

THE ROLE OF DAVID URQUHART WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE
OTTOMAN-BRITISH RELATIONS DURING 19TH CENTURY

ARIF UĞUR GÜLSARAN

OCTOBER 2020

THE ROLE OF DAVID URQUHART WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE
OTTOMAN-BRITISH RELATIONS DURING 19TH CENTURY

BY

ARİF UĞUR GÜLSARAN

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER 2020

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by the rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 16/10/2020

Name/Surname: Arif Uğur Gülsaran

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Arif Uğur Gülsaran', written over a horizontal line.

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, David Urquhart's role and his contributions to 19th century Ottoman –British relations are analysed. Urquhart's politic, economic and cultural views on Ottoman State as part of Ottoman-British relations are considered in detail. In order to comprehend Urquhart's role in the relations, his transformation to a Turcophile in Ottoman territory which he had come to join Greek revolt and his assigned duties in Ottoman State as a diplomat are researched. Information about the years he was defending Ottoman State's rights in Britain, organizations, and media organs that he established after his diplomatic career ended is given. This study comprises Urquhart's effectiveness times between the years 1825 and 1876. British National Archive resources, Urquhart's personal documents, British newspapers of related years and Urquhart's writings are analysed during the research period for this study. This thesis clarifies Urquhart's views on why Britain should take Russia on and cooperate with Ottoman State. Additionally, Urquhart's consideration on Turkish and Islamic culture, his activities and their reflections on public opinion are viewed in detail.

Key Words: *David Urquhart, Russophobia, Ottoman-British Relations, Diplomatic history*

ÖZET

Bu tezde 19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı-İngiliz ilişkilerinde David Urquhart'ın rolü ve katkıları incelenmiştir. Tez içinde Urquhart'ın Osmanlı Devleti hakkındaki politik, ekonomik ve kültürel görüşleri Osmanlı-İngiliz ilişkileri çerçevesinde detaylı bir şekilde ele alınmıştır. Urquhart'ın ilişkilerdeki rolünü anlamak için Yunan isyanına katılmak için geldiği Osmanlı topraklarından bir Türk destekçisi olarak çıkması ve sonrasında bir İngiliz diplomatı olarak Osmanlı topraklarında aldığı görevler araştırılmıştır. Diplomat olarak kariyerinin bitişinden sonra İngiltere topraklarında Osmanlı Devleti'nin haklarını savunuşu ile bizzat kurduđu organizasyonlar ve basın yayın organları hakkında bilgiler verilmiştir. Bu çalışma Urquhart'ın aktif olduđu 1825-1876 yılları arasını kapsamaktadır. Çalışma esnasında İngiliz Ulusal Arşivi kaynakları, Urquhart'ın kişisel evrakları, dönemin İngiliz gazeteleri ve Urquhart'ın yazdığı eserler incelenmiştir. Bu tez Urquhart'ın neden İngiltere'nin Rusya'yı karşısına alıp Osmanlı Devleti ile iş birliđi içinde olması gerektiđi görüşünü cevaplamaktadır. Ayrıca Urquhart'ın Türk ve İslam kültürü hakkındaki görüşleri ve icraatları ve bunların İngiliz kamuoyundaki yansımaları incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *David Urquhart, Rus karşıtlığı, Osmanlı-İngiliz İlişkileri, diplomasi tarihi*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor Assist.Prof. Dr. Aysen Müderrisođlu for her valuable support and contributions as my thesis process was at ease by her inspirational advices. I also appreciate head of our department Prof. Dr. Ahmet Tařađıl and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Büyükaksoy who encouraged me for studying the Ottoman history.

I would like to express my gratitude to British National Archives and Balliol College Library team and in particular to Amy Boylan who gave kind and thankworthy support during my researches in Britain.

I appreciate my parents Süleyman and Ayşegül Gülsaran for their support for my academic journey together with love and tolerance for my entire life. At last, I am grateful to my wife, Ahsen Bulut Gülsaran whom I owe a great deal of thanks for standing behind me during this hard period and her unflagging support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. EARLY LIFE OF DAVID URQUHART	4
2.1. Childhood and Youth	4
2.2. Greek Rebellion.....	5
2.2.1. Britain’s Policy during the Greek Rebellion	5
2.2.2. David Urquhart’s Participation in the Greek Rebellion	9
3. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1831-1838.....	12
3.1. His Special Mission for Stratford Canning.....	12
3.2. The Revolt of Mehmet Ali Pasha and Britain’s Policy	13
3.3. Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi	16
3.4. Urquhart’s Views on the Eastern Question	17
3.5. Commercial Tour in the East.....	20
3.6. Secret Visit to the Circassia	23
3.7. The Portfolio.....	25
3.8. Commercial Negotiations between the Great Britain and the Ottoman State	27
3.9. Urquhart as Secretary of Embassy and the Breach with Lord Ponsonby	30
3.9.1. Lord Ponsonby’s Status before Urquhart’s Designation	30
3.9.2. Urquhart’s Designation as Secretary of Embassy and the “Vixen” Affair	32
3.9.3. Conflict between Lord Ponsonby and David Urquhart.....	35
3.10. Treaty of Balta Limanı	38
3.11. Urquhart’s Reaction to His Recall	39
4. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1839-1855.....	44
4.1. Chartism	44
4.2. The Battle of Nizip	46
4.3. Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Tanzimat.....	48
4.4. The Convention of London and War against Mehmed Ali Pasha.....	51
4.5. Political Activities of David Urquhart between 1841-1849	54
4.6. Ottoman-British Relations During 1840s	58

4.6.1. Sultan Abdülmecid, Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Stratford Canning.....	58
4.6.2. Lebanon Uprising.....	60
4.6.3. Hungarian Refugees Matter.....	61
4.7. Urquhart’s Visit to Lebanon and İstanbul	63
4.8. Urquhart and the Crimean War.....	65
4.8.1. Urquhart’s Views on Ottoman Military	66
4.8.2. The Problem of the Holy Places and the Special Mission of Prince Menshikov	69
4.8.3. The Invasion of Principalities and Vienna Conference	73
4.8.4. The Declaration of War and the “Massacre” of Sinop.....	76
4.8.5. The Declaration of War by Britain and France	79
4.8.6. The War and Urquhart’s Campaign.....	81
4.8.7. Peace-making Process: The Treaty of Paris	86
5. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1856-1876.....	90
5.1. Foreign Affairs Committees.....	90
5.1.1. The Foundation and Formation of Foreign Affairs Committees.....	90
5.1.2. Free Press and Diplomatic Review	95
5.1.3. Members of Foreign Affairs Committees	100
5.1.4. Turkish Bath Movement	102
5.2. Visit of Sultan Abdülaziz to London	106
5.3. Old Age of David Urquhart	112
6. CONCLUSION	117
REFERENCES.....	120
Primary Sources.....	120
Secondary Sources	125
APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	133

1. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of nineteenth century, Ottoman State was regressing in both fields of finance and war. Portion of Ottoman territory had evolved to a problem called Eastern Question. It was being dreaded that, a European war between major countries would outbreak in case of conflicts raised about partition of Ottoman territory. In this context, Eastern Question was getting to have the meaning for protection of Ottoman State's territorial integrity in the course of time.

For Britain, it was essential to prevent Mediterranean and the straits' control was seized by Russia to keep Indian road safe. Therefore, Britain had been pursuing policy for preserving independence and territorial integrity of Ottoman State, since 1830s. That policy of Britain had been provided for strengthening Ottoman State by reforms and became tough against its enemies. The main reason that caused Britain to pursue such kind of policy was Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi and straits issue. As of that date, an Ottoman-British alliance had been constituted which had converted into an alliance in war zone during Crimean War and maintained. One of the key factors which made great contribution for implementation and persistence of that alliance was diplomatic relations.

A British citizen David Urquhart rose to prominence with his unusual and frame breaking ideas while Ottoman British relations was proceeding. He came to Ottoman territory to fight against Ottoman State which he had not known before but as became familiar with Ottoman State and Turks by living among them and comprehending their culture; he became supporter and tried to protect their rights. David Urquhart had travelled every inch of Ottoman territory, had command of Turkish language and got in touch with Ottoman diplomats. On the other hand,

Ottoman governors had considered him like one of them and called him as Daoud Bey. David Urquhart had already left great number of writings about Ottoman State, Turks and Islamic culture by his declining years.

Many articles and books by David Urquhart have been reviewed during preparation this thesis. Moreover, records about Ottoman-British relations and David Urquhart in British National Archives and David Urquhart's personal documents from Balliol College which affiliated to Oxford University have been reviewed. In addition, Palmerston Papers presented by Southampton University, *Free Press* and *Diplomatic Review*, the media organs of Foreign Affairs Committees which were founded by David Urquhart, and various British newspapers were the other resources that were utilized for this thesis.

In this thesis, David Urquhart's role and status in nineteenth century Ottoman-British relations will be reviewed. At first, David Urquhart's childhood, youth and especially his conversion process to a Turcophile from a philhellene who had come to Ottoman territory for joining Greek revolt will be analysed. Secondly, Urquhart's assignments in Ottoman State between the years 1831 and 1838 as an official British diplomat and his influence on Ottoman –British relations. In the third place, his resignation and turning back to Britain, joining Chartism movement, deputyship, launching campaign against Russia and Palmerston and his role in Crimean War will be examined. In conclusion, beside his foundation Foreign Affairs Committees as a working-class movement and its media organs, Turkish bath movement, Sultan Abdülaziz's visit to Britain and Urquhart's declining years will be considered.

This thesis will focus on David Urquhart's role and influence on nineteenth century Ottoman-British relations throughout the years he was effective in conjunction with his perspective and ideas on Turkish and Islamic culture.



2. EARLY LIFE OF DAVID URQUHART

2.1. Childhood and Youth

David Urquhart was born at Braelangwell, Cromarty, Scotland in 1805. He was the second child of David Urquhart of Braelangwell and his mother, Margaret Urquhart, was second wife of his father (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43). His family belonged to the clan of the Urquharts at the Scottish Highlands and came from aristocratic origin with high sense of national pride (Robinson, 1920, p. 20). His father died when he was a child and he was grown up by his mother. She took away him to central Europe for his first education in 1817. Urquhart began his education at French military school, College of Sorez . After a year in France, he started to study in Geneva under famous evangelist Caesar Malan (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43). Malan educated his students with his own religious discipline and sometimes his thoughts comprised radical leanings. Urquhart did not consider some Christians as real Christian. Although Mrs. Urquhart had evangelist ideas, she was against to radicalism. Therefore, she sent Urquhart over to Spain for travelling with a tutor. Her main purpose was to break Malan's influence on his son (Robinson, 1920, pp. 32-34).

In 1821 Urquhart returned to Britain and started to learn essentials of agriculture along six months. Then he spent four months to gain knowledge about gunnery at Woolwich arsenal as an ordinary workman ( elik, 2012, p. 180). He began his university career at St. John's College, Oxford on 31 October 1822 (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43). His hard-working routine and remarkable ideas raised Jeremy Bentham's attention. Bentham was important philosopher of the era and founder of the utilitarianism (MacDonell, 1908, pp. 268-280). He influentially affected Urquhart's ideas about economy, free trade, and moral norms. In addition, Bentham had an impact on Urquhart's participation in the Greek rebellion (Jenks, 1964, p. 3). Urquhart

and his mother exchanged some letters with Bentham while Urquhart was in Greece (Urquhart papers, 1A6). In 1825 Urquhart had to leave Oxford because of his illness and went to south of France for the treatment. He never returned to Oxford again and ended his academic career (Senior, 1950, pp. 4-5).

2.2. Greek Rebellion

After the Napoleonic Wars and the Vienna Congress, great powers tried to provide peace and balance especially against to nationalist movements in the continent. Therefore, they declared their neutrality in the beginning of the Greek rebellion (Karal, 2011, p. 114). During that time Robert Jenkinson was the prime minister and Viscount Castlereagh was the minister of foreign affairs of Britain. British government announced neutrality as the other great powers, but public opinion clearly took sides of Greeks.

On the other hand, David Urquhart took an interest in foreign policy firstly through Greek Rebellion. His first touch with Ottoman State and Turkish was during Greek rebellion. Urquhart had joined the Greek Rebellion as a philhellene, but he became Turkish sympathiser after the rebellion.

2.2.1. Britain's Policy during the Greek Rebellion

In the early 19th century European intellectuals started to pay attention to Greeks future in the Ottoman State. That interest peaked with the beginning of the Greek rebellion at 1820. Many philhellene committees were founded in European big cities and published newspapers and journals to support Greeks (Jelavich, 2003, pp. 249-250). Although the governments of European countries were neutral, public opinion was completely at the side of Greeks and against to the Ottoman State. In Britain, London Greek Committee was founded in March 1823 (Woodhouse, 1969, p.

71). That committee was so important because with the foundation of committee; philhellenes were organized in whole Britain, managed charity organizations, and affected public opinion on behalf of Greeks. Members organized campaigns to raise funds and sent loan money, guns, and ammunition to Greek rebels (Woodhouse, 1969, p. 121). At that point, another important event was the death of minister of foreign affairs Viscount Castlereagh in 1822. George Canning was the new minister and British policies started to change after that time. Canning sympathized with Greeks and identified the rebels as 'warriors' (Karal, 2011, p. 116).

Between the years 1821-1824 the rebellion developed as gunfight between the rebels and Ottoman State and the rebellion was not suppressed. Sultan Mahmud II asked for support to Egypt governor Mehmet Ali Pasha. Pasha had regular army and navy constituted like European style. Pasha accepted to send over his son İbrahim Pasha to suppress the rebellion in return of Crete and Morea governorships and İbrahim Pasha succeed immediately (Aksan, 2011, pp. 309-310). Then, Greeks decided to create regular military unit and they received the greatest support from British philhellenes. As a result of discussions, Thomas Cochrane, and Richard Church, who were famous commanders of the era, were sent over Greece by London Greek Committee (Woodhouse, 1969, pp.128-134). However, London Greek Committee constructed ships and put under the commander's order. Permission for construction of those ships was a clear sign determined the change of British policy regarding Greek issue.

During that period, British Foreign Policy was completely ruled by George Canning. In 1827, his nephew Stratford Canning was appointed to İstanbul Embassy as ambassador. Although Greek rebels' request to be put under protection by Britain had been rejected in 1825, support to Greek rebels carried on. On the way to colonies

in Eastern Mediterranean; Britain preferred a small Greek state and weak Ottoman State instead of powerful Mehmet Ali Pasha (Karal, 2011, p. 116). On the other hand, in Russia, Nicholas I had ascended the throne and took Alexander I's place. Nicholas I was opposed to predominance of Mehmet Ali Pasha on Eastern Mediterranean either. Therewith, Russia-Britain negotiations had been started and St. Petersburg protocol was signed on 4th April 1827. According to protocol, Greece would be an associated state within Ottoman State and Turkish population would be displaced (Jelavich, 2003, p. 251). On 6th July 1827, London Treaty was signed between France, Russia, and Britain, so it was settled to impose the agreement on Ottoman State and establishment of independent Greece. Ottoman State considered the decision as an interference in their internal affairs and revoked the decision (Jorga, 2017, pp. 302-303). George Canning died a month after the London Treaty on 8th August 1827 and Greek rebels lost a great supporter (Woodhouse, 1981, p. 5).

Following these developments, a common navy consisted of British, Russian, and French armaments was sent over to the Morea under Edward Codrington. Navy would receive the orders from the ambassadors in İstanbul (Jorga, 2017, p. 305). Admiral Codrington had sent a letter to Stratford Canning to receive his opinion. Canning, instructed to use of gun fire in case of need because of his discussions with Russian and French ambassadors (Byrne, 1964, pp. 114-115). Allied navy blockaded around the Navarino and demanded cease fire from İbrahim Pasha. After İbrahim Pasha reported as he would ask for authorization and permission from Ottoman State; allied navy commenced fire to Ottoman-Egypt navy that was lying at anchor on 20th October 1827. Battle of Navarino was over after destruction of Ottoman-Egypt navy and considered as a disaster for Ottoman State. Therewith, diplomatic relations

between Ottoman State and Britain were at a dead end and Canning left İstanbul with French and Russian ambassadors on 8th December 1827 (Poole, 1988, pp. 61-63).

After Navarino issue, British parliament was almost split into two parts. On the one hand, deputies who were George Canning supporters welcomed the result positively, but on the other hand; some deputies were considering the result as Russia's benefit. King George IV condemned the Navarino issue by defining the issue as 'untoward event' (Woodhouse, 1981, p. 1). Duke of Wellington had been assigned as prime minister and Lord Aberdeen had been assigned as Foreign Affairs Minister. Wellington began to pursue a policy to preserve territorial integrity of Ottoman State. Meanwhile, Russia had declared war against Ottoman State, in April 1828 and because Russia guaranteed no land occupation to Britain, British government did not take a concrete step regarding recent developments (Aksan, 2011, pp. 316-317).

Russian troops had reached up to Edirne at the end of the war and Treaty of Adrianople had been signed between Ottoman State and Russia on 14th September 1829. According to agreement, an independent Greek state had been established and Russia increased its power in Eastern Mediterranean (Karal, 2011, p. 121). The impolicy pursued by Britain also played a significant role for arising out of this situation.

William IV ascended the throne whereupon death of George IV on 26th June 1830. Charles Grey was assigned as prime minister. The conservative Tories, who had been in power for many years, were replaced by the liberal Whigs. Ottoman policy became of secondary importance because of some revolutionary mobility in Europe. British government had focused on internal affairs during this period but would give weight to Ottoman State on the occasion of Egypt.

2.2.2. David Urquhart's Participation in the Greek Rebellion

David Urquhart started to interest in Greek Rebellion when he was in South France as Jeremy Bentham, one of the founder members of London Greek Committee, affected David Urquhart on this issue. Bentham would prepare a constitution for Greece later and close friend of John Bowring the secretary of London Greek Committee. In the letter to Bowring, he mentioned about Urquhart as a great Philhellene and also sent same letter to Urquhart (21 August 1825, Bentham to Urquhart, Urquhart papers, 1A6, nr. 4). In addition, half-brother of David Urquhart, Charles Gordon Urquhart was in Greece as colonel. He died in Karabusa Island that he was assigned as governor accidentally on 3rd March 1828 (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43).

