik Ahmed Fethi Pasha was named a permanent Ottoman ambassador.⁹¹ However, the Ottomans never actually reopened negotiations on the subject in either the Austrian or Ottoman capital. The delay resulting from Ahmed's journey to Vienna, where he did not arrive until the last day of September, already indicated such a strategy, and the members of the Divan maintained their silence towards the internuncio much as did Ahmed towards Metternich.⁹²

Since Metternich as well as Stürmer was not inclined to speak out in this affair, it came to nothing. The cabinet in Vienna adopted the passive attitude as outlined by the internuncio earlier when he had learned that the talks would continue in Vienna:

“The matter regarding the instructors is suspended at the moment like all the others. I have decided not to talk about it with anybody any more but to wait until the moment is deemed opportune to reopen the discussion on the topic with me. I find this attitude to be the only one appropriate to the dignity of the imperial court; any over-eagerness [on our part] would cause another disadvantage, that would, among others, lead the Porte, by nature so distrustful, to believe that we are interested in hastening the despatch of these instructors and claiming for ourselves the credit for a service that it [the Porte] has to request and acknowledge.”⁹³

Austria's assumed passivity could not of course escape the attention of the second German Power, whose envoy in Vienna, Mortimer Count Maltzan, wrote in late December 1836 to Berlin:

⁹⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 10 Feb. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 6 April 1836.

⁹¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 64, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 20 and 27 April 1836; TNA, FO 78/274, Ponsonby to Palmerston, Therapia, 16 April 1836.

⁹² SS, HD, SG 10026, Wien 93, Report from Vienna, 1 Oct. 1836; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 6028, Bockelberg to Frederick William III, Vienna, 4 Oct. 1836.

⁹³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 11 May 1836.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

“Three months have passed since the arrival of the Turkish ambassador in Vienna without a word being said about the affair in question; the way in which it stops and starts will be depend on the moves initiated by the Porte; the imperial cabinet has firmly decided in no case to take the initiative.”⁹⁴

Consequently, only three Prussian officers, Vincke, Fischer and Mühlbach, arrived in Constantinople in late August 1837 and joined Moltke, the fourth chosen by the king.⁹⁵ The story of their two-year activity in the Levant is too well-known to be repeated here and is not the goal of this paper. What can be briefly said, however, is that their observations on the Ottoman reform movement and its army, and particularly the views of Moltke, entirely confirmed the criticism contained in the Prussian and Austrian diplomats' reports from previous years. The service of Moltke and his colleagues had no really positive effect on the army because the Ottomans simply did not know how to make the best of their qualities. Moreover, the Prussians exercised no real power or authority and the soldiers had no reason to listen to them. Moltke, Mühlbach and Vincke were finally deployed in 1838 at army headquarters, where military commanders were often deaf to their advice. This proved to be fatal for Hafiz Pasha, who did not listen to Moltke's warnings before the battle at Nezib with the Egyptian army in June 1839, in which he was completely defeated. At that time the two-year period assigned to the Prussians was about to terminate and Frederick William III decided to recall them. Moltke, Mühlbach and Vincke followed Fischer who had departed earlier for home. The battle at Nezib and Mahmud II's death a few days later also resulted in the Porte's plan to employ several Prussian artillery officers, declared in November 1837 and already settled with Prussia when the battle took place, not coming to fruition.

The presence of the Prussian officers in the sultan's service was not, however, entirely insignificant in the history of the Ottoman Empire, because they left behind them documentary evidence probably more important to diplomatic history than to military history. The reports they wrote, and especially those of Moltke, sent to Berlin and read in Vienna, were later a valuable source of information, in particular in early 1838 when a war between Mahmud II and Mohammed Ali seemed to be imminent, or a year later when it actually broke out. Already in September

⁹⁴ GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 6028, Maltzan to Frederick William III, Vienna, 21 Dec. 1836.

⁹⁵ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 66, Stürmer to Metternichi, Büyükdere, 30 Aug. 1837; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7279, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 30 Aug. and 6 Sept. 1837.

1836, when Moltke was the only Prussian officer in the sultan's service, Stürmer drew attention to the great informative value of his reports and recommended that Metternich have his own Austrian officer in the Ottoman Empire regularly reporting to Vienna, which finally did not happen.⁹⁶

Though the decision concerning the non-employment of the Austrian officers had to be the cause of some disappointment in Vienna, hiring the Prussians instead of the French and British was regarded as a triumph of conservative diplomacy and definitely offered some consolation.⁹⁷ It also did not prevent Austria from continuing to think about cementing its good relations with the Ottoman Empire through its own military assistance to the sultan's military reforms. It is clearly evident from the above-mentioned Archduke Johann's visit to Constantinople in October 1837 that resulted in the sending of several Ottoman students to Vienna and in the handover of Austria's gifts of the total value of 4,872 florins to Mahmud II by Hauslab on 4 November 1837. These gifts were generally of a military nature or were intended for the use by the army: military material and equipment, models of military tools, geometrical instruments for the measurement and completion of (military) maps, books and maps of military character.⁹⁸ Stürmer accompanied the presentation of these items with speeches of usual diplomatic courtesy and an evident intimation that Mahmud II enjoyed the greatest confidence in Austria's participation in Ottoman military reforms. The internuncio started with these words:

“His Majesty the emperor, my most gracious master, knows the active interest which Your Majesty ceaselessly pays to the creation of your army. He takes a sincere pleasure in it

⁹⁶ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 65, Stürmer to Metternich, Büyükdere, 7 Sept. 1836. Metternich gained a certain compensation in the presence of the two physicians in Constantinople, whom Mahmud II requested in 1838. Doctors Neuner and Bernard arrived the Ottoman capital in early December of the same year. The former soon became the sultan's personal physician and through his reports Metternich was the first European statesman in the spring of 1839 to learn of the sultan's imminent death. The latter became a director of the Medico-surgical school in Galata-Serai and informed Metternich about the events in the Ottoman Empire in the following years. GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7280, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Büyükdere, 12 Oct. 1838; A. KERNBAUER, *Die österreichischen Ärzte in Istanbul und die Großmachtdiplomatie*, in: M. SKOPEC, A. KERNBAUER (Eds.), *Österreichisch-Türkische medizinische Beziehungen historisch und modern*, (Mitteilungen der österreichischen Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften 10/1990), Wien 1990, pp. 11–14.

⁹⁷ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 67, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 25 July 1837.

⁹⁸ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 10, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 5 Sept. 1837.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

because he sees in this glorious effort an important assurance for the security of the Ottoman Empire. Always ready to contribute to the accomplishment of the useful intentions of Your Majesty, as much as it is in his power, the emperor has had a selection of models, military tools and geometrical instruments made by the best craftsmen in Vienna, which, in addition to several maps and military equipment, seemed to complete the collection Your Majesty already possesses in this respect."⁹⁹

Flattery and patience were the only means that Austria had to achieve the employment of its own officers in the Ottoman Empire. It finally saw this happen during the second war between Constantinople and Alexandria when Austria and Great Britain assisted the Ottoman forces in the Syrian campaign against Mohammed Ali in 1840/41. In addition to the Austrian expeditionary forces fighting on the Syrian coast under Austria's banner, 4 officers were employed directly by the Porte at its own expense. The Ottomans requested them in August 1840 with the aim of employing them in Syria to build fortification works, and Metternich willingly agreed.¹⁰⁰ In November 1840, Stürmer introduced them to Sultan Abdülmecid I – Lieutenant-Colonel Philippovich, Major Trattner, Major Pott, Captain Platzler. The internuncio desired to obtain for them the same conditions that Prussian officers had enjoyed in previous years. In early December, the Austrians left Constantinople for Syria but what had happened to the Prussian officers happened to them too: the Porte in fact did not know how to employ them and when they arrived in their destination, they realised that they had nothing to do, and they were happy when they were recalled home in February 1841.¹⁰¹

The same fate met Austrian military doctors sent to Syria when the Viennese cabinet learnt in early November 1840 of an absolute lack of capable physicians and surgeons in the Ottoman army waging war in Syria. Metternich immediately initiated the sending of 10 doctors chosen

⁹⁹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 10, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 8 Nov. 1837.

¹⁰⁰ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 15, Metternich to Mavrojény, Vienna, 6 Oct. 1840, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 13 Nov. 1840.

¹⁰¹ HHStA, StA, Türkei VI, 78, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 22 Sept. and 30 Oct. 1840, Türkei VIII, 15, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 6, 19 and 20 Oct. 1840, Türkei VIII, 15, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 30 April 1841; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7282, Königsmarck to Frederick William IV, Büyükdere, 26 Aug. 1840, MdA I, 7283, Königsmarck to Frederick William IV, Büyükdere, 18 Nov. and 2 Dec. 1840, MdA I, 7284, Königsmarck to Frederick William IV, Büyükdere, 30 March 1841; AVPRI, fond 133, Kantselariia, opis 469, 1841/41, Titov to Nesselrode, Pera, 2 Feb. and 13 March 1841.

by the War Council (4 senior officers and 6 junior officers).¹⁰² They arrived in Syria in late February 1841, where they were to be employed in the Ottoman military hospitals. It is certain that they really were active in hospitals in Beirout, Jaffa, Acre, Damascus and Sidon, but their service was frustrated by many difficulties, for example, the problematic conduct of the Ottomans delaying the payment of the agreed salaries and paying little interest in the doctors' work in the disastrous hospital organisation, which was, in fact non-existent, and which was something that Moltke had also criticised in the Ottoman army some years earlier. To improve the existing state of affairs it was necessary to make an enormous effort, but the conditions did not permit such an effort, and in mid April 1841 Stürmer recommended to Metternich the withdrawal of the doctors. Most of those who survived the plague which afflicted the region in early 1841 left Syria in June 1841.¹⁰³

With the return of the Austrian officers who had been intended to support the fortification works and supply medical treatment from Syria back to the Danube Monarchy, the chapter of Prussia's and Austria's military assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the first half of the nineteenth century closed, though a few Ottoman students still remained in Vienna in the 1840s. The practical impact of the Prussian as well as Austrian officers' presence in the Levant on the modernisation of the Ottoman army was negligible and for various reasons far fell behind the accomplishments of French officers in Mohammed Ali's service.¹⁰⁴ But one cannot forget that the assistance given also included the education of Ottoman students in Central Europe, which was not limited to Austria. As for those sent by Mahmud II to Prussia, however, the studied correspondence does not offer any information and no relevant literature exists. Consequently, though education is generally regarded as the most important field of Mahmud II's reforms,¹⁰⁵ it is impossible to assess here the significance of the Ottoman youths' studies in Austria and Prussia.