In the early 1827, David Urquhart sailed from Marseille with the brig *Sauver* that under command of Thomas Cochrane. He took part at destroy of Ottoman squadron in Bay of Salona on 28th September 1827 and his achievements caused start of Battle of Navarino (Urquhart, 1838a, pp. 20-31). Afterwards, he was assigned to frigate *Hellas* as lieutenant. He attended siege of Chios Island and got injured. Urquhart had spent recovery period in Samos and developed ideas about Greek politics and institution. Although he was offered to be commander of *Perseverance*, he had rejected the offer and resigned Greek service in November 1828 (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43).

Urquhart decided to visit İstanbul after the Russian-Ottoman war ended. This visit was the Urquhart's first encounter with Turkish and played a major role in the transformation from a philhellene to Turcophile (Woodhouse, 1969, p.149). Urquhart mentioned that he was impressed a lot from a story he had experienced on the way to İstanbul. He heard the story from Ottoman soldiers as follows; Ottoman soldiers had not responded with a counter fire to Russians because the war was not officially

beginning although Russian troops started gunfire. Urquhart had considered this story verily precious in terms of ethical approach and he engaged to Turkish here (Bishop, 1897, pp. 44-45).

Urquhart had researched about mineralogy during he was studying at Oxford. When he came İstanbul, he joined a reception held by Sultan's close advisors with a group of mineralogists. Sultan Mahmud II desired to reopen nearly eighty mines which had been closed by reason of dilapidation and wrongful management. Therefore, he wanted to get information from well educated professionals. Urquhart was impressed by this reception. In his letters to his friend Gerard Smith and his mother; he mentioned his opinions about Turkish had been changed surprisingly and he thought there was prejudgement against Turkish in Europe (Lamb, 1981, pp. 339-340).

In February 1830; he had left İstanbul after staying three months and returned to Greece. He researched around Rumelia, Thessaly and Albania along summer of 1830 to analyse the borders that Greeks wanted to determine (Bolsover, 1936, p. 444). In 1838, he published two volume book includes details about this trip; *The Spirit of the East* (Urquhart, 1838a, 1838b), which contributed his reputation greatly. He gave detailed information in letters to his mother regarding situations and policies in the region. He especially objected to Russia's existence in region and criticized policies of Pro-Russian Capodistrias. He defended that Capodistrias' policies were against Britain's economic and political interests. Moreover, he claimed that Russia was scheming in region to capture Ottoman State (Lamb, 1981, p. 338; Senior, 1950, pp. 9-13). Those reports were relayed to William IV's private secretary Sir Herbert Taylor over Urquhart's mother and to king over Sir Herbert Taylor in the end. William IV was extremely impressed by the reports as he was already against Russian

policies and conveyed the reports to the French and Russian governments (Bolsover, 1936, p. 444). As a consequence, while he was still in Greece; Urquhart was nominated to accompany Prince Leopold as British commissioner but because the prince declined the throne, the assignment was dropped. (Carlyle, 1899, p. 43). He returned to Britain in 1831 and was presented to the king.



3. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1831-1838

3.1. His Special Mission for Stratford Canning

Stratford Canning resigned the İstanbul embassy in 1829 due to dispute with Lord Aberdeen regarding the Greek border. On 20th June 1829, Robert Gordon was assigned as envoy extraordinary instead of him. Gordon submitted the London Protocol to the Ottoman State on the borders signed by Britain, France, and Russia when he arrived in İstanbul, on 22 March 1829 but Ottoman State declined the protocol as the boundary range was large. At the end of Ottoman-Russian war; Bâb-ı Âli had remained under pressure of Russia over Treaty of Adrianople and conceded the protocol. Ottoman planned meetings with British, French, and Russian envoys for discussing the details of the agreement (Turan, 1951, pp. 135-142).

Britain had begun to pressure for re-signing a new protocol about the issue as they thought Russia had provided advantage. Therewith Britain, France and Russia signed another protocol in London on 3rd February 1830. According to new protocol Greece exactly became independent though borders became narrow some more. It was Britain who demanded to narrow down the borders (Turan, 1951, pp. 143-144). In 1830, Palmerston was appointed as foreign minister in place of Lord Aberdeen in Britain. Britain offered change of borders in favour of Greece as soon as Palmerston had taken office. Palmerston aimed to put an end to the issue by discussing the matter with Russia and France. He decided to send Canning over İstanbul as a special officer. In the winter of 1831, David Urquhart was among the committee that went to İstanbul with Canning (Lamb, 1981, p. 343).

Canning's mission was discussing the borders with Mahmud II in İstanbul and come to conclusion. Urquhart was sent to meet Grand Vizier Reşid Pasha who was in Albania at that time. His mission was to receive support from Pasha regarding borders

(Lamb, 1981, p. 343). Canning had written a personal letter to Pasha with approval of Palmerston and Urquhart fared to Albania to relay the letter. On December 2nd, he arrived Scutari to meet the Pasha (Senior, 1950, p. 24). He had been stayed at Pasha's quarter for ten days and conveyed first-hand reports to Canning. Pasha responded Urquhart friendly although he did not assure for support about the borders (Lamb, 1981, p. 343). Afterwards, Urquhart left Albania and went up to Canning in İstanbul.

Although Urquhart was not able to persuade Pasha, he availed of via reports from region. The main reason Urquhart was assigned there was that he was in the region and met the Pasha twelve months ago and had a command of the Turkish language (Jenks, 1964, p. 11). Urquhart's main purpose was to accomplish his duty and gain a permanent assignment later on (Lamb, 1981, p. 343). After he had completed his mission, Canning sent him back to London in March 1832 (Senior, 1950, pp. 26-27). After long negotiations, Canning had imposed Ottoman State on the terms of treaty and returned his country in August 1832. The revolt of Mehmet Ali Pasha that emerged at that time, played a major role in the agreement of the conditions by the Ottoman State.

3.2. The Revolt of Mehmet Ali Pasha and Britain's Policy

Mehmet Ali Pasha was one of the commanders of the army that Ottoman State sent over Egypt in 1801 to clear the French out of there. Mehmet Ali Pasha became the victor of the power competition after the exit of French and was assigned as Egypt governor. In 1881 during a convocation he hosted, Mehmet Ali Pasha eliminated the Mameluke lords, whom he considered as the major obstacle to the reforms he wanted to make. Afterwards Mehmed Ali Pasha started to make new reforms as he brought students educated in Europe to pass, he had set up European model army and navy with the contributions of French officers and technicians and he established

European-style educational institutions. Moreover, revenue of Egypt has been increased by his economic reforms (Cleveland, 2008, pp. 76-82). During Greek rebellion, at the instance of Sultan; Mehmed Ali Pasha sent his son over the region in acknowledgement of Morea and Crete governorships. After Battle of Navarino, İbrahim Pasha came back and could not provide the support expected from him during Ottoman- Russian war. Mehmed Ali Pasha requested Crete and Syria governorship after the Treaty of Adrianople, but Sultan contented with giving the governorship of Crete. Pasha started to make plans to get the Syria governorship and found the opportunity in December 1831. 6000 Egyptian who escaped from the country went to Akka. The army at the helm of Ibrahim Pasha went through the Syria when Akka governor refused to return of the Egyptians. Akka was captured in May 1832 (Zurcher, 2016, pp. 63-64). Sultan had demanded to withdraw the army, but Pasha insisted on to get Syria governorship. Pasha was announced as rebel and a war had been declared between Pasha and Sultan. Revolt of Mehmed Ali Pasha had become trouble for Ottoman State for ten years and caused varied endings when interest of foreign countries was involved in the issue.

Initially, European countries did not take an intensive interest in Revolt of Mehmed Ali Pasha. They considered the issue as an internal disorder that a governor's uprising against Sultan. General opinion was that Sultan would deal with the rebel governor (Karal, 2011, p. 131). However, things took place unexpectedly. Stratford Canning was in İstanbul for discussions about Greek border and he indicated that the revolt would become dangerous in his report to Palmerston (7 March 1832, FO 78/209, Canning to Palmerston). Palmerston was indifferent to the issue. Pasha's forces defeated Ottoman army near Damascus after they had captured Akka. Pasha overcame Pasha of Aleppo who tried to stop him and on 29th July 1832, he destroyed

the Ottoman army under command of Hüseyin Pasha substantially in region between Antakya and İskenderun (Jorga, 2017, pp. 334-335). At the same time, Mahmud II was in contact with Canning. At Canning's instigations, he asked for help from Britain and requested to send a British navy to Eastern Mediterranean. Even Namık Pasha and Mavroyani were sent to London for lobby but Palmerston rejected that request on Prime Minister Grey's say-so (Crawley, 1929, p. 55; Kurat, 1990, p. 60). During that time, British newspapers were publishing articles praising Mehmed Ali Pasha's reforms emphasizing its importance for British trade (4 June 1832, Edinburgh Evening Courant; 4 June 1832, Belfast Commercial Chronicle; 3 September 1832, Morning Advertiser).

Mehmed Ali Pasha offered to bring the war to an end in return for Syria governorship. Mahmud II had rejected this and summoned Reşid Pasha from Albania and sent him across İbrahim Pasha. Reşid Pasha and İbrahim Pasha started war in Konya. On 21st December, Ottoman State was defeated certainly at the end of the war that caused death of thirty thousand people. There were no obstacles stand in Pasha's way to İstanbul anymore (Aksan, 2011, pp. 393-396). Mahmud II had no way out except getting external help. Due to rejection of Britain for help and France's support for Mehmet Ali Pasha; Sultan had decided to interview with Russia who was asking to aid for a while. With Russia's involvement, the rebellion became an international issue beyond a war between Pasha and Sultan.

In February 1833, Russian ships arrived in İstanbul and in April, Russian army of five thousand arrived. İstanbul was completely under control of Russia (Crawley, 1929, p. 55). Russian troops in İstanbul caused Britain to turn its attention suddenly here. Britain and France had decided to involve the issue as Russia's takeover of İstanbul was unacceptable (Armaoğlu, 1997, p. 205). Palmerston delegated to provide

peace settlement between Pasha and Sultan to newly appointed British ambassador Lord Ponsonby. With mediation by the envoy, Convention of Kütahya had been signed between Pasha and Sultan on 14th May 1833. Pasha gained Damascus governorship in addition to Egypt and Crete and his son İbrahim Pasha got Adana governorship together with Jeddah governorship (Karal, 2011, p. 136).

3.3. Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi

Russian troops were still in İstanbul although peace had been made between Mahmud II and Mehmet Ali Pasha. Britain predicted that Russia would not leave İstanbul without getting benefit in return for the help. Tsar Nikola sent Count Orlov over İstanbul as his ambassador at large. Orlov's mission was to persuade Mahmud II of signing an accord between Russia and Ottoman State (Tukin, 1999, pp. 223-224). On the other hand, Palmerston had been desiring Russian troops left İstanbul immediately. At the same time, British and French navies came ahead the Dardanelles as their aim was to suppress Russia. British and French envoys pressed on Bâb-ı Âli to eject Russians from İstanbul. British newspapers were reporting news as İstanbul was occupied by Russians (10 April 1833, 21 May 1833, *The Morning Chronicle*; 8 May 1833, *Wexford Conservative*).

Count Orlov and Mahmud II had been going on meetings for making alliance agreement. In consequence of meetings, Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, which was a defensive accord, signed between Ottoman State and Russia on 8th July 1833. According to third clause, if Ottoman State ask for help, Russia would help through by land or sea lane. Duration of accord was determined as eight years by the fifth clause. Moreover, there was a confidential clause in accord such that in case of attack to Russia, Ottoman State would close the straits for foreign naval but allow Russian warships to pass through (Kurat, 1990, p. 62). With Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi; Russia

achieved dominance over İstanbul and straits. Russian troops left İstanbul on July 10, after the treaty was signed.

The accord between Ottoman State and Russia had made an overwhelming impression in London. It has been even discussing that this agreement would cause a war in Europe by unbalancing balance of power. Russian dominance on Ottoman State presented threat to Britain's trade route to India. British government and public opinion were sceptical of Russia (Esiner, 2019, pp. 494-495). Furthermore, Treaty of Münchengratz which was assigned between Russia and Austria had raised those doubts (Tuncer, 2013, pp. 130-133). British newspapers criticized the accord with both barrels and questioned how Britain and France had allowed such agreement (6 May 1834, 8 September 1834, Sun; 13 September 1834, Hereford Times).

Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi would cause a dramatic change on Ottoman policy of Britain. Hereupon, Britain would work for conserving territorial integrity of Ottoman State and ending up Russia's domination on Ottoman State. Also, an anti-Russian sentiment would rise among public and David Urquhart had featured in arise of the anti-Russian attitude.

3.4. Urquhart's Views on the Eastern Question

David Urquhart's views on Eastern question were become more evident when he had turn back to London in 1832. He had been in the region at certain intervals, worked through and got information about the issue. He started to put his views into practice after he came to Britain. It can be considered that Urquhart passed his opinions on eastern question and conveyed his knowledge by three written work. The first was the memorandum he had sent to foreign office in 1833, the second and the one made tremendous impact was his book *Turkey and its Resources* (Urquhart,

1833), and the third one was the pamphlet he had published; '*Islam as a political system*' (Urquhart, 1865). In the memorandum and his other two works, David Urquhart stated his opinions on Eastern question and his thoughts about the policy Britain should follow.

As it was mentioned before, during revolt of Mehmed Ali Pasha, Mahmud II had requested Britain to send naval support to Eastern Mediterranean. But because his request had been refused; Ottoman State compromised with Russia and Russian warships were sent to İstanbul. Therewith, David Urquhart sent a memorandum to foreign office on 12 February 1833 (Bolsover, 1936, p. 445). In the memorandum, Urquhart defended that Ottoman State had been deserved to be supported and would not be divided because of an internal unrest (Lamb, 1981, p. 349). He mentioned people had been living in country did not took part in revolt of Mehmet Ali Pasha and the revolt was individual. Moreover, he emphasized the success of revolt was not because public support, it was sequence of disciplined army and navy; Russian impression on Ottoman State and Russian schemes (Lamb, 1981, p. 349).

On the other hand, he touched upon the significance of Britain's economic interests. Urquhart defended that Ottoman State would have an essential role for British trade in future. In his point of view, if Britain would not help Sultan and Russia would help instead of Britain, Britain would also lose the advantages that it already had, in addition to future commercial interests (Bolsover, 1936, p. 445). Urquhart thought that Russia lay behind the revolts in Serbia, Albania, Greece, and Egypt. He defended that if Russia became dominance in the region, it would strike a blow at British trade and as an only way to prevent this consequence; Britain should prevent Russia's demarches by intervening hastily (Lamb, 1981, p. 350).

Urquhart published his much-ballyhooed book, dedicated to William IV, *Turkey and its Resources* during the same year. It is obvious that his views about Eastern question became apparent. He considered that Ottoman State's political situation resulted in a crisis and in case the crisis resulted against Ottoman State, it would cause rapid collapse. Furthermore, Russia's achievement or failure in regard to its works were carried on thus far was subject to same condition (Urquhart, 1833, pp. 218-219). According to Urquhart, Ottoman State should complete all reforms in military and reconstruct the army. No more law should be introduced towards non-Muslim and councils on the score of religious concern. If assemblies that were conducive to formation of higher delegation committees, were set up; the system would rise up on its own strong foundation (Urquhart, 1833, p. 122). In conjunction with abolishment of janissary, debilitating determinant on Ottoman State administration was destroyed. Ottoman State would develop local self-government principles among its own institutions to refresh and become powerful. By strengthening of local self-governments, all people in country would support reforms of Mahmud II (Bolsover, 1936, p. 445). Urquhart was also supporting the reforms by Mahmud II up to that time. He stated that Sultan put the reforms that all previous sultans had wanted to do into practice as abolishment of janissary and feudal lords (Urquhart, 1833, p. 115).

In 1833, Urquhart also published a pamphlet named "Islam as a political system". In the pamphlet, Urquhart conveyed his experiences that he gained by living together with Muslims and he remarked that there was misinformation and prejudgement against Muslims in Christian world (Urquhart, 1865, pp. 149-150). He defended; European public's perception; as Islam expands by sword, oppression, intolerance towards other religions and science and literature hostility, were

completely wrong (Urquhart, 1865, p. 177). Urquhart continued his statement such “Turkey is the only government in the world which is not struggling with its people to wrench from them their privileges. It is, on the contrary, engaged to confer them. A Sultan can impose no tax, make no law, declare no war, and contract no debt. If the constitution of Islam were translated and applied to any country in Europe, it would be considered a beautiful, but impracticable, theory of Utopian freedom.” (Urquhart, 1865, pp. 184-185).

David Urquhart’s book, *Turkey and its Resources* was approved by William IV and copies were sent to all ministers (Bolsover, 1936, p. 446). According to Bailey’s point of view, Urquhart comprehended better than anyone that Ottoman State was an immeasurable market and Britain might trade on this market. Urquhart pointed out Russia would take control of the world in case it attained Ottoman territory (Bailey, 2012, p. 337). In the meantime, Urquhart mentioned his views above; Russophobia raised in Britain and his arguments were taken into consideration more.

3.5. Commercial Tour in the East

Due to influence of Sir Herbert Taylor; Palmerston dispatched Urquhart for a tour to Ottoman territory to search for commercial and political conditions and obtain first-hand information (Webster, 1947, p. 329). Urquhart confirmed this offer and departed from London to start his journey. The tour was scheduled to be completed in eighteen months. Urquhart arrived İstanbul in 1833 December; he presented himself as commercial traveller and covered his connection with foreign office (Bolsover, 1936, p. 447).

When Urquhart arrived İstanbul, Ottoman-British relations were strained because of Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi. Lord Ponsonby who had come İstanbul six months before, was working to fix the relationships and promote British prestige.

Britain's main aim was to stop Russian dominance on Ottoman State. For this purpose, Palmerston informed Russian government that firm steps would be taken to provide absolute independence of Ottoman State. Britain also called on Ottoman State to make reforms by using their own resources (Bolsover, 1936, p. 447). Moreover, Lord Ponsonby was authorized to command the navy in Mediterranean at will (Crawley, 1929, p. 62). At the same time, confidential meetings began between Lord Ponsonby and Mahmud II Samos through prince Vogorides. Only, Vogorides, court jester Abdi Bey and palace physician McGuffog were aware of the meetings (Bolsover, 1936, p. 447). Sultan was wondering about Palmerston's and the envoy's recommendations although he was annoyed with Britain because of Mehmed Ali Pasha issue. Ottoman-British relations were getting better in conjunction with those meetings.

Urquhart started to work as soon as he arrived İstanbul. He was sending regular reports to Palmerston regarding economic conditions. In his report dated January 23rd, 1834; he stated that if Ottoman-British relations were promoted, Britain would import the raw materials that were already imported from Russia (Esiner, 2019, p. 497). Ottoman officers had noticed Urquhart's coming to İstanbul. Although he covered his relation with foreign office, he found out the impression of his book *Turkey and its Resources* and got in contact with some former friends. He received an invitation from Alexander Blacque who was the editor of the journal 'Moniteur Ottoman' and also one of Mahmud II's advisors. Blacque offered him to prepare a report contains the ideas in his book and to publish this report in newspaper. In addition to this, he stated that the report and translation of the book would be presented to Mahmud II (Bolsover, 1936, p. 448).

Urquhart's stay in İstanbul was planned for eight weeks. However, Ponsonby wanted him to stay İstanbul longer when he learnt Urquhart was there in relation of foreign office. Ponsonby and Urquhart agreed on Russian threat even though they dissented on some issues. Palmerston was also pleased with the reports sent by Urquhart and therefore he approved Urquhart's stay in İstanbul until April (Bolsover, 1936, p. 450). Urquhart was planning to improve his relations with Ottoman officers to have a significant role in Ottoman-British relations, when his stay was extended (Jenks, 1964, pp. 37-38). As Urquhart was in İstanbul and supportive; Lord Ponsonby were pressing British government for pursuing more effective policy on eastern question.

Urquhart's reports' contents became more political than economical after a while. In one of his reports; he stated that Ottoman State considered Britain as allied against Russian threat and if a British squadron came in Dardanelles, it would be a significant message to Russia (28 February 1834, FO 78/249, Urquhart to Palmerston). Reforms were in Urquhart's field of interest. He requested Mahmud II to send young Turkish students to Europe for education. Although Ponsonby and Urquhart were working in coordination, they had unlike opinions about if Turkish could achieve reforms. In one hand, Ponsonby relied on Seraskier Hüsrev Pasha about the reforms but on the other hand, Urquhart considered Pasha as head of antagonists against reforms. In the meanwhile, Ottoman State declared that redif troops would be established to assist the regular army. Ponsonby was pleased with this news and his beliefs on the reforms could be realized became stronger (Bolsover, 1936, pp. 450-451).

3.6. Secret Visit to the Circassia

David Urquhart made a tour to Black Sea coast during July and August 1834. The most significant part of the tour was his visit to Circassian coast. Circassia region was between the Crimea and the Caucasus. Circassian people had been seen loyal to Sultan before Ottoman-Russian war. Russia took control of the region with 1829 Treaty of Adrianople, but local community refused Russian dominance and raised up. Therewith, Russian blockaded the Circassian coasts (Bolsover, 1936, p. 451). Urquhart decided to make a confidential visit to region as he found out that local community was against to Russian dominance and loyal to Sultan.

David Urquhart firstly had a meeting with Circassian intendant Sefer Bey in Samsun and planned another meeting with the establishment. He went to region and met with fifteen Circassian lords and two hundred village chiefs at Soujak Castle in Anapa (18 August 1834, FO 78/249, Urquhart to Palmerston). Circassians stated that they were against Russians and required British assistance for independence. As a result of meeting, a declaration of independence was declared with support of Urquhart and dedicated to King William IV. Urquhart sent the original copy in Ottoman Turkish and an English copy of the text to Palmerston in his report dated 18th August (18 August 1834, FO 78/249, Urquhart to Palmerston). Urquhart's main purpose for giving support to Circassian's resistance was to make Britain ally with Sultan against Russians. In his report dated 2nd September, he demanded from Britain to send a squadron to the straits (2 September 1834, FO 78/249, Urquhart to Palmerston). As a landmark in this issue, Urquhart's first report about his Circassia visit was made after he returned to İstanbul. That was a sign for he was desiring to take initiative regarding the issue. As another highlight, Urquhart had designed

Circassian flag and that flag was pretty same as the flag that Circassians use today (King, 2007, p. 253).

Lord Ponsonby considerably supported Urquhart's moves in Circassia. In his report dated 16th September, he stated that he considered Urquhart's visit to Circassia significant and British intervention in issues in region was of capital importance for European balance of Power and British commercial interests (16 September 1834, FO 78/249, Ponsonby to Palmerston). Ponsonby considered that this case was a great opportunity regarding Ottoman-British alliance same as Urquhart, but they clashed over about Urquhart's request for making aid to Circassian. He defended that making aid exceeds his authority and it might place Britain in an awkward position (11 October 1834, FO 78/249, Ponsonby to Urquhart).

Palmerston decided to recall Urquhart after he knew about his actions in Circassia. His decision might be considered because of Urquhart's reports that became political rather than economical. Ponsonby kept going to defend Urquhart by indicating that Urquhart did not encourage Circassians to revolt as they had been already armed before Urquhart arrived the region. Moreover, he remarked that no one except Urquhart could get that much information in a short span of time (Bolsover, 1936, p. 452). On the other hand, Palmerston was nervous about if any problem would arise with Russia. Ponsonby's defence made Palmerston to reconsider his attitude towards Urquhart. He recommended King to transform the British consulate in İstanbul to a consulate general and assign David Urquhart as chief consul in place of current chief consul John Cartwright who would be retired soon (Bolsover, 1936, p. 453). But Urquhart had left İstanbul in early December before this offer. Because of Palmerston's critiques, Urquhart and Ponsonby were discouraged and Urquhart thought that he would not benefit in İstanbul anymore. Both of them started thinking

that British government could not pursue a pro-Turkish and anti-Russian policy actively. Therefore, Urquhart decided to go back to London and try to influence public opinion through press. Ponsonby supported Urquhart on his decision (Jenks, 1964, p. 55). Urquhart had a pamphlet prepared with contribution of Lord Ponsonby and sent it to London for being published before he turned back to London. That pamphlet named *England, France, Russia, and Turkey* was considerable in matter of anti-Russian propaganda and made a major contribution to Urquhart's reputation. Even, Ponsonby edited the texts and provide financial aid for publication (Urquhart, 1835; Carlyle, 1899, p. 44).

3.7. The Portfolio

British government had been changed and Tories were governing when David Urquhart arrived London at the beginning of 1835. Robert Peel was assigned as prime minister and Duke Wellington was appointed as foreign affairs minister in place of Palmerston. Wellington was against to pursue an active policy regarding Ottoman State. He trusted in Russia although Ponsonby conveyed his concerns about Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi (Bolsover, 1936, pp. 453-454). Urquhart drew up a report to Wellington for sending a squadron to the straits to reduce Russian influence on İstanbul and to support Sultan against Mehmed Ali Pasha. Though, Wellington refused to pursue an active policy regarding this issue (Jenks, 1964, p. 56). At the same time, Wellington withdrew the Ponsonby's authority to call fleet in case of necessity (Bailey, 2012, p. 310). In the meantime, Peel government lasted in short time and Whigs came to power in April 1835. Lord Melbourne became prime minister and Palmerston was reassigned as Foreign Affairs minister (Bailey, 2012, p. 321).

At the same time David Urquhart was lobbying to prejudice British public opinion in favour of Ottoman. The pamphlet named *England, France, Russia and*

Turkey had a broad repercussion as information about Russian policy and Urquhart's opinions about Britain's support to Ottoman State is essential to retain its own commercial and political interests had attracted public opinion's attention. According to Urquhart's point of view, Tsar Nikola aimed to subvert European balance of power and capture Istanbul and the straits as well. Moreover, in Europe, he desired to make Austria, Germany and Greece satellite states and in Asia, he planned to get Iran and Afghanistan under control, and this would be deprivation for British trade. Britain should support Ottoman State with France to prevent this scenario come true. Ottoman State could make reforms that another state would not complete for centuries, only in ten years but even so it needed Britain's assistance against Russia and Mehmed Ali Pasha threats (Bolsover, 1936, p. 455). Urquhart stated his views clearly on this issue in pamphlet which drew intense interest as fifth edition had been published. Newspapers also were supportive by publishing articles impressed from the pamphlet. Urquhart was pleased with this situation.

Urquhart's second attempt in that year was publishing secret Russian papers. The secret papers which were sent to governor of Warsaw, brother of Tsar, were founded by Polish rebels during the revolt in 1830. Polish refugee Count Zamoyski brought these documents to Britain and delivered to Palmerston. Palmerston kept the documents for one year but did not take into consideration so much. Afterwards the documents were conveyed to Sir Herbert Taylor and then to Urquhart via Taylor (Webster, 1947, p. 333). The documents consisted of confidential correspondences of Russian diplomats during Greek rebellion. Urquhart decided to publish the documents in despite of Palmerston and Ponsonby's concerns. After discussions, it was decided to establish the *Portfolio* that would be published periodically. The *Portfolio* was edited by Urquhart's friend Westmacott and printed by James Ridgway of Piccadilly.

Although Taylor tried to cover Urquhart's involvement in this issue, Urquhart had approved the *Portfolio* officially (Bolsover, 1936, p. 457). The first issue was published on 28th November 1835 and had been published weekly. Articles on Urquhart's opinions about Eastern Question were published besides Russian confidential correspondences in *Portfolio*. In the issue dated February 1836, Circassian Declaration of Independence was also published (The Portfolio, 1836, pp. 187-195).

The *Portfolio* had achieved success that Urquhart expected and aroused British public opinion's interest. Leading British dailies began to make interpretations about the topic and included in their articles. Urquhart's papers made British public opinion, which was confused, comprehend the developments (Ross, 1836, p. 27). Russian envoy sent protest to Palmerston because of rumours were spread as papers were publishing by foreign office (Bolsover, 1936, p. 458). The *Portfolio* obtained its goal and Urquhart featured in this result. Urquhart would be rewarded with being assigned as secretary of embassy at İstanbul. The *Portfolio* had been published till June 1836 and afterwards was republished between the years 1843 and 1845 (Carlyle, 1899, p. 44).

3.8. Commercial Negotiations between the Great Britain and the Ottoman State

David Urquhart's another significant aim was to conclude a treaty of commerce between Ottoman State and Great Britain. According to Urquhart's point of view, Ottoman State could obtain all raw materials which Britain had been imported from Russia. Moreover, if Ottoman State developed enough, Ottomans would absorb British commodities more than Russians. Urquhart's desire for conclusion of a trade agreement had some other reasons. First of all, this treaty would be for benefit of British manufacturers and also provide Ottoman State got stronger.

However, if Ottoman State got stronger; it would be a buffer state against Russia in Eastern Mediterranean (Bailey, 2012, pp. 339-340).

Between the years 1832-1836; while annual average of British import figure from Russia had been more than four million pounds, annual average of British export figure from Russia had been two million three hundred thousand pounds. At the same years, British export figure from Ottoman State was two million seven hundred thousand pounds and British import from Ottoman State was eight hundred thousand pounds (Bolsover, 1936, pp. 458-459). Urquhart desired that Britain increased import range from Ottoman State in order to prevent such kind of unbalanced figure. This situation would provide Ottoman State got strong economically as well as absorption greater quantities of British manufactures. Moreover, as a political result; increase of trade would improve Ottoman –British relations and strengthen the Ottoman State against Russia (Bolsover, 1936, p. 460).

Urquhart gave extensive information about the commercial resources of the Ottoman State in his book *Turkey and Resources* and determined that Britain should benefit from those resources. If Ottoman State developed properly; Britain would import the materials like copper, iron, tallow, hemp, lead, wax and grain for cheaper rates and in greater quantities from Ottoman State than Russia (Urquhart, 1833, pp. 140-145). In addition, Ottoman State was sufficient for maritime transport. According to Urquhart, there was not any other country which had such a favourable environment that those materials can be bought on a liberal scale. Ottoman State had plenty of natural resources as woods and mines that were unobtainable from no other country. Therefore, production would be increased, and raw material costs would decrease when Ottoman State overcame the administrative impediments (Bailey, 2012, pp. 328-329).

Urquhart put his thoughts into practice and prepared a draft treaty of commerce to be signed between for Ottoman State and Britain. Urquhart's suggested a detailed trade agreement in addition to capitulations. Customs tariff should be increased because Bâb-ı Âli was in financial difficulties as Ottoman State had been gained three percent customs tariff through capitulations. With this agreement, the tariff which could not be increased directly, was increased by new internal taxes up to fifteen percent (Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 47). Urquhart mentioned that in exchange of abolishment of internal taxes and monopolies; customs tariff should be increased (Bolsover, 1936, p. 460). Meanwhile, the customs tariff treaty between Ottoman State and Britain had expired in 1834 and Ottoman State had charged London Envoy Nuri Efendi to conduct negotiations for a trade agreement. Ottoman State was insistent for customs tariff to be increased up to five percent (Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 83).

Palmerston had counterclaim for abolishment of internal taxes and monopolies when Nuri Efendi presented Ottoman State's offer. Urquhart foresaw that negotiations would come to a deadlock and got involved in by offering decrease of import taxes which were applied as sixty percent to Ottoman commodities. In return, Ottoman State would abolish the monopolies, internal taxes and customs tariff would be remained three percent. In addition, Ottoman State would provide free transit through the Straits and Iran (Bolsover, 1936, p. 461). Although Urquhart's resolution was commonly approved at the beginning, president of trade, Poulett Thompson, objected his offer. Thompson stated that application of lower taxes to Ottoman State would offend the Russia and he defended that Ottoman State would not able to provide enough raw materials which had been provided by Russia (Jenks, 1964, p. 75). Thereby, as a result, Urquhart's treaty of commerce plan fell through. However,

Treaty of Balta Limanı which was signed in 1838, would be consisted of Urquhart's suggestions but success of the treaty was dedicated to Lord Ponsonby.

3.9. Urquhart as Secretary of Embassy and the Breach with Lord Ponsonby

David Urquhart had been appointed as the first secretary to İstanbul embassy in July 1836 due to both his initiatives for Ottoman-British trade negotiations and he was considered as Eastern question expert among British public opinion. There were two significant case which drew the attention. First of them, the "Vixen" affair, which caused an international incident and the second case was the disagreement he had with Lord Ponsonby that would result in end of his career.

During that period, Lord Ponsonby's attempts for rebuild British reputation among Ottoman State. Though, he fell down on these attempts, so his status was affected in a negative way and he also fell out with Urquhart. Herewith, Urquhart was unseated, and Lord Ponsonby fell out of favour with Ottoman State officers.

3.9.1. Lord Ponsonby's Status before Urquhart's Designation

In those years, British project on strengthen Ottoman army was put into effect by Palmerston. Sultan Mahmud II also sympathized with the idea of army got training from foreign officers. Britain was one of the countries that Ottoman had requested for this issue. At London envoy Nuri Efendi's instigation, request for sending soldiers over to Ottoman State for military training was conveyed to Palmerston (Bolsover, 1934, p. 109). Thereby, Palmerston sent Polish General Chrzanowski who was serving British army for a while, over to İstanbul and after a while royal engineers Du Plot and Colonel Considine threw in with Chrzanowski (Yıldız, 2009, p. 419). But because of the developments occurred after, British military officers would not be welcome in İstanbul.

During those dates, the major aim of Mahmud II was to get back Syria from Mehmed Ali Pasha. Lord Ponsonby believed that this issue would be solved and so he planned and induced Mahmud II to send Alexandre Blaque over to London and Paris to ask for Britain's and France's help. The mission of Alexandre Blaque was planned confidentially because he was refraining from Russia. In the meantime, Lord Ponsonby's plan was collapsed when Alexandre Blaque died mysteriously in Malta at the beginning of his secret mission trip. Ponsonby thought that Alexandre Blaque died of natural causes as he was poisoned by Russians (Aktepe, 1981, p. 262). British press also considered Alexandre Blaque's death as sudden and unexpected and stated he died after a short disease (Sun, 1 July 1836; Sussex Advertiser, 4 July 1836; Morning Post, 2 July 1836).

Within same days, another incident affecting Ottoman–British relations occurred. On 8th May 1836, a British citizen called William Churchill wounded a Muslim boy while he was hunting and he was battered and imprisoned by Ottoman officers (İpek, 1995, pp. 668-669). Ponsonby rated the event as an opportunity and demanded from Mahmud II removal of Ahmed Fevzi Pasha whom he thought Russian supporter and foreign minister Akif Pasha who was acting in countenance of Russia recently. Moreover, he informed Bâb-ı Âli that he would not make any official call with Akif Pasha till his demand fulfilled (14 July 1836, FO 78/266, Ponsonby to Palmerston; Bolsover, 1934, p. 109). With that case, rough times began for Ottoman British relations again. British press attention headed to this matter. Newspapers included Ponsonby's comments and blamed Pashas for being Russian supporters (Sun, 18 June 1836; Morning Advertiser, 2 July 1836; Globe, 18 June 1836).

After that situation, British military officers' acceptance to army became more difficult. Officer Considine got the cold shoulder when he came to İstanbul. Besides

Mahmud II dismissed Akif Pasha by using his illness as an excuse with influence of Ponsonby (İpek, 1995, p. 598). Officer Considine returned to his country in two months as he was not assigned for any significant position in army (Yıldız, 2009, p. 424). Ponsonby was stranded by those developments and a hostility aroused towards him among Ottoman public opinion. Russia was trying to take advantage of this situation and Russian envoy was pressing on Bâb-ı Âli constantly. Due to Russian stress, Ottoman State decided to appeal for removal of Ponsonby per new London envoy Mustafa Reşid Pasha. British newspapers also announced that Lord Ponsonby would leave from embassy (Sun, 17 June 1837).