The diplomatic and social background is probably even more interesting in this chapter of the relations between the two German Powers and the Ottoman Empire. As for the former, the events connected with the military assistance of Europe were an integral and not at all an unimportant

¹⁰² HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 15, Metternich to Stürmer, Vienna, 10 Nov. 1840.

¹⁰³ HHStA, StA, Türkei VIII, 15, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 14 and 30 April 1841, Türkei VIII, 16, Stürmer to Metternich, Constantinople, 7 July 1841; GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7283, Königsmarck to Frederick William IV, Büyükdere, 18 Nov. 1840, MdA I, 7359, Maltzan to Frederick William IV, Vienna, 13 Nov. 1840, MdA I, 7360, Maltzan to Frederick William IV, Vienna, 10 Dec. 1840.

¹⁰⁴ LEVY, p. 24.

¹⁰⁵ ZAKIA, p. 421.

Miroslav Šedivý

The Diplomatic Background of Austria's and Prussia's Military Assistance to the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s

part of the Eastern Question. Since the Great Powers did not want to finish off the “sick man on the Bosphorus” in the 1830s, the principal question of their Near Eastern policy was not how to divide it but how to preserve it, and they vied mainly for influence over the sultan's court and not for his territories. The Ottoman students' stay in Europe or the European military advisers' presence in the Ottoman army was obviously able to make the relations between the sultan and the respective European country more cordial. It was a paradox that in the matter of sending officers to the Levant, Prussia was the most successful nation though it did not compete for influence over the sultan's court to same degree, and Austria failed despite its considerable desire to employ its subjects in its south-eastern neighbour's army – the short Syrian episode was an absolute fiasco. Austria's diplomatic pressure pursued in conjunction with Russia was strong enough to prevent the employment of French and British officers, but Prussia and not Austria finally made the most of supplying military assistance. It is also possible that Austria's obvious efforts encouraged the opposition of the formerly unsuccessful Western Powers and disquieted Mahmud II and his advisers. Less probably meant more in the affair, and Königsmarck seemed to be right when he wrote in his report from February 1836:

*“He [Stürmer] told me that Turkey was a beautiful woman spoiled by flattery and to whom one must pay court in order to obtain favours from her. If our comparison is correct, I answered him, I believe that my system would work better because I had always thought that to please and captivate women of this sort it is necessary to give the impression of indifference.”*¹⁰⁶

As for the social aspect, the Prussian and Austrian assistance to the Porte corresponded with Mahmud II's reformatory effort and desire to carry out changes in the European style – according to models that he tried to find not only in France or Great Britain but also in the two German Powers. At the same time, Austrian and Prussian representatives in Constantinople carefully observed the changes in the Ottoman Empire, in the military in particular, sending careful observations to Vienna and Berlin, making from the Ottoman reform movement a series of discussions and a matter of diplomatic involvement for Austria and an object of interest for Prussia. The two German Powers had already known about this process

¹⁰⁶ GStA PK, HA III, MdA I, 7277, Königsmarck to Frederick William III, Pera, 17 Feb. 1836.

since before the mid-1830s and contributed to it at least by sending gifts of a military type to the sultan. They were therefore hardly surprised when he asked them for military assistance, which must therefore be understood in the wider context of the diplomatic and social relations between the two Great Powers and the Ottoman Empire that have still not been sufficiently researched for that period.

Abstract

The primary goal of the paper is to put the assistance of Austria and Prussia to the Ottoman military reforms in the 1830s into the context of diplomatic relations within the Eastern Question, and explain why the Sublime Porte asked the two German Powers for their officers, why only the Prussians were finally employed in 1837. Furthermore, the paper also evidences the fact that the collaboration of the two German Powers with Sultan Mahmud II in his reformatory effort must be viewed not only in the diplomatic but also social context and that the changes in the Ottoman army had been attentively observed by Austria's and Prussia's diplomats, and Austrian Chancellor Metternich in particular, long before the employment of the two Powers' officers in the Near East was officially discussed with the Ottoman authorities; the Viennese cabinet had even provided the education of several Ottoman youths in its Technical military academy. The paper is finally intended as a brief contribution to the relations between Central Europe, represented in this case by the two most important members of the German Confederation, and the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s.

Keywords

Austria, Prussia, Ottoman Empire, Metternich, Mahmud II, Military Reforms, Ottoman Army