Lord Ponsonby tried to use “Vixen” affair that will be touch on in the next topic as a last throw of the dice. Churchill case could not be resolved until February 1837. At that date, Palmerston considered dismissal of foreign affairs minister as a goodwill gesture and the problem arrived at a solution (Bolsover, 1934, p. 110). Furthermore, there were attempts for British military officers’ acceptance to Ottoman army and Considine came to İstanbul again. Ottoman State rejected those offers by remarking that any non-Muslim would not be assigned as command element. The policy for improving Ottoman army with contribution of British officers that was kept going since 1834 midyear; failed in late 1838. Ponsonby was proved right about this subject as Ponsonby had thought that no reforms could be effective on Ottoman State unless Russian threat would be eliminated. If Russian threat was eliminated, it would be easy to make reform.

3.9.2. Urquhart’s Designation as Secretary of Embassy and the “Vixen” Affair

David Urquhart was assigned as first secretary of embassy to İstanbul in 1836 summer and arrived İstanbul at the end of July. Ottoman-British relations were pretty

taut when Urquhart had arrived İstanbul. Churchill event took place, trade negotiations were incomplete and status of British military officers in Ottoman army was not finalised. Urquhart arrived İstanbul with new projects on his mind. He was planning to improve and maintain his relations with Turkish friends, but he was not welcomed by Lord Ponsonby as he expected. Ponsonby was distressed because of the conditions that were mentioned above. Urquhart considered him as upset and in doubt with his position.

Sir John McNeil; friend of Urquhart who had been responsible to Iran, accompanied Urquhart while he was going to İstanbul. Urquhart and MacNeil were welcomed by Lord Ponsonby when they arrived İstanbul and had a long-time meeting at embassy residence. After the meeting, Urquhart met with McNeil privately and mentioned that Ponsonby had kept him at a distance and greeted him with jealousy. In response, McNeil recommended him to be patient and compliant to regain Ponsonby's confidence. Ponsonby made no bones about that he got annoyed with Urquhart's return (1837, Narrative of events, Urquhart papers, 1C5b).

In spite of their relationships was doing badly and there was discordance between them; Urquhart and Ponsonby had a mutual plan that would cause an international incident. Merchant George Bell of Glasgow, whom Urquhart had convinced in London, to trade in Caucasus, asked foreign office if there was any decision that British government recognized the Russian blockade of Black Sea coast (Luxembourg, 1998, pp. 131-134). Palmerston replied Bell as he should search the articles about this issue. Following the searches, Bell decided that British government did not recognized such blockade. Afterward, Bell came to İstanbul to obtain necessary documents to trade with Caucasus and he achieved his purpose with Urquhart's contribution (Luxembourg, 1998, p. 141). With that permission, the

schooner called Vixen departed from London in October 1836.

Urquhart had a grasp of region by virtue of his prior visit to Circassia. He had already stated in his articles on *Portfolio* that Russian presence in the region had conflict with Britain's interest and would affect British trade negatively. Moreover, he also determined that Russia's presence in region also concerned Ottoman State's, Iran's and India's statuses closely (Gleason, 1950, pp. 179-180). Urquhart expected one of his two alternative assumptions would come true at the end of Vixen schooner's journey. The first was Russian seizure of the schooner. As a result of that Russia would fell out with Britain and so a fleet would be sent to Black Sea which would cause abrogation of Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi. The second one was that, if Russian did not seize the schooner; it would mean that Russian government would disclaim for Circassia region and Britain would be able to help Circassian people legitimately (Bolsover, 1934, p. 111).

Urquhart's first assumption had come true as Vixen was seized after thirty-six hours from its departure from İstanbul by a Russian warship nearby Soujak Castle (Luxembourg, 1998, p. 142). After seizure of the schooner, Ponsonby reported to Palmerston as he considered Russia's move aggressive and that was the right time to be determined and sending a warship to Black Sea. On another report, Ponsonby mentioned that Bell had already informed him about his journey, and he told him that he was not entitled to approve or disapprove of the journey. That report indicated that Lord Ponsonby had already been aware of the issue along Urquhart (Bolsover, 1936, p. 330). Urquhart wrote King William IV's support of Vixen's journey out after years. On King's letter over his private secretary, it was stated that any merchant whoever trade to Circassian region, serves his country greatly (Urquhart, 1853, pp. 318-319).

During diplomatic activities were going forward on one hand; British government sent new commissioners to region in order to strengthen its conditions in Circassia. One of those commissioners was James Bell who was brother of George Bell. Bell mentioned in his book that, his going to Circassia was upon Palmerston's request and this request was conveyed to Urquhart over Permanent Secretary Strangways (Bell, 1840, p. 5). However, British Government's efforts ended in smoke. Palmerston did not want to go to war in despite of public dissent. Hence, although Britain was potently against Russia to held trade on the northern coast of Black Sea; they declared that they approved Russian rights at Soujak Castle. That declaration was well received by Tsar and he approved to pay compensation (Bolsover, 1936, p. 465). "Vixen" affair was ended because of reasonable diplomacy between Tsar and Palmerston. Plans of Lord Ponsonby and Urquhart were failed. Afterwards, Lord Ponsonby and Urquhart would fell out with each other completely and Urquhart would be blamed for "Vixen" affairs.

3.9.3. Conflict between Lord Ponsonby and David Urquhart

As it was mentioned on previous part, Lord Ponsonby dissatisfied with Urquhart's assignment to İstanbul and they were in communication with each other at the lowest level. Ponsonby was apprehensive about his position and did not want Urquhart to recontact with his Turkish friends. He thought that Turks would support Urquhart against himself (Robinson, 1920, p. 50). Urquhart had stayed at Ponsonby's residence for six weeks and then he mentioned his physical and mental health worsen. He indicated that Ponsonby treated him superciliously and disrespectfully. He left envoy's residence and settled in his own place at Scutari. He began to dress up and live like a Turk. Later on, he left there and moved in Caouron Chesme (Kuruçeşme) (1837, Narrative of events, Urquhart papers, 1C5b).

One of the reasons of Ponsonby's apprehension about his position was the articles published regarding him in Britain. In the article, which was published by İstanbul reporter of *Times*, Dr. Millegan who was also one of Urquhart's friends; was mentioned that Ponsonby was ineligible and affectless and Urquhart would be assigned in place of him. Ponsonby got annoyed and he blamed Urquhart for this article (Webster, 1947, p. 341). Otherwise, Urquhart also contributed assignment of Hassuna de Ghies to Turkish foreign affairs; whom Ponsonby was against to (Jenks, 1964, p. 128). Moreover, Urquhart was meeting frequently with Ahmet Fevzi Pasha who Ponsonby blamed for Churchill event and banned Urquhart from meeting him.

In despite of all those developments, Ponsonby and Urquhart were seemed to make up with each other in December 1836. Ponsonby rejected the claims on that he was in bad with Urquhart in his report to Palmerston (Webster, 1947, p. 343). However, Ponsonby rejected Urquhart's request for keeping on the commercial treaty negotiations at the beginning of the year 1837 and this was the last straw. Ponsonby did not want Urquhart involve with that agreement and did not want to share draft agreement with him (Temperley, 1936, pp. 408-409). Dragomans who was working at British embassy had also hand in this issue as Urquhart thought that all dragomans were Russian spy and demanded them to be fired. He was against to make trade negotiations meetings over dragomans. Dragomans who were impressed by Pisani Family; began to work unfavourably of Urquhart. They told Ponsonby that Urquhart had interviews to take place of him (Bolsover, 1936, p. 465).

Lord Ponsonby informed Urquhart through Pisani as he would not like to meet him anymore and he was banned to use embassy archive in January 1837. Also, Urquhart was accused for three issues. The first was his rare participation to dinner with envoy during he was staying with him. Second one was that he supported press

which assaulted verbally to envoy and the last one was he told Ottoman officers that envoy did not trust in British government any longer. Urquhart denied the accusations at all (Bolsover, 1936, p. 465).

Ponsonby identified Urquhart as “mad” in his report dated 10th of February. (10 February 1837, FO 78/301, Ponsonby to Backhouse). Meanwhile, Lord Ponsonby applied for annual leave to Britain and his request was approved. It was coordinated that Urquhart would stay in İstanbul as charge d’affaires during Ponsonby’s absence. Lord Ponsonby thought that Urquhart would take place of him and therefore he cancelled his annual leave plan (10 February 1837, FO 78/301, Ponsonby to Backhouse).

Urquhart’s recall was irregular as Palmerston approved his unasked annual leave in the letter dated 8 of March (8 March 1837, FO 78/309, Palmerston to Urquhart). Furthermore, in the report dated 10th of March; Palmerston stated that he would not be able to stay in İstanbul because of “Vixen” affair (Webster, 1947, p. 351) and he informed Urquhart that he should leave İstanbul immediately in his report on 21st of March (21 March 1837, FO 78/309, Palmerston to Urquhart). Another letter was arrived on 21st of April but because Urquhart had already departure from İstanbul to London, he was not able to receive the letter (21 April 1837, FO 78/309, Palmerston to Urquhart). Hereby, Urquhart’s eight months long embassy secretary position ended. That was also end of Urquhart’s diplomatic career. He wrote a detailed apologia addressed to foreign office when he returned to London and that would cause a long and hard debate between him and Palmerston. Furthermore, King William IV died on 20 June 1837 who was great supporter of Urquhart and Palmerston took this as an opportunity to exclude Urquhart.

3.10. Treaty of Balta Liman

Mustafa Reşid Pasha who was in charge of Paris and London embassies since 1834, was assigned as foreign minister at the end of the year 1837. Pasha indicated that there would be reforms in Ottoman State during his last meeting with Palmerston. Also, he took initiative and did not put the request of Ottoman State for removal of Ponsonby into action. His assignment as foreign minister was an advantage for Britain and Palmerston demanded Ponsonby to cooperate with Mustafa Reşid Pasha. As to embassy in İstanbul; Henry Bulwer was assigned as secretary of embassy in place of Urquhart (15 August 1837, *The London Gazette*, p. 2156). Bulwer would coordinate trade negotiations in İstanbul.

According to Palmerston's point of view, with abrogation of monopolies, beside Britain would take advantage of trade; trade would expand progressively, and Ottoman State would get wealth by this means. Monopolies prevented improvement of Ottoman industry and increase of export. Palmerston considered that liberalization of Ottoman economy was related to reforms (Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 89). However, there were no concrete steps had been taken yet until at the end of the year 1837 (Temperley, 1936, p. 34).

After those late developments, Ponsonby desired to gain a victory to re-establish his reputation. Therefore, he tried to conclude the trade agreement for the benefit of Britain. It was advantage for him that Mustafa Reşid Pasha was in charge. Meanwhile, Mehmed Ali Pasha monopolized all goods counter to capitulations and that damaged British merchants. Palmerston demanded Ponsonby to use this situation to good account. He wanted Ponsonby to clarify Ottoman State that Mehmed Ali Pasha was earning most of his income from the taxes he obtained from monopolies and he would get weak if he was deprived of his resource. Ponsonby agreed with this

opinion, but he considered that the thing which would convince Ottoman State was the guarantee of British government to force Mehmed Ali Pasha to keep to the agreement if he refused articles of agreement.

Meetings restarted in April 1838. Ponsonby held losing of British support over Ottoman State. Mahmud II and Mustafa Reşid Pasha were aware of that Britain intended. Lord Ponsonby and Mustafa Reşid Pasha had a significant meeting. Ponsonby remarked that political part of the agreement was the major part and to get rid of Mehmed Ali Pasha was depend on the agreement. Pasha was persuaded at the end of the meeting and he also persuaded Sultan. Bulwer reported that Ottoman State was poised to approve an agreement against Mehmed Ali Pasha (Bulwer, 1870, pp. 273-280).

On 16 August 1838; a trade agreement was signed in Mustafa Reşid Pasha's mansion in Balta Limanı. According to agreement, Ottoman State would abolish monopolies and internal taxes. Exports would be taxed twelve percent and import taxes would be five percent. The date of entering in force of customs tariff determined as 1 March 1839. The agreement was approved by Queen Victoria on 8th of October and by Mahmud II in early November (Kütükoğlu, 1974, pp. 109-111). The agreement was substantially designed in favour of Britain and Palmerston congratulated Ponsonby. Indeed, success of the agreement which Urquhart had planned and began; was dedicated to Palmerston, Ponsonby, and Bulwer.

3.11. Urquhart's Reaction to His Recall

When Urquhart returned to Britain in May 1837, he was unaware of that his diplomatic career would end as he was still writing reports to foreign office. However, he was indignant and upset but he thought that he would resume his duty due to the reasons as his close relationship with the king, public opinion's great interest on

Vixen affair and weakness of the government. But during the events was totally different as the king died on 20th of June, Vixen affair lost popularity and Melbourne government had been in power until 1841(Woodward, 1938, pp. 77-103).

The letter from Taylor to Urquhart dated 7th August 1837; indicated that Urquhart would form public opinion against Palmerston. Taylor demanded Urquhart to decide about that issue by himself (7 August 1837, Taylor papers, Taylor to Urquhart, p. 400-401). Urquhart had come to know that Henry Bulwer was appointed in place of him on 15th of August. At the end of August, Urquhart and Palmerston had a long interview. Palmerston accused Urquhart of leaking his letter dated 10th March 1837 to *Times* and betraying. Moreover, he also put the blame on Urquhart for published articles against Ponsonby. On the other hand, Urquhart was claiming that he had followed the orders from Palmerston and Ponsonby.

Urquhart wrote to foreign office to find out why Bulwer was appointed in place of him, but he could not get a satisfactory answer. Thereby, he wrote a sixty-eight pages long letter to Palmerston on 20th of September. In his letter, he expressed the communication problems between him and Ponsonby and how Ponsonby took place in Vixen affair. He stated that Ponsonby had put advertisements on the newspaper through his attorney and set against his secretary of embassy period by this way. He indicated that *Portfolio* was published by order of foreign affairs and he received the orders for Vixen Affair from Palmerston and Ponsonby (20 September 1837, FO 97/409, Urquhart to Palmerston). Palmerston would not reply that letter until the next year. Meanwhile, Urquhart started to think that Palmerston was a guilty of treason, but he would not mention his thought officially until 1839.

Between the years 1837 and 1838; Urquhart had been spending most of his time by writing the book *Spirit of the East* that consisted of two volumes, eight hundred pages and included information from Urquhart's trip to Albania. (Urquhart, 1838ab). Moreover, Urquhart's articles on foreign office were being published in *Times*. Urquhart had resolved to launch a campaign against Palmerston at the same time.

Lord Ponsonby was the first target of Urquhart's campaign. In December, he gave a deposition at Court of Queen's Bench against Ponsonby's attorney Walker as he had slandered him. Ponsonby became at the centre of the allegations on this occasion and it was decided that the envoy to be called as witness. Ponsonby considered that would cause loss of reputation and sought a settlement with Urquhart. Urquhart withdrew his complaint in return of court fees would be paid by Ponsonby. Another case was related to publishing costs of *Portfolio*. Urquhart requested foreign office for covering expenses and published an article in *Times* about this matter. However, foreign office rejected that request in order to leave no official evidence about publishing of *Portfolio*. Urquhart had to pay nine hundred forty-four pounds of expense out of pocket (Senior, 1950, pp. 114-115).

In the meantime, Urquhart was trying to rally supporter and organizing meetings with commercial groups through George Bell. The most significant of them was the large public dinner which made on 23rd May 1838 at Glasgow. Three hundred thirty merchants and manufacturers had attended to the dinner (Foreign Policy and Commerce, 1838, p. 5). Urquhart waded into British foreign policy during his impressive speech. He mentioned that Ottoman State is quite significant for Britain's political achievement and explained it in detail as Russia desired to become dominate on Ottoman State which would cause big threat for British trade. Moreover,

he mentioned that actual foreign policy was contributing Russian interests and also Palmerston had pursued misguided politics in the case of Vixen affair (Foreign Policy and Commerce, 1838, pp. 10-11, 25, 34). That meeting worked great and attendant merchants prepared and signed a petition for searching of Vixen negotiations by foreign office and preservation of rights of British merchants. Similar meetings were also organized at Hull, Sheffield, Leeds, Birmingham, Manchester, and Newcastle (Robinson, 1920, p. 60).

However, Urquhart's letter dated 20th September 1837 to Palmerston was still left unanswered. Urquhart decided to show the letter which he had written, to Stratford Canning who was Member of Parliament at the same time and he demanded him to bring up the issue to House of Commons. In the meantime, Canning was elected to the committee in House of Commons which was established to search for the contact between foreign office and Russia for Vixen affair. Canning demanded Urquhart to roll out the letter on 15th of June. Palmerston replied Urquhart on 20th June 1838 and after seven hours hence Urquhart's letter was published in *Times* (20 June 1838, FO 97/409, Palmerston to Urquhart). On the meeting in next day at House of Commons, Canning criticized Palmerston harshly and brought up the petition that was signed by merchants. He stated that Bell had got permission from Palmerston to trade in Circassia and departure of the ship from İstanbul was approved by Ponsonby. On the other hand, Palmerston rejected the claims at all. Furthermore, Urquhart's letter was also brought up. Palmerston reminded that the letter was published in *Times* and referred Urquhart's lack of discretion. Government was absolved then by sixteen votes in a ballot (Senior, 1950, pp. 124-125). In letter of reply on 20th of June, foreign office informed Urquhart that he had no official status and stated that the letter published in *Times* was a private document and included false statements (20 July

1838, FO 97/409, Backhouse to Urquhart). And on 26th of July, Palmerston's response to Urquhart and Urquhart's reply to him were published in *Times* (26 July 1838, FO 97/409, Urquhart to Backhouse).

Following those developments, some groups began to consider Urquhart as ally. Notable personages like Sir George Sinclair, governor of the Bank of England, and Sir Francis Burdett offered Urquhart to be deputy in the election of 1839 but Urquhart had refused (Robinson, 1920, p. 63). People whom Urquhart had contacted in the year 1838, always promoted Urquhart's ideas and took his side. Some of them were William Cargill, Newcastle merchant; Robert Monteith; George Flyer, lawyer and member of Bell family; Charles Attwood and Ross of Bladensburg. Urquhart began to defend that Palmerston was a Russian spy and he was guilty of treason as of 1840. Those people would take Urquhart's side.

4. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1839-1855

4.1. Chartism

Political parties in House of Commons were well balanced. Tories were reorganizing and get strong consistently under the leadership of Peel to get support of middle class. Whigs needed support to remain in power as they did not have the majority and that constantly caused speculations about government and ministers. Thereby, internal politics became more significant than foreign policy. Unrest among working class had calmed down after 1832 Reform Bill which made increase in number of the voters, but it appeared again at the end of 1830's. That was because of the depression in 1837 as it caused a wide range of unemployment. The new Poor Law which placed restrictions to outright aids refomented the unrest. There was a common backlash towards the Whigs but that was not sufficient for removal. In the years 1837-1838, Thomas Attwood, banker, revived Birmingham Political Union and launched Chartist movement with Francis Place. The main aim of Chartist movement was establishment of democratic electoral system and they were opposed to free trade (Wallerstein, 2011, p.83). They published a notice called People's Charter in 1838. In the notice they criticized inability of 1832 Reform Bill and workers were suffering from hunger amidst plenty. Moreover, enfranchisement for all men over the age of 21, vote by secret ballot and abolishment of property necessity to become Member of Parliament were some of their demands. Chartism based on the popular sovereignty (Tilly, 2004, p. 46).

Attwood had presented the Chartist notice that was approved by one billion two hundred signatures to Parliament on 12th July 1839, but it was rejected by majority. Therewith, Chartist leaders began to split up with each other. "National Convention" which identified themselves as People's Parliament succeed little and

most of the commissioners had retreated. People like George Julian Harney, William Cardo and Dr. Taylor who were armed and using harsh language became prominent and got public support (Hovell, 1918, pp. 174-175). David Urquhart encountered Chartists at the same time. Urquhart had already known some of them through George Flyer, London lawyer, and found out that they were planning Chartist rising in different regions of country. Newport was the place that rising would occur. In Urquhart's point of view, the rising was a Russian plot as they desired to enable Russian invasion by causing chaos and disorder. The one who would perform this was Polish refugee Beniowski who was included in Chartist movement. Urquhart was considering that Beniowski was a Russian spy (Hovell, 1918, pp. 175-177).

Before the Newport rising, Colonel Pringle Taylor who was an Urquhartite conveyed Urquhart's thoughts and doubts to Marquis of Anglesey. The reason of conveying to Anglesey was because Taylor also considered Russia dangerous and Anglesey was familiar with prime minister and foreign secretary. Anglesey of Marquis confirmed that he would convey the case to Lord Melbourne but before Taylor received new information, Newport rising had begun. Rising was quelled easily and leaders were imprisoned. Therewith, Taylor demanded to contact with prime minister directly and arranged an interview with Lord Normanby. When Taylor expressed his thoughts, Normanby did not pay attention to spy allegations because he thought that Palmerston was also accused by Urquhart and his friends for same claims (Hovell, 1918, pp. 177-183).

Urquhart thought that government would not take action and tried to induce Chartist that they went wrong. He visited large industrial towns and searched for Chartist groups and tried to make them believe in his theory. He told them that there was a hidden Russian control over their movement and British foreign policy was

serving for Russian interest. Most of Chartist were impressed by Urquhart's speech and convinced. Those who changed mind were identified as "converts". Urquhart and his friends started to send "missionaries" to regions that Chartism was popular. Duty of the "missionaries" was telling government's foreign policy and influence of those policies on British industry and they were funded by "National Subscription" of which members were Pringle Taylor, Fyler, Cargill and Ross of Bladensburg (Senior, 1950, p. 146).

During winter of 1839, Urquhart visited Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield and Carlisle and organized meetings. He stated that he attracted many supporters. In 1840, he made two significant meetings in Newcastle and Glasgow and there were people who attended commercial meetings of Urquhart and had been supporting him as William Cargill and Major Hodgson Cardogan, the Tory candidate for Morpeth; in Newcastle and Bells and Robert Monteith in Glasgow. In both of meetings, petitions for investigation of foreign office and Palmerston's policies were signed. Moreover, Cargill and Monteith published a pamphlet for searching the accusations to Palmerston. (Jenks, 1964, pp. 214-215). When Palmerston decided to involve in Mehmed Ali Pasha case in July 1840, Urquhart and his friends had to focus on that issue.

4.2. The Battle of Nizip

After Treaty of Balta Limanı, Bâb-ı Âli had a meeting with Lord Ponsonby regarding Egypt issue. Ponsonby indicated that he would work to prompt Britain and he offered someone would come with him to London to make a joint attempt. Therewith, it was decided that Mustafa Reşid Pasha to go London as an envoy. Pasha's mission was to negotiate with Britain to sign an alliance agreement intended to a counterattack to Mehmed Ali Pasha (Beydilli, 2006, p.348). Palmerston informed

Ponsonby that it was not possible to make an alliance agreement as Mahmud II demand when he had learnt Pasha had been sent to London. Palmerston was not planning to war Mehmed Ali Pasha but for abolishment of Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi. The agreement which was offered by Palmerston intended to preserve Ottoman State in case of an attack but also intended to limit Sultan's elbow room. Whereupon Mustafa Resid Pasha was called back to İstanbul (Baysun, 1940, p. 732).

In the meantime, Mahmud II had given order to start battle readiness. Palmerston conveyed the decision to Ponsonby as if Mehmed Ali Pasha attacked, Britain would take sides with Ottoman State, but in case of Sultan attacked first, and Britain would not support Ottoman State. Meanwhile, Ottoman army passed over the Euphrates and stopped over Nizip. On the other hand, İbrahim Pasha located his headquarters in Halep (Karal, 2011, p.140). Ponsonby informed Palmerston that war was inevitable, and Ottoman State was stood to lose. Ottoman State under command of Hafiz Mehmed Pasha and army under command of İbrahim Pasha came across at Nizip on 24th June 1839. In consequence of the war, Ottoman army was defeated and there were no obstacles on Mehmed Ali Pasha's route to Anatolia and İstanbul. Mahmud II had died one week later, before defeat news arrived in İstanbul and his sixteen years old son Abdülmecid ascended (Armaoğlu, 1997, p. 211). Soon after that chief admiral Ahmet Fevzi Pasha, who was friend of Urquhart, submitted and left the navy to Mehmed Ali Pasha (Tukin, 1999, p. 255). Afterwards, European countries would involve in the issue for resolution of Egypt issue.

4.3. Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Tanzimat

Mustafa Reşid Pasha who associated with Tanzimat Reforms was from the era in which reform movements had built up in West and East. After education period, he worked in public sector in several positions and was assigned as Paris envoy in 1833. He had learnt French which was the diplomatic language of that era. In 1836, he was assigned as London envoy. During his second ministerial period in London, he visited Paris once again and he made use of the newspaper *Courrier Français*, to form public opinion in favour of Ottoman State. Thereby, Pasha was an officer who knew European law well, trying to think as occidental and thought Ottoman State should take part in western civilization (Karal, 2012, pp. 122-123).

Pasha had turned back to London when he learnt outbreak of Battle of Nizip. Just then he received the order to return İstanbul for *cülus* ceremony (Baysun, 1940, p. 733). He had met with Palmerston before he turns back to İstanbul and announced that he prepared a memorandum about the necessary reforms for Ottoman State. He sent the memorandum to Palmerston on the day he would departure from London. In the memorandum, Ottoman State's problems were presented with and reasons and also solutions were emphasized. Pasha considered that Mahmud II had made reforms for flaunting until that time and stated that Ottoman State could only get strong with actual reforms. He indicated that safety of life and property and fair trial were essential. According to Pasha, Ottoman State should adopt the laws which were enacted by European countries (Mardin, 2012, pp. 149-152).

Mustafa Reşid Pasha fared to İstanbul after he had given the memorandum. Palmerston considered that Mahmud II was encouraged to war by Russia and was pleased with that Pasha was in İstanbul while there was such a mess. In the meantime, on 28th July 1839; five representatives of European countries sent a common

diplomatic note which was written out by Metternich to Bâb-ı Âli. They indicated that their governments had discussed about Egypt matter and demanded Ottoman State not to take a step without their consultancy. Ottoman State answered in the affirmative and demanded support (Tuncer, 2013, p. 135). Palmerston demanded to convince five major countries to sign an agreement that would guarantee Ottoman State's independence for ten years as he considered that Ottoman State would gain time to get strong by reforms with such an agreement.

Mustafa Reşid Pasha came İstanbul on 4th September 1839. Grand vizier of that time was Hüsrev Pasha and he was trying to convince Sultan Abdülmecid for extinguishment of Mustafa Reşid Pasha (Baysun, 1940, p. 733). However, Abdülmecid wanted him to remain Foreign minister and Hüsrev Pasha changed his mind and conspired with Mustafa Reşid Pasha. Mustafa Reşid Paşa, Hüsrev Pasha, Ahmet Fethi Pasha and Halil Rıfat Pasha took control of Bâb-ı Âli. In addition, Pro-Russian Akif Pasha was assigned to Kocaeli governorship to lead him off İstanbul (Çadırcı, 2012, p. 201).

Mustafa Reşid Pasha met with Ponsonby regarding reforms in September 1839. Ponsonby thought some urgent matters should be discussed. Those were division of Ottoman governor's unimilitary and military authorizations, implementation of Treaty of Balta Limanı provisions, collection of taxes, making arrangements regarding officials and providing immunity of property among Muslim and non-Muslim subject. Pasha put reform program across to Abdülmecid before the resolution of Egypt issue. Accordingly, after the principles of The Rescript of Gülhane was formed, he came into Sultan's presence and explained details to make Sultan approve the draft he had prepared. His argument was that unless the principles which were implemented by western statesmen for a long time, were adopted; and

without prevention of fundamental matters as corruption, bribery, mismanagement and injustice, it was not possible to receive support from Europe. It had to be demonstrated to whole Europe that Ottoman State would approach to western civilisation through Tanzimat. Abdülmecid was persuaded reforms. Pasha instantly made a clean copy of draft rescript and got Sultan's approval (Noviçev, 2012, pp. 355-356).

Ottoman executives, notably Hüsrev Pasha, shaykh al-Islam, ulema, European envoys, Greek and Armenian Patriarchs and foreign guests attended to the ceremony for declaration of The Rescript of Gülhane. On 3rd November 1839, Mustafa Reşid Pasha read The Rescript of Gülhane to that community. The statesmen including Sultan had sworn on Koran to remain loyal to the rescript (Karal, 2012, p. 113). The principles which had been indicated in the rescript were, the equal protection of law, abolishment of tax farming, prevention of conscription, non-admission of corruption and bribery, preparation of a criminal code, providing safety of life and property, fair tax collection and no extrajudicial execution (İnalçık, 2012, pp. 171-179). According to Lord Ponsonby's point of view, The Rescript of Gülhane was an important step and enemies of Ottoman State and Mehmed Ali Pasha would try to prevent application of the rescript. Palmerston and Ponsonby indicated that they were ready to lend assistance for making the principles actual (Temperley, 1936, p. 162).

By considering Russia's acts which conflicted with their interests in Middle East and became a threat for British connection to India; British government had responded the rescript positively as they were expecting Ottoman State gain strength and persuade anti-Russian policy in Middle East. According to the rescript, equality was guaranteed and therefore Russia would not be able to interfere in the internal affairs of Ottoman State under cover of protection of orthodox Slavs (Noviçev, 2012,

p. 357). Also, British press was interested in The Rescript of Gülhane. *Morning Post* had presented English version of the rescript to its readers. Moreover, *London Evening Standard* indicated that the rescript was totally belong to Mustafa Reşid Pasha and *Dublin Evening Post* had published an article about the foreign envoy's pleasure and regretted Ottoman State regarding the rescript (28 November 1839, *Morning Post*; 29 November 1839, *London Evening Standard*; 10 December 1839, *Dublin Evening Post*).

4.4. The Convention of London and War against Mehmed Ali Pasha

European countries amended their policies after those developments. Tsar Nikola had sent a private envoy to London on 15th September 1839 in order to declare that they decided to act in unison with Britain regarding Eastern Question. In addition, it was guaranteed that Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi which would be expired, would not be renewed during the interview. Palmerston gave order to Ponsonby in order to be in cooperation with Russian envoy of İstanbul. On the contrary, France provided more support to Mehmed Ali Pasha (Armaoğlu, 1997, p. 212-213).

The interviews which were kept on by European countries regarding resolution of Egypt issue ended up with The Convention of London on 15th July 1840. The countries that had signed the convention were, Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia to the exclusion of France. In accordance with the agreement, Egypt governorship would be left to Mehmed Ali Pasha and way of descend from father to son would be valid. Also, Akka governorship and Syrian territory would be up to him. If he did not accept the offer, only Egypt governorship would be given. Exclusion of France from the agreement stunned Paris. The thought of going to war in order to protect Mehmed Ali Pasha was even put into words among public (Armaoğlu, 1997, p. 213-214).

Those developments attracted David Urquhart's attention. As soon as the convention was declared, he put forward his idea that Palmerston was a guilty of treason once again. Urquhart went to Paris in August 1840 on the purpose of giving Thiers, prime minister of France, guarantee that the treaty was unpopular in Britain and telling about the displeasure for breakdown of British-France relations. He published the book, *The Crisis: France in face of the four powers* while he was in Paris. His claims in his book were interesting. He defended that the treaty was made not against Mehmed Ali Pasha but against France. He stated that the treaty was complement of Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi and provided Russian control on Indian, Syrian and African trade with whole southern Europe. He defended that the treaty was used by Russia in order to drive a wedge between Britain and France as he considered death of Mahmud II, the loss of war and submitting Ottoman navy to Mehmed Ali Pasha were all diplomatic constipations and Palmerston was an intermediary who was meeting Russia's demands (Urquhart, 1840, pp. 1-65).

Meanwhile, Urquhart supporters were organizing public meetings at Birmingham and Newcastle in August 1840. Attwood, Cardo and Thomas Doubleday declaimed against Russia in those meetings. During early September of 1840, Attwood and some Urquhartites had thrown in with Urquhart. Their purpose was to announce 15th July agreement was imposed to Britain by Russia through "the traitor" Palmerston to French people. They also met with some deputies from French Parliament (Jenks, 1964, p. 227).

During same period, Mustafa Reşid Pasha sent the instrument of ratification by Sultan for the treaty signed by European countries to British embassy. On the other hand, France was trying to lead Ottoman State to compromise directly with Mehmed Ali Pasha. Meanwhile, prescribed time that was given to Mehmed Ali Pasha had

expired. British navy had bombed Beirut and Ottoman soldiers come ashore. After three days, Bâb-ı Âli declared that Mehmed Ali Pasha was unseated from all governorships he had been assigned. Palmerston gave order to Admiral Stopford to disconnect with Egypt and Syria. However, General Jochmus and Sir Charles Smith were assigned as commanders in Ottoman army and navy. On 26th September 1840, General Jochmus reported that they had win the fight with İbrahim Pasha's military forces. After a while, upper hand of Ottoman military forces under British military officers' command, over İbrahim Pasha's forces became definite. Beirut was seized on 10th October 1840 (Jorga, 2017, pp. 362-364).

Mehmet Ali Pasha was stalemated completely. He reported that he was loyal to Sultan and wanted to make peace. He asked for mediation of France in this regard. Mustafa Reşid Pasha responded Mehmed Ali Pasha as they were not able to make an agreement beyond ally's knowledge. In a short while, allied navy which was consisted of British, Austrian and Ottoman warships, defeated İbrahim Pasha by four hours long bombardment at Akka. İbrahim Pasha had to retreat from whole Syria territory (Temperley, 1936, p. 123). Ponsonby passed sanjak of İbrahim Pasha's army, which defeated at Beirut, in to Abdülmecid. That meant the resolution of Mehmed Ali Pasha matter which occupied Ottoman State's agenda for ten years. Abdülmecid had thanked to Britain for their help and commended Lord Ponsonby for his work in favour of Ottoman State (Temperley, 1936, pp. 124-125).

On 27th of November, Mehmed Ali Pasha had signed the treaty of Alexandria with executive officer of British navy, Napier. According to the treaty, Egypt would remain at himself by inheritance and Ottoman navy and Syria would be returned. Pasha restored Ottoman Navy to Ottoman State in January 1841 and Egypt governorship had given to Mehmed Ali Pasha by inheritance with royal decree of

Sultan on 13th of February (Jorga, 2017, p. 365). Urquhart's theories had missed the mark. Palmerston assisted Ottoman State for Egypt issue and Russia did not attempt to capture İstanbul. Moreover, Thiers government was unseated by king because of failure.

London Straits Convention had been signed between Britain, Austria, Russia, Prussia, France and Ottoman State on 15th July 1841. France was also included to the treaty this time. Based on the agreement, the straits would be closed for warships during peacetime. Russia was devoid of advantages of Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi but prevented French and British warships crossed over into Black Sea with this agreement. Moreover, Ottoman Sultan's control over the straits was ensured by European countries. On the other hand, by this agreement, Britain had extinguished Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi which had been the major target of foreign policy since 1833 (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 216-217). In the meantime, some other significant developments occurred such as Mustafa Reşid Pasha was unseated and Sadık Rıfat Pasha was assigned as from Foreign Minister (Temperley, 1936, p. 163). On the other hand, in Britain, Whigs lost their seat in March 1841 elections and conservatives came to power. Robert Peel was assigned as prime minister and Lord Aberdeen was the new foreign minister. Stratford Canning was assigned as İstanbul envoy on 10th of September in place of Lord Ponsonby.

4.5. Political Activities of David Urquhart between 1841-1849

At the end of 1841, Urquhart's status made him despaired for the future. Cooperation with Chartist movement had failed to satisfy. Newspapers had quitted to mention about Urquhart's activities and his policy against Palmerston was failed. Because Palmerston had resigned from foreign office after the elections, he did not pay attention to Urquhart's accusations about betrayal. On the other hand, Urquhart

was going on to work with few people who were supporting him absolutely. For that purpose, he began to make more private meetings and he contacted with Benjamin Disraeli who would be prime minister in the future and William Ewart Gladstone.

Urquhart and Disraeli were in touch with each other in 1839 at first. In that period, Disraeli tried to contact with Urquhart in order to get information and advices on foreign policy but Urquhart had rejected his request. In 1841, Urquhart requested to meet with Disraeli this time. During those days, Urquhart did not have any other communication choice. Disraeli had gained reputation in House of Commons by his oratorical skills. Urquhart had sent part of his studies on Persia to Disraeli and Disraeli analysed the study for a month and returned Urquhart as he considered the work interesting. Moreover, he added on that he wanted to meet with Urquhart (Jenks, 1964, pp. 239-240).

In those years, Urquhart and Disraeli had focused on two main subjects of foreign policy. First one was Afghanistan matter and the other was Serbian case. Britain had been endeavouring to capture Afghanistan in order to prevent expansion of Russia in Middle Asia and preserve Indian road. Therefore, there were armed conflicts in region. Also, the war against Afghanistan Emirates did not seem to go positively as expected (Roberts, 2003, pp. 1-12). Urquhart published his work named *Diplomatic Transactions in Central Asia from 1834 to 1839* in 1841 which was on British and Russian Afghanistan policies (Urquhart, 1841). Disraeli also concerned about the issue and was exchanging opinions with Urquhart and, he also mentioned about Urquhart's views on his book in House of Commons. Another issue that they had interested in was Serbian cases. As a result of a revolt in Serbia in 1841, Milos Obrenović had been dethroned and Aleksandr Karadordevic took his place. Sultan recognized Karadordevic officially. On the other hand, Russia demanded to get

stronger in Serbia, refused to recognize Karadordevic and wanted a new election. Urquhart was writing articles on the topic in *Portfolio* which he reissued in August 1843. In addition, he published his book about Serbians; *A Fragment of the History Servia*; in 1843 (Urquhart, 1843). He considered Serbians as brave people same as Circassians who stood up to Russians. Same issue was also brought up in House of commons by Disraeli. Disraeli stated similar opinions with Urquhart's as Russia had been getting closer to two significant strategic regions year by year. One of that regions was Danish Straits and the other was Dardanelles. He defended that Ottoman State got weak because of the schemes of European diplomacy and Britain remained passive regarding the issue. Those opinions and discourses of Disraeli indicated that he was impressed by both his correspondences with Urquhart and his views (Jenks, 1964, p. 249).

Urquhart's relationship with Gladstone was more official. It was known that, in 1843, British government demanded to revise the commercial treaty which was signed in 1838. Urquhart immediately offered his service to foreign office and Gladstone who was president of board on that date. Foreign office did not want Urquhart to have an active role for the discussions, but Gladstone had different views. He was aware of that Urquhart had know-how about the issue and his views would be beneficial. Urquhart and Gladstone corresponded with each other about the issue, but their connection had remained. Urquhart's opinions were totally based on opposition to Palmerston's administration and consequently Urquhart could not take support from both political parties.

Approaching to 1847 elections, Urquhart's followers put pressure on him to be in Parliament. Urquhart became candidate from Stafford town for 1847 elections by considering those requests. As a result of the elections, Urquhart received

approximately half of the votes and went into the House of Commons as he won the election with 754 votes on his two rivals (6 August 1847, Derbyshire Advertiser and Journal). Urquhart had published a thank-you note after elections and mentioned that result of elections was correspond of his fifteen years effort. He also stated that that was not an end but a fresh start for him (7 August 1847, Staffordshire Advertiser). Urquhart's presence in parliament pleased Ireland. Ireland press introduced Urquhart as he was against Palmerston and Whig and that was significant for Ireland's rights (7 August 1847, Dublin Weekly Nation).

Urquhart speeded up his actions against Palmerston who was reassigned as foreign affairs minister in 1846, after he had been elected to House of Commons. It can be considered that he cooperated with Youghal representative Thomas Anstey in parliament for that purpose. Urquhart and Anstey were the origin of accusations in parliament towards Palmerston. Even it was claimed that those two established a party, but that information was denied afterwards. Moreover, accusations that were made against Palmerston as he was Russian spy and traitor were made in order to make British public ascertain the truth (11 September 1847, Staffordshire Advertiser; 1 December 1847, Cork Examiner). In February 1848, Anstey made a motion for publishing of Palmerston's papers on foreign policy dated from 1830, with Urquhart's contribution. During the sessions in February, that issue was discussed but Urquhart and Anstey did not succeed. Moreover, they were not approved by public opinion (27 February 1848, Weekly Chronicle; 24 February 1848, Morning Chronicle; 24 February 1848, Morning Advertiser). In 1849, Urquhart published his book named *Pillars of Hercules* which was about his Spain and Morocco trips. In the same year, he had resigned from his position in parliament and travelled to Ottoman territory again. He would spend the years between 1849 and 1851 in Ottoman State.

4.6. Ottoman-British Relations During 1840s

After settlement of Mehmed Ali Pasha matter, the period till the Crimean War was a peace period for Ottoman State and Ottoman State concentrated on Tanzimat reforms during that period. Furthermore, some cases which would cause international matter had occurred like Lebanon revolt and Hungarian refugee problem. It is observed that after the refugee problem tension between Ottoman State and Russia was increasing. On the other hand, while those cases were going through, Ottoman–British relations made positive progress. Especially, new İstanbul ambassador Stratford Canning featured in that progress as compatible communication between Sultan Abdülmecid, Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Canning affected Ottoman–British relations positively.

4.6.1. Sultan Abdülmecid, Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Stratford Canning

Stratford Canning was reappointed as İstanbul ambassador of Britain in 1841 and arrived İstanbul in January 1842. He would carry out his duty until 1858 at certain intervals. He returned to London allowedly and proffered resignation, but his resignation was refused by foreign affairs minister Palmerston and he resumed his duty. Canning's ambassadorship period should be considered in two parts. Between the years 1842 and 1847, Canning had concentrated on Ottoman State's internal reforms and between 1847 and 1858, he focused on the conflict with Russia. He also developed positive relationship between Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Sultan Abdülmecid during those periods.

Canning's first meeting with Abdülmecid was on 27th January 1842. In that year, Canning was fifty-six and Abdülmecid was nineteen years old. It would not be wrong to consider that Canning regarded the Ottoman Sultan as his student. After the first meeting, Canning's views about Abdülmecid were positive as Canning qualified

him as smart and thought that he would be successful with increasing age.

Abdülmeçid stated that he had given order for implementation of the law which were declared at Gülhane, he desired peaceful relationships with all European countries and to gain intimacy and trust of Britain (Poole, 1888, p. 81). In his reports, Canning indicated that he was able to meet with Sultan comfortably, encouraged the Sultan regarding reforms and Sultan praised Canning for his contribution to gain intimacy of Britain (Poole, 1888, p. 206). During Abdülmeçid's sultanate, Ottoman–British relations had peaked up. It can be considered as an indicator that Queen Victoria honoured Abdülmeçid with The Order of the Garter after the Crimean war in 1856 through Canning. The order was the greatest order of Great Britain's nobility ranks and was given to a Muslim for the first time (20 November 1856, Morning Chronicle; 11 November 1856, Morning Advertiser; 20 November 1856, Sun).

The relationship between Canning and Mustafa Reşid Pasha was also good and compatible. During Pasha's London ambassadorship, Pasha had visited Canning, explained the reforms he demanded and asked him for advice (Poole, 1888, p. 105). Also, Canning qualified Pasha as characterful inborn and educated gentlemen (Poole, 1888, p. 104). Canning believed in that, in order for Ottoman State carry out the reforms, Mustafa Reşid Pasha should be in İstanbul. Moreover, it was necessary for Britain's interests and to resist Russia. During the period that Pasha was appointed as Paris envoy and far from İstanbul, Canning tried to persuade Abdülmeçid for return of Pasha. In 1845, in a letter to his wife, he stated that he was seeking for return of Pasha and it was in the wind. Indeed, after two months, Pasha was appointed as Foreign Minister (Poole, 1888, pp. 141-143). The relationship between Canning and Mustafa Reşid Pasha was maintained well during Pasha's grand viziership periods. When the Pasha was unseated from his last grand viziership position, Canning's duty in

Ottoman State also came to an end. Canning said farewell to Sultan on 25th of September and ended his mission.

4.6.2. Lebanon Uprising

Lebanon region was under control of Ottoman State but conducted by Şahap family. Druse and Maronite were effective in the region. Lebanese who did not like the council which was established for implementation of Tanzimat reforms had risen and rebels went to foreign countries. The first reaction to the revolt was from France which was considering itself as mentor of ultra-catholic Maronites. In addition, the region was significant for safety of trade road to India for Britain and they did not want a powerful France there. Britain started to make protestant propaganda and established a protestant church in Jerusalem with contribution of Canning's efforts in 1842. Protestant missionaries had spread into Syria and Lebanon and made progress in short time. Druses became protestant and entered under the domination of Britain (Karal, 2011, pp. 210-211).

Ottoman State appointed Ömer Pasha as Lebanon emirate and that might be considered as end of Şahap family's domination. France protested this action and began to defend rights of Şahap family and Britain involved in the case on the excuse that protecting Druses. Ottoman State unseated Ömer Pasha and approved a new civil order for Lebanon. According to that, Lebanon would be conducted by two district governors as one Druse and one Maronite. Moreover, the new order was not enough to suppress the revolt. By involvement of five big states' envoys, Ottoman State sent Şekip Efendi over Lebanon with exceptional power. It was determined that the weapons would be collected from public, declared that rebels would be forgiven, and the compensations would be paid to people who incurred losses. However, collection of weapons was difficult and therewith, most of Druse and Maronite leaders were

imprisoned. France declared that they would capture the Syria coasts and land troops. It was claimed that French ambassador got arrested and French public opinion became against to Ottoman State. After those developments, Ottoman State unseated Şekip Efendi from foreign affairs minister position, quitted collection of weapons in Lebanon and released the arrested leaders (Karal, 2011, p. 212).

A new civil order was established in Lebanon in the year 1846. A council consisted of ten members who had administration, property and justice authorities that was under control of each district governors. In that council, there were six Christian members, four Muslims members and majority would be Christian. Canning stated that revolt was suppressed with that such kind of solution (Poole, 1888, p. 102). After those decisions, there had been peace environment in Lebanon until 1860.

4.6.3. Hungarian Refugees Matter

Hungarians within Austria-Hungary Empire established a self-governing state as a result of 1848 revolutions. Afterwards, they declared independence and elected Lajos Kossuth as president on 14th April 1849. Hungarians had gone to war with Austria and began to get successful results. Therewith, Austria requested assistance from Russia and a large Russian army advanced towards Hungarians and Hungarians lost the war. Therewith, Hungarian took refuge to Ottoman territory. Also, Polishes who cooperated with Hungarians came to Ottoman border and Ottoman State admitted them also. Austria and Russia demanded return of those refugees according to Treaty of Belgrade's eighteenth clause, but Ottoman State refused that demand. Therefore, the Hungarian refugees' matter had started.

According to the eighteenth clause of Treaty of Belgrade, Ottoman State had undertaken penalizing of rebel Austrians in case of they took refuge in Ottoman

territory. Thereby, Ottoman State requested support to Britain and Mustafa Reşid Pasha met with Canning and broached the issue. Canning recommended Ottoman State to return refugees because the eighteenth clause of Treaty of Belgrade did not comprise that situation (Poole, 1888, pp. 189-190). Ottoman State refused Austria and Russia's demand with Britain's support. Palmerston had announced that Britain was standing by Ottoman State regarding that issue (Temperley, 1936, p. 203).

British public opinion also stood by Ottoman State and British newspapers published that Ottoman State protected refugees by never returning them (26 September 1849, Cork Examiner; 12 October 1849, Carlisle Journal; 8 December 1849, London Daily News).

Austrian and Russian governments sent a repressive diplomatic note to Ottoman State and threatened by quitting political relations. Therewith, Ottoman State offered Hungarian refugees to become Muslim. Most of them accepted and Ottoman State delegated military missions as top brasses to them, but Austria did not like that situation. Russia and Austria recall their envoys. Ottoman State published a notice and declared that they were defending refugees completely with humanitarian emotions. Palmerston stated that Russia and Austria's recall their envoys was only for hectoring and British government declared that they got set to put British navy into service of Bâb-ı Âli. Also, France offered assistance (Karal, 2011, p. 217).

Due to Ottoman State's firm stand, Britain and France's decision to assist Ottoman State and European public opinion's view which was in favour of Ottoman State and against Austria; Austria and Russia retreated and began meetings with Ottoman State. Russia and Ottoman State compromised after the meetings. According to agreement, desirer ones of Hungarian and Polish refugees might turn back to their countries and the rest would be placed far away from Russian and Austria borders.

Russia dissatisfied about the solution of the matter thus as they realised intimacy of Ottoman State and Britain. That situation caused to start of the tension between Ottoman State and Russia.

4.7. Urquhart's Visit to Lebanon and İstanbul

David Urquhart spent the years between 1849 and 1851 in Ottoman territory mostly in Lebanon and İstanbul. When he had arrived to Lebanon in November 1849, it was peacetime in Lebanon after the civil war between Druses and Maronites. Authority was divided between Ottoman governor, one Maronite and one Druse executive. Britain was defending the continuation of the system. On the other hand, some of the Ottoman executives in region argued for a direct Ottoman authority instead of that system (Temperley, 1936, p. 198). Urquhart was spending his time with those executives and supporting them actively. He advocated that people in region would be happier with a direct Ottoman authority.

Urquhart referred his experiences in Lebanon in his two-volume book *The Lebanon: A History and a Diary* which was published in 1860. He told about the Lebanon history in first 183 pages of the first volume and his daily experiences in the rest of chapters (Urquhart, 1860). Urquhart had stayed in Lebanon for six months; from November 1849 to May 1850. He worked for organizing people in the city Zahle which had Christian residents and tried to convince them to submit petition for Turkish governor. That situation got reaction from British consul Moore. Thereafter, Urquhart convened the native merchants in Beirut and encouraged them to submit petition to Bâb-ı Âli for reduction of custom duties. Ottoman State was against to that and Ottoman executives refused to meet with Urquhart after the public meeting of merchants, then Urquhart left the region (Urquhart, 1860, pp. 437-444). As another interesting anecdote about Urquhart during his time in region; he was attacked by

pirates. In his letter to Canning in January 1850; Palmerston had asked if Urquhart had been attacked by pirates in Eastern Mediterranean. Even he mentioned that he blamed himself and Russia for that attack (20 January 1850, PP/GC/CA/286, Palmerston to Canning). Canning verified the attack was occurred in his reply to Palmerston (20 February 1850, PP/GC/CA/201, Canning to Palmerston).

During summer of 1850, Urquhart came to İstanbul and that annoyed Canning. Although Urquhart was non-commissioned in the name of British government; he thought Urquhart was powerful in virtue of his contacts in İstanbul. Canning reported Palmerston that Urquhart had not met with him though he met with Sultan in Chios on the way back (20 July 1850, PP/GC/CA/219, Canning to Palmerston). In Palmerston's reply to Canning, Palmerston defined Urquhart as "Daoud Effendi" and stated that he was spending time in East because he lost his authority in Britain (7 August 1850, PP/GC/CA/293, Palmerston to Canning). In his report in August 1850; Canning reported that Urquhart was still in İstanbul and wearing fez hat like Turks. In addition, he stated that he believed that Urquhart was not able to meet Sultan formally (20 August 1850, PP/GC/CA/221, Canning to Palmerston). In another report dated January 1850, he mentioned that Urquhart would settle in İstanbul permanently until the autumn. He defined Urquhart as half-mad, as Urquhart thought that Turks should be adopted and preserve the lifestyle mentioned in Quran (7 January 1851, PP/GC/CA/229, Canning to Palmerston). Moreover, Urquhart asked for help to Canning to be able to meet the Sultan, but his request was refused by Canning (25 January 1851, Urquhart papers, 1C10, Canning to Urquhart). Urquhart had stayed in İstanbul until end of the year 1851 and then returned to Britain. After he returned to Britain; he decided to quit his active political life and did not participate in the elections in 1852.

4.8. Urquhart and the Crimean War

In 1844, Nikola, tsar of Russia, visited Britain with the view of coming to an agreement regarding Ottoman State's future. He suggested that Russia and Britain should work in cooperation for Christian people were living in Ottoman territory. He had told to British officers; it should be considered that collapse Ottoman State was inevitable. Furthermore, he thought that; the major problem between Britain and Russia had been solved by Straits Convention in 1841. After meetings, a protocol for a secret British-Russian convention was prepared. According to convention, the parties would discuss for establishment of a new order without disturbing the balance of power in Europe; in case they foresaw that collapse of Ottoman State was irrepressible. British did not consider that convention as binding formally. They considered it as exchange of views. But Nikola's approach was different as he thought that he had certainly come to an agreement with British. Nikola reckoned without influence of British press and public opinion (Figes, 2012, pp. 94-95). David Urquhart was one of the most significant personages who promoted anti-Russian view among public opinion before and during Crimean War. He had supported anti-Russian opinion and Britain entering the war either by press or his books and public meetings he had organized.

Russian-British connection had continued until the year 1849. Russia was the only state which had not been influenced by revolution of 1848 which penetrated whole Europe. Russia demanded to dominate the Ottoman State and considered Ottoman Diplomat's good relations with Britain and France by Tanzimat reforms as a threat. Moreover, Russia regarded itself as the patron of the Orthodox world. During Hungarian Refugees problem, Britain's opting to take the part of Ottoman State and sending fleet to Dardanelles, drove a wedge between Britain and Russia. British

public opinion had turned against Russia and statements as Russian expansion was endangering for Britain's interest were made. Nikola made decision on negotiate with Britain despite those opinions. In January 1853; during his meeting with British St. Petersburg envoy Sir George Hamilton; he stated that Britain and Russia should reach an agreement. Nikola described Ottoman State as "sick man" and an instantaneous death of Ottoman State; would lead to a chaos and also would turn into a European war. He offered to left Egypt and Crete to Britain and share out Ottoman State (The Annual Register, 1854, pp. 252-258). However, British government had refused the offer and Russia decided to take solitary action as they turned Holy Places issue into a problem.

4.8.1. Urquhart's Views on Ottoman Military

David Urquhart foresaw a potential Ottoman-Russian war and wrote the book named *The Military Strength of Turkey* (Urquhart, 1869) that revealed Ottoman State's military situation. The book was manuscript and published by Foreign Affairs Committee in 1869. The book handled Ottoman State's Military capability and geographical position comparatively with Russia's position in general terms. Moreover, it focused on Ottoman-Turkish lifestyle, superior sides of state governance and explained how those features provides the advantage to Ottoman State.

Urquhart attached importance to Ottoman State's geographical position in case of a potential war. It was obvious that he had comprehensive knowledge of the region. He laid bare the circumstances in region, advantages and disadvantages of Russia and Ottoman State. According to Urquhart's point of view, Ottoman State's defence and European peace were relied on retention of Moldavia and Wallachia by Ottoman State (Urquhart, 1869, p. 8). Ukrainian steppes were on tough region and those rigors were

extreme disadvantages for Russia as those steppes acted as breakwater ahead Ottoman territory (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 13-14). Furthermore, Russia implemented a depopulation policy in region during the Ottoman Russian War between 1768 and 1774 and post-war. As a consequence of that depopulation policy, Russia had tightened the noose (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 10-11).

Urquhart revealed that he had a grasp of the region at every point of his book. While explaining the pros and cons of Ottoman and Russian armies, he presented detailed knowledge about geography, climate, and soil structure of the region.

Urquhart had determined the significance of Moldavia and Wallachia in detail and he stated that Russia could not be able to wage war against Ottoman State unless they hold those provinces. He remarked that he had travelled every inch of those provinces and knew that people did not like Ottomans but hated Russians (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 18-19). Russia broke in Moldavia and Wallachia without declaring war in 1806. In 1821, they were derailed from war as Austria was object to Russia's entrance in the provinces. Russia entered the region as soon as declaration of war in 1828. They also entered in provinces in 1848 but was coerced to leave. By year 1852, Russia had been scheming to break in the provinces again (Urquhart, 1869, p. 20).

Urquhart tried to reveal the contribution of Danube River and Balkans for defence. He likened Danube River as a moat and stated that Ottoman State's safety was laying on the depth of Danube River. Russia's main purpose was not the provinces, but İstanbul. As long as Ottoman State preserved its position in Moldavia and Wallachia, the capital city would be kept out of war. Urquhart submitted a plan about defence of Ottoman State in the provinces to Sultan. He considered Christians to be recorded in a certain manner in that plan and he stated that Christians would be beneficial as a permanent auxiliary military power under their

own institutions and brasses. He mentioned that the plan was greeted with astonishment as Ottoman State asked if Christians would seriously serve to Ottoman State. He explained as that plan was accepted with the consent of the provinces and so immunity of the borders in future would be assured by Moldavian army stand behind the 25.000 Turks and Prut River in Dobruja (Urquhart, 1869, p. 29). On the other hand, Balkans were behind the Danube River, but the region was indefensible. Troops would get through with ease. Assuming that; even Russia was able to bring its current resources completely to Balkans; Ottoman State would be able to resist with a troop that was little high in number than Russia's. In that point, sea power would dominate the war. Urquhart thought that Ottoman State's undoing would not be a consequence of a Christian revolt, but only because of a Muslim schism. He stated Russia's only hope was Ottoman State's renovation policy. Urquhart was opposing to western renovation in Ottoman State as an old-new polemic in Ottoman State would be a disaster for Ottoman's but for the good of Russia (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 30-31).

Another point that was considered by Urquhart, regarding Ottoman State's defence and European peace, were the Straits. Russia's possession territorial waters in Black Sea was a threat for Ottoman State and also for Europe. Urquhart indicated that Britain asserted the interest by the integrity of Ottoman State, as a pretext for the refusal of Ottoman State's appeal for help from Britain against Russia. He remarked Britain had never been supportive to Ottoman State from 1809 to 1841 (Urquhart, 1869, p. 37). Urquhart assessed the necessity to prevent Russia holding Dardanelles as vital for infinite existence of British Empire. He indicated the only way to prevent Russia holding the Dardanelles was to give up to think Ottoman State was asking for help from Britain but he also considered that the rulers would not be able to comprehend the issue (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 40-41).

Urquhart remarked it's critical for Ottoman State to have a regular army and to use bashibazouks in balance. It was disadvantage for Ottoman State that those two systems dissented to each other. Next war would not be like 1829 war, so Ottoman State should save on its resources and show its whole energy. According to Urquhart's point of view, Ottoman State should operate with regular army while defending Moldavia and Wallachia; but use bashibazouks and Albanians for defence of Bulgaria. A regular army in Moldavia and Wallachia would assure the war remains in region. Moreover, bashibazouks and Albanians in Bulgaria would be assisted by regular army in case of necessity. In the same time, that would prevent a potential Austria-Russia alliance. By this means, Ottoman State would provide private space for both of its military troops in character; make them proud of their own private rights, and also get through the conflict between two troops (Urquhart, 1869, p. 74).

Urquhart had various recommendations for new military organisation in future. The first one was conservation of social manners and customs in the army and renovation of the uniforms which was considered preservation of the soldiers among people. The second one was, strengthening of Danube castles by colonizing Dobruja and opening a military road from İstanbul to Silistra. In addition, he suggested establishment and preservation of a mounted troop as Ottomans made good use of cavalries. In this manner, Russia's plans would be postponed indefinitely, and it would not be possible for Ottoman State to pass over its own power (Urquhart, 1869, p. 139).

4.8.2. The Problem of the Holy Places and the Special Mission of Prince Menshikov

After the year 1850; a discussion regarding holy places in Jerusalem came up as if Catholics or Orthodoxies have had privileged rights on those places. France was

advocating the Catholics and Orthodoxies were advocated by Russians. Sultan had given an imperial order which allowed Catholics to supervise the Church of Nativity instead of Orthodox Rums until end of 1852 December. It meant that the imperial order in 1851 November, which promised the same privileges to Orthodoxies became reversed. Russians who were advocating the protection rights of Orthodox Rum society since Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca; regarded that decision as an insult. Therefore, Tsar Nicola accredited Prince Menshikov to İstanbul as an extraordinary envoy in February 1853 (Aksan, 2011, pp. 467-468).

Menshikov was an admiral, marine works minister and general governor of Finland. He came to İstanbul by a warship and welcomed grandly at Tophane by orthodoxies. He caused Foreign Service minister Fuad Pasha to resign as soon as he came by refusing to meet with him because he considered pasha was pro-French. Sadık Rifat Pasha was nominated to his place (Temperley, 1936, p. 309). Menshikov was refraining from British and French envoys but they were on leave and at their countries. Menshikov informed Bâb-ı Âli about his motions by a verbal diplomatic note. The most remarkable motion was for making an agreement which Sultan would authorize Russia to be dominate on all Orthodox citizens. Accordingly, Tsar would be the protector of twelve million Orthodox in Ottoman State (Türkgeldi, 1987, pp. 13-14).

In the official correspondences with Britain, Tsar Nicola indicated that they had have no thought of war by sending Prince Menshikov over İstanbul and they only had peaceful purposes. Moreover, new rights and privileges to Greek Church in Ottoman borders and Russia's protection rights on orthodox people were the other issues indicated (Miller, 1923, p. 202). On the other hand, British charge d' affaires Colonel Rose was thinking Russia was working on war scheme. Rose gave order by

telegram to Admiral Dundas who was in Malta, unbeknown to government, to bring Mediterranean navy to Aegean Sea. Dundas refused to move without order from government. On the other hand, French sent fleet to Salamis Gulf on 20th March (Temperley, 1936, pp. 310-311). Foreign affairs minister Lord Clarendon agreed on Admiral Dundas and was advocating that navy should not be sent. Furthermore, he conveyed Canning that he was nervous about latest developments and instructed him to turn back to İstanbul and resume his work (Poole, 1888, p. 234).

Prince Menshikov's main purpose was concluding an offensive and defensive treaty with Ottoman State like Unkiar Skelessi. According to that, in case of an attack to Ottoman State, Russia would help, and protection of Christian orthodox people would be officially given to Char in return. Additionally, he demanded keeping that information confidential and he threatened Ottoman State to withdraw the committee in case of British embassy learn that issue. However, that issues were conveyed to British embassy (Jorga, 2017, p. 415). At that time, Britain did not consider Menshikov's coming to İstanbul a threat to Ottoman State. According to Britain, French exaggerated the holy places issue and Britain's main purpose was just following the developments but not interfere holy places issue between Ottoman State, Russia and France (Hearnshaw, 1970, pp. 344-348).

Tsar Nicola and Russian committee in İstanbul dissatisfied about Canning's reassignment in İstanbul. Canning was known as personal enemy of Tsar and also known one of the prominent ones of anti-Russian side in Britain. Moreover, He had been effective on Sultan and Bâb-ı Âli. Therefore, he was considered as provocateur of the war by Russia (Kurat, 1990, p. 72-73). Canning had arrived İstanbul at the beginning of April. He recommended Ottoman government officers to take care of Russia's requests regarding holy places in Jerusalem sensibly but absolute refusal of

the motion for protection. Ottoman State wholly refused Prince Menshikov's offer after meetings with British and French envoys. Menshikov submitted his second offer as partake of ultimatum on 19th April. According to new offer; holy places issue was demanded to be solved and an act demanded regarding protection of orthodoxies (Rich, 1985, pp. 46-49). With support of Canning and approval of French envoy; some of demands for holy places were accepted on 22nd April 1853; yet offer for act on protection of Orthodoxies had rejected (Hearnshaw, 1970, pp. 347-348). In addition, France disclaimed some of its rights on holy places and consequently the holy places matter between Ottoman State, France and Russia was solved on 5th of May (Temperley, 1936, pp. 319).

Holy places issue was solved but Menshikov could not have the act he wanted. On the day the dispute was settled; Ottoman State was received a diplomatic note referring Russia was the protector of the orthodoxies in compliance with Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca and Treaty of Edirne and allotted to response in five days (Temperley, 1936, pp. 319-120). On 9th of May; Canning met with Abdülmecid and guaranteed that Ottoman State would be protected by British fleet and then Bâb-ı Âli rejected Russia's demand for the act because that act would threat Ottoman State's independency (Jorga, 2017, p. 417). Menshikov, had given a new diplomatic note for acceptance of their motions and allot three more days and threatened to break off the relation in case of refusal. At the same time, Mustafa Reşid Pasha who was known pro-British, was surprisingly appointed as foreign affairs minister referring to Menshikov's request and Giritli Mustafa Pasha was appointed as grand vizier. Probably, Canning's meetings with Menshikov had role on those appointments. Canning might introduce him as pro-Russian to Menshikov (Manneh, 2012, p. 483). No results were achieved by meetings after amendment of council of ministers and

Russia's motions were refused. Therewith, Menshikov left İstanbul with embassy officers on 21st May and he thought that his committee failed due to Canning (Aksan, 2011, p. 469).

4.8.3. The Invasion of Principalities and Vienna Conference

Diplomatic relations between Russia and Ottoman State were ruptured after Prince Menshikov left İstanbul. Tsar Nicola gave an order for occupation of principalities on 27th May 1853. On the other hand, as a result of the meetings, British government decided to send fleet to Basika Bay which were in high sea beyond Dardanelles on 1st of July. France made call in the same way (Temperley, 1936, p. 333). Britain changed its decision and send the fleet because of public repression. Public opinion sympathized with Ottoman State but against the Tsar. A significant determinant on this was Ottoman State protected the Hungarian refugees during Hungarian refugee problem. Articles about Russian threat on Near East interests of Britain were published in newspapers (Martin, 1963, pp. 107-120). Canning, assembled with Sultan Abdülmecid and recommended not to consider the Tsar's declaration as casus belli and requested an unarmed protest in case of an occupation (Temperley, 1933, p. 618). On the other hand, Russia started to occupy the principalities on 22nd of June, at the beginning of July, they passed through Prut River and occupied Moldavia and Wallachia under the command of General Prince Gorchakov (Hearnshaw, 1970, p. 349).

David Urquhart involved Crimean War debates during summer of the year 1853 and published his book *Progress of Russia in the West, North and South* (Urquhart, 1853). During the same time, he started writing articles in newspaper

named *Morning Advertiser*. Those articles were published with name of *Recent Events in the East* (Urquhart, 1854).

Urquhart believed that Russia's commercial policy was one of the most essential phases of its diplomacy. That policy was significant for domination of Russia on Europe. According to Urquhart's point of view, during 1840's trade between Russia and Britain decreased while the trade between Ottoman State and Britain increasing. Under those circumstances, Russian landlords were affected negatively. Besides, Moldavia and Wallachia's inclination to trade with Britain instead of Russia was a major factor for Russia to occupy. Growth of trade volume between Britain and Moldavia and Wallachia did not perform in other Ottoman provinces because other regions were restricted by custom duty agreement signed between Britain and Ottoman State in 1841 (Urquhart, 1855a, pp. 14-15). Due to those developments, Russia aimed to stop Britain's grain export network from Moldavia and Wallachia. If Russia achieved that, Britain would be dependent on Russia on grain export as Poland region was a major grain supplier for Europe which was under control of Russia. By occupying Moldavia and Wallachia, Russia gained economic advantage for itself but it was disadvantaging for Britain. Whole production power was held by Russia (Urquhart, 1855a, pp. 12-13). Danube River was another significant point for Britain shipping raw materials by water. Every product shipped through Danube River instead of Odessa or St. Petersburg caused decrease in Russia's income (Urquhart, 1853, pp. 300-301).

When Russia occupied Moldavia and Wallachia, its supposed aim was to keep Prince Menshikov's equality request between Latin and Orthodoxies and to be protector of all orthodoxies in Ottoman State. However, Urquhart thought Christians who was living in Ottoman State did not want Russia's patronage as people in region

was persecuted by Russia because they did not recognize Russian Church. He alleged that they were defining Tsar as “antichrist” and were anxious if Russia’s domination on Ionian Sea would cause a Christian civil war (Urquhart, 1853, pp. x-xii).

Ottoman State started diplomatic meetings intensively after occupation. As suggested by Canning, they were not embattled. On the contrary to Russia’s expectation, Britain, France, Austria, and Prussia protested against occupation. Moreover, British, and French navies were at offshore waters of Dardanelles (Kurat, 1990, p. 73). Russia stated that as a reason for occupation. On the other side, British press which Urquhart belonged to; was criticizing government as the navy was sent late and encouraged Russia (Temperley, 1936, p. 335). In addition, Abdülmecid dismissed grand vizier Mustafa Pasha and foreign affairs minister Mustafa Reşid Pasha in July. Canning discusses with Sultan and provided them to be reinstated. Sultan’s expectation of British assistance had an effect on this reinstatement (Poole, 1888, pp. 282-283).

Meanwhile, great powers had meetings with each other to find a solution for the matter. Meetings were conducted from two headquarters. First one was envoys’ effort under leadership of Canning. Second one was the Vienna Conference which was held by Lord Clarendon. On 12 July 1853, Britain, France, Austria, and Prussia organized a conference. Consequently, they decided to give a diplomatic note to Ottoman State and Russia and the note was served on both states on 27th of July. Russia accepted the note subject to Ottoman State’s acceptance without any amendment. On the other side, Ottoman State was advocating the note would not be accepted without amendments. The clause which was refused by Ottoman State was protection of Rum-Orthodox concessions by Russia because that clause would make Ottoman State deemed to have accepted Russia’s claims (Jorga, 2017, p. 423).

Ottoman State offered the acceptance of the note formed by themselves, but it was not accepted by Nicola, so the meetings remained inconclusive and a diplomatic crisis started (Aksan, 2011, p. 472).

4.8.4. The Declaration of War and the “Massacre” of Sinop

As diplomatic attempts had given no result, pressure of public opinion for war declaration increased. Sultan Abdülmecid organized a great council meeting on 26th of September. Mustafa Reşid Pasha could not convince the council to get to wait for guarantee from Britain and France. Abdülmecid accepted recommendation of the council on declaration of war and the war between Ottoman and Russia officially began on 29th September. Ömer Pasha who had deployed in Shumen, granted a delay to Russia on 6th of October for leaving the principalities but it was refused by Russia (Aksan, 2011, p. 473).

European states perceived that Ottoman State had a little chance to succeed against Russia. However, Urquhart did not agree with that opinion. He thought that Ottoman State would be sufficient if they complied with the manners and there was no foreign intervention (Urquhart, 1869, pp. 40-41). Indeed, there were lots of developments supporting Urquhart's views. On 23rd October, Ottoman army under command of Ömer Pasha, passed through the Danube River and rebuffed the Russian army. During the beginning of the war, Ottoman army was succeeding in Rumelia and Anatolia (Woodward, 1938, p. 252).

Britain, had authorized Canning to recall the navy to İstanbul but Canning did not recall the navy as he thought that if the navies remained out of Dardanelles; Russia would not pretext it for protesting (Temperley, 1936, p. 339). Ottoman State applied for British and French navies to come İstanbul at the beginning of September

but Canning was against to that request as he did not want to let Russia use it as a trump card by renegeing on the 1841 London Straits convention (Rich, 1985, pp. 82-84). Britain and France attached high importance to independency of the straits. They considered that independency of Europe tightly coupled with the straits. Also, the straits were had significant position for Black Sea and Danube. According to Urquhart's point of view, that crisis was an opportunity for Britain to enter the straits and termination of the Straits convention. Ottoman State also desired British navy to come to straits in furtherance of balance of power. British and French ships in juxtaposition would be welcomed (Urquhart, 1853, pp. xxxi-xxviii). On 20th October, Canning call the navies to İstanbul involuntarily. The navies dropped anchor to Büyükdere. Russia protested this circumstance as they regarded it renegeing of 1841 Straits Convention (Türkgeldi, 1987, p. 29). In the meantime, it can be considered that Urquhart changed his mind. He stated that when navies passed through the straits, it would supress the Turks, not Russians and it was only a politic manoeuvre. Hereby, it was the first time Urquhart objected a British intervention (Jenks, 1964, p. 295).

At the end of September, Urquhart started to organize public meeting which lasted for three months. He tried to form a public opinion by making speeches in Staffordshire, London, Nottingham, Manchester, Glasgow, and Ireland. Main theme of his speeches was evil of secret diplomacy. He criticized carrying out the orders of foreign officers unquestioningly by the envoys. He was propagandising his own views and trying to press upon the government. He demanded the government to stand behind Ottoman State and to contend with Russia. The meetings had been attracted considerable attention and worked out. Newspapers were making mention of the meetings and Urquhart's speeches (Morning Advertiser, 28 September 1853, 5

October 1853, 3 November 1853; Morning Herald, 28 September 1853, 2 November 1853; Staffordshire Advertiser, 1 October 1853, 15 October 1853).

During November, a Turkish fleet which aimed to reinforce Ottoman forces in Batumi passed the Black Sea strait. The fleet was told to haven Sinop due to storm. During same days, a Russian fleet under command of Admiral Nahimov was seen near Sinop. On 30th November 1853, Ottoman fleet was terminated in couple of hours as a result of the battle between Russian and Ottoman fleet. Moreover, Russians set Muslim districts in Sinop on fire and burned Turkish soldiers floating in water to survive by throwing oily cloths (Karal, 2011, p. 235).

After Sinop attack, Ottoman State called British and French envoys to meet to inform and request help (Tukin, 1999, p. 305). The case had wide press coverage in Britain. Russia's attempt of attack although British and French fleets were at Bosphorus; was perceived as a challenge against Britain and France. Moreover, the attack was defined as a "massacre" (Sun, 20 December 1853; Morning Post, 19 December 1853; Freeman's Journal, 21 December 1853).

According to Urquhart's point of view, in Britain, Sinop attack was considered as weakness of Ottoman State. Indeed, he advocated that Ottoman navy succeeded at battle, as the battle was between seven small Ottoman frigates against whole Russian navy. Although it was out of balance, Ottoman navy could be able to scuttle a Russian warship (Free Press, 2 May 1860). Urquhart criticized the government and also Canning regarding that case. Canning had prevented Ottoman fleet which would lounge Black Sea to be consist of ships could ride enemy out and Ottoman State was not reinforced by Britain even though all requests. It was considered that Canning was responsible for the incident (Morning Advertiser, 12 January 1854; Free Press, 2 May

1860). Britain and France had to decide after this. Either they would go to war beside Ottoman State or they would wait for Russia to win the war and just watch dissolution of the state. With those thoughts and Ottoman State's request, British and French navies started to patrol through Black Sea from 3rd of January (Tukin, 1999, p. 306).

4.8.5. The Declaration of War by Britain and France

Britain was still making an effort to come to an agreement with Russia after Sinop attack. According to new draft; Russia would evacuate from Moldavia and Wallachia; Ottoman State would be afforded guarantee for that Russian Tsar Nicola was not malevolent towards Ottoman State and Ottoman State would be incorporated to Concert of Europe and some arrangements would be made on Straits Convention 1841. On the other side, Ottoman State would convey Russia that they were willing to send delegates over a neutral zone to make a contract based on Wien note. That offer was refused by Russia (Jorga, 2017, p. 427). British public opinion was reactive to Sinop case. Newspapers published articles regarding the necessity to taking action against Russia. Public demonstrations supporting Ottoman State were held in Manchester, Newcastle and many other cities. In his speech to a bevy of people at Paisley; David Urquhart mentioned that British people should request Queen for declaration of a war against Russia or withdrawal of British fleets from Ottoman territorial waters (Figs, 2012, p. 165).

Britain and France had made effort for peace making for a while, but all offers were rejected by Russia. Tsar had instructed Russian envoys in Britain and France for quitting diplomatic relations and returning to their countries in the first week of February. After few days, British and French envoys turned back to their countries. (Hearnshaw, 1970, p. 355). With influence of public opinion Britain and France sent

ultimatum to Russia and demanded to evacuate from the principalities until 30th of April but because Russian Tsar maintained silence with this call, it could be considered that the war started unofficially (Rich, 1985, p. 104). On 12 March; Ottoman State, France and Britain had reached an alliance accord. According to the accord, Ottoman State's territorial integrity would be guaranteed and a common military operation against Russia would be provided. On March 27, France and on the next day Britain declared war on Russia (Aksan, 2011, p. 476). Lord Clarendon, in his speech on March 31, mentioned that they had to take up the arms with France to protect and defend Ottoman State and provide success in making an honourable peace agreement (Rich, 1985, p. 107). Urquhart found declaring war insufficient and he criticized aldermen severely in his speech to bevy in Stafford. According to him, British government and ministers made Russia provide an advantage by declaring war in this manner and he considered declaration of war as a deception of ministers. That was done under public opinion pressure and just for to convince British citizens and French government (Staffordshire Advertiser, 15 April 1854).

Outbreak of war and participation of Britain and France; status of Austria and Prussia came into prominence. Russia desired to gain over those two states as well as Britain and France. Austria got annoyed of occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia as they considered it as a threat for their own territory. Therefore, Austria decided to take action and on 9th April 1854; a protocol had been signed between Austria, Prussia, Britain and France in Wien. The protocol was on protection of Ottoman territorial integrity, necessity of evacuation from Moldavia and Wallachia and maintaining the balance of Europe. Moreover, Austria and Prussia signed another alliance agreement to force Russia evacuate from principalities. At the same time, Ottoman State was pleading Russian attack in Silistra successfully. Russia could not be able to capture

Silistra although they had attacked over and over. Furthermore, assistance; expected from Greece, did not arrived as France had blockaded Pire. Austria sent a strident diplomatic note to Russia for evacuation of Moldavia and Wallachia and on June 14, an agreement was signed between Ottoman State and Austria. According to the agreement, Austria would occupy Moldavia and Wallachia until the end of the war and protect the region from attacks (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 242-244). Austria wanted Russia to evacuate from the principalities, but it was rejected. Ottoman State defeated Russia around Silistra in June; Russia started to retreat from principalities during August and Austria started to enter the principalities according to agreement with Ottoman State (Jorga, 2017, pp. 431-432). Thereby, a buffer zone was established at coastal area of Danube River between Ottoman State and Russia and one of the fronts against Russia was closed.

4.8.6. The War and Urquhart's Campaign

During the first months of the war, British government was consternated and unsettled. In one hand, war was declared against Russia but on the other hand, war time diplomacy for peace was maintaining. British public opinion started to direct criticism at Aberdeen's government. Press thought that government did not take action sufficiently. There were articles on newspapers regarding Urquhart's authentic interpretations about Ottoman State's power after wars at Danube were completed successfully but the government was criticized (Birmingham Journal, 17 June 1854). According to Urquhart, British people did not comprehend the situation and British government was committing national crime. Urquhart and his fiancé Harriet Fortescue had given of their selves to enlighten the British people as they were publishing articles, pamphlets in newspapers and organizing meetings during the period (Bishop, 1897, p. 73).

Harriet Fortescue was thirty years old young lady when she first met with Urquhart. They were acquainted with each other by favour of their mutual friend; Mrs. Ross of Bladensburg. She was familiar with Urquhart's ideas and works which had impressed her (Bishop, 1897, pp. 25-31). An intimate connection was established between them but Fortescue's family was doubtful about Urquhart as they were not feeling comfortable about their daughter would marry with the oppose man of Britain (Bishop, 1897, p. 66). They married on 5 September 1854. After they had married, Fortescue helped Urquhart out with his works as organization of meetings and correspondences were Mrs. Urquhart's duty. She keenly carried on her works based on Urquhart's instructions, also. She had written many articles by name "Caritas" in *Morning Herald* and *Morning Advertiser* (Bishop, 1897, p. 112). Afterwards, those articles were published as a pamphlet named *The Story of the War* (Urquhart, 1857).

After Moldavia and Wallachia were occupied by Austria, there was no contact between the parties of the war. Britain and France desired to force Russia to make peace. Therefore, Britain, France and Ottoman State reached a consensus on attack to Crimea. Crimea was like storehouse of Russian land and naval forces and so the region was a threat risk for Ottoman State. Allies' aim was to capture Sevastopol as they conceived that Russia's logistic support would be quitted if Sevastopol was captured (Jorga, 2017, pp. 436-437). All three allies had a common interest regarding Crimea attack. At first, Ottoman State was under pressure of fear spread by Russian Mediterranean fleet and İstanbul's security would be provided by termination of the fleet. Secondly, Britain would ensure the safety of Indian route. At last, France would get rid of a threat which would defeat its trade interests in Mediterranean (Karal, 2011, p. 239). Therefore, allies landed to Crimea on 13 September with 24.250 French, 22.000 British and 7.000 Ottoman soldiers. The fleet consisted of 15 French,

10 British and 9 Ottoman battleships with 50 steamships and 300 transport vessels (Danişmend, 1972, pp. 158-159).

Urquhart was carrying on his works during autumn of the year 1854; he was publishing articles in newspapers and corresponding with his friends in İstanbul (Bishop, 1897, pp. 97-98). At the same time, he was carrying on conducting meetings at manufacturing centres. He succeeded to attract workingmen's attention on foreign affairs via those meetings and laid the foundations of Foreign Affairs Committees. Between fifty to sixteen hundred people attending to his meetings (Robinson, 1920, pp. 124-125). In October, after a meeting in Newcastle; Newcastle upon Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee was established. They announced their aim as to become aware of and monitor government's foreign policies (Newcastle Journal, 2 December 1854). Foreign Affairs Committees were established in Newcastle within a small group and continued its existence effectively for twenty years by spreading country-wide.

During winter, terrible news from war zone demoralised British people. In contrast to expectations of allied forces, Russia was fighting hard and withstanding as it indicated that the war would not conclude in short time. Sevastopol blockade had failed. Ottoman and British troops suffered in Inkerman and Balaclava. Military operations were moving slowly because of cold weather conditions and epidemics. On 26 January 1855 Britain and France; on 15 March 15.000 troops from Kingdom of Sardinia as they had an alliance agreement with Ottoman State; remained incapable (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 245-246).

Palmerston was appointed as prime minister in February 1855; after Lord Aberdeen resigned. Urquhart has launched last major campaign against Palmerston when he was assigned as prime minister. During summer of the year 1855;

Palmerston government faced public backlash. Sevastopol had not been captured yet and military casualties increased. Furthermore, Palmerston government accepted to attend peace talks in Vienna even while the army was suffering. Urquhart started to writing articles in *Morning Advertiser* again and he was publishing many pamphlets, also. He had assembled approximately thirty meetings during summer. The meetings attracted considerable attention and were able to influence public opinion. Moreover, meetings had wide media coverage, particularly in *Morning Advertiser*. After a well-attended meeting at Stafford, Urquhart made mention of two words. First, Russia had designs; second was British cabinet was their accomplice (*Morning Advertiser*, 2 June 1855, 4 June 1855). During another well-attended meeting in Newcastle, Atwood, who was one of the followers of Urquhart; mentioned that Urquhart should be prime minister as that was the only way out for Britain. That speech of him brought down the house (*Morning Advertiser*, 15 June 1855; *Newcastle Journal*, 9 June 1855). In an article which was published on 16 June 1855, the offer for Urquhart's prime ministry was criticized harshly, as that country was not a dictatorship; parliament was still effective and Britain's fate should not be given up to Urquhart (*Morning Advertiser*, 16 June 1855). Meetings kept going in Bristol, London, Birmingham, Dudley, Sheffield, and many other places. The meeting in Birmingham was reported in newspapers as "Great Birmingham Meeting" and Urquhart gave speech to 8000 people. On the other hand, 7000 people listened Urquhart in Sheffield (*Morning Advertiser*, 6, 9, 16, 31 July 1855; *Birmingham Journal*, 7 July 1855). Those meetings could be considered successful and influenced public opinion even though they did not produce a major result like Palmerston resignation.

According to Urquhart, aiming at Crimea was wrong; if Crimea had been preferred for protection of İstanbul, it was totally wrong because Ottoman State had

already removed Russia from principalities and Russia had no way to come İstanbul by land. If it was presumed that Russia would come by sea; Russian fleet was powerless to attack İstanbul (Urquhart, 1857, pp. 65-66). Urquhart advocated that subjugation of Odessa instead of Crimea would be deadliness for Russia. If Crimea had captured and although Russia surrendered; they would rebuild Russian fortresses just after the war and not pay war compensation. According to Urquhart, occupation of Crimean was not dangerous for Russia but for Ottoman State (Urquhart, 1855c, pp. 3-4). Even if Crimean was a threat for Ottoman State as in popular consideration; the risk disappeared when allied navies had entered Black sea. On the other hand, Odessa outweighed because Odessa port was the location in which Russian was consolidating their army during significant wars instead of Sevastopol. Urquhart believed that Britain should attack and capture Odessa and fine Russia. Russian trade would be interrupted in case Odessa was captured and Russian landlords and merchants would put pressure on Tsar, and then a favourable result would be got easily (Urquhart, 1855c, p. 3). Urquhart took a tougher line and claimed that government was not in war with Russia. He indicated that government's main goal was not seem to defeat Russia and if British government was not using its forces to lay low Russia, then it meant they were protecting Russia. According to Urquhart's consideration, attacking Crimean was for humiliating Ottoman State (Urquhart, 1855c, pp. 9-10).

Battles between allies and Russia in Crimean went on for a year. Allies speeded up Sevastopol blockade since date of 16 August. Bombardment started on 5 September and they succeeded to enter Sevastopol on 13 September 1855 (Türkgeldi, 1987, p. 83). On eastern front, Russia captured Kars on 25 November 1855. Urquhart thought takeover of Kars was significant because Kars was a door to Persia and

central Turkey. Consequently, Russia would have an ace in the hole at peace talks. That was British government's fault and treason (Free Press Serials, No: 14, p. 19).

4.8.7. Peace-making Process: The Treaty of Paris

The conference on peace talks in Vienna was totally over in May of the year 1854 but peace talks and meetings about determining criteria for peace were carried on with Austria's mediation. For that purpose, on 8 August 1854; the general principles named "Four Points" were determined in a meeting between Austria, Britain, and France in Vienna. The first principle was Moldavia and Wallachia and Serbia would be released from Russian protection and the rights and privileges given by Ottoman State to those territories would be under guarantee of great powers. The second one was free navigation on Danube River would be provided. Third principle was making Black Sea a neutral zone by amendments on Straits Convention of 1841 and prohibition of all states stocking war ships. The last one was protection of rights and privileges of Christians in Ottoman State by great powers conformably with Sultan's sovereignty rights. Those "Four Points" were submitted to Russia but the offer was rejected (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 246-247). Hereupon, discussions with Russia would be on providing Russia's acceptance of those four points. Accordingly, an alliance agreement was signed between Austria, Britain and France and based on the agreement; those three states would not even make a peace agreement with Russia separately. Austria notified Russia about the four points again (Miller, 1923, p. 233).

Austria was trying to accord Ottoman State and Russia periodically. A new conference in Vienna was decided to be held between 15 March and 4 June 1855 (Türkgeldi, 1987, p. 43). Palmerston did not have hope for making a peace agreement with Russia unless they gain a military victory. In addition, he despaired of having a

heavy hand on Russia without termination of Russian threat on British interest in Far East (Rich, 1985, p. 149). Tsar Nicola died just before the conference and Alexander II ascended the throne. Although Alexander was a pacifist; the war was keep going (Kurat, 1990, p. 74).

During the second conference in Vienna, an offer in terms of four points was submitted to Russia but Russia did not accept the third point about neutralization of Black Sea. On the other hand, Britain and France remained firm about that issue. Russia caused the conference to remain inconclusive by rejecting that point (Rich, 1985, pp. 149-156). Urquhart considered that there was a slight difference between Vienna Note and Four Points. In Vienna Note, the Ottoman sovereignty was left to Russia and The Four Points left Ottoman sovereignty to Russia but also allies (Urquhart, 1855c, p. 15). After Vienna conference ended; Urquhart believed that Russia was exploiting the conference to gain time. It was obvious that Russia would not accept some of the points in any case. With those redundant meeting and discussions saved Russia three months (Urquhart, 1855b, pp. 11-12).

In September of 1855; efforts for making peace talks increased after allies entered Sevastopol. Four points was submitted to Tsar as an ultimatum on 16 December (Armaoğlu, 1997, p. 250). On 16 January, Russia accepted the offer and confirmed peace talks to be started. Austrian, Russian, British, French and Ottoman delegates met in Vienna and decided a conference to be held in Paris (Miller, 1923, p. 235).

Meanwhile, Britain and France attempted a reform program to be prepared regarding Christian citizens by Ottoman State. The fourth article of the Four Points was already on that issue as Ottoman State should pay the price in return for being a

member of international community. That could be possible by providing absolute egalitarianism between Muslims and Christians in juridical sense. For those purposes, The Imperial Reform Edict was declared on 18 February 1856. The edict was on providing equality between Muslims and Christians on twenty articles. Christians got abreast with Muslims through new rights and integration of the two religions was tried to be provided. The Imperial Reform Edict was not an edict which was prepared with Ottoman State's free will like The Rescript of Gülhane. The principles were determined by foreign states to strengthen Ottoman State's hand at peace talks. Moreover, The Imperial Reform Edict was only for Christians but The Rescript of Gülhane was for entire Ottoman citizens (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 258-259). Mustafa Reşid Pasha who was one of the architects of The Rescript of Gülhane; had also criticized the edict. He advocates that those amendments should be spread over time rather than making suddenly. Therewith, he criticized Ali and Fuad Pashas. Additionally, he remarked that some articles were ambiguous as those might be perceived distinctly by European states and it would cause foreign intervention (Cevdet Paşa, 1953, pp. 70-71). It was considered that Urquhart was extremely against a foreign intervention to Ottoman State. He believed that Ottoman State should be bounded to traditions and therefore, he considered The Imperial Reform Edict as a false step and an attempt against to sovereignty of Sultan and state. He also indicated that the articles were designed by Canning with instructions of British government (Diplomatic Review, 4 September 1867, pp. 138-139).

On 25 February 1856; Paris Conference was assembled. Peace agreement consist of thirty articles, on the hand, was signed on 30 March 1856. The states which signed the agreement were France, Britain, Austria, Prussia, Ottoman State and Sardinia. According to the agreement, Ottoman State became a part of Concert of

Europe and all states would return the territories they had captured. Black Sea had been neutralized and cleared of war ships. The Straits Convention of 1841 would remain valid. Moldavia and Wallachia would be self-governing states and no other state would interfere in their internal affairs. That was a remarkable attempt to separate Moldavia and Wallachia from Ottoman State (Armaoğlu, 1997, pp. 250-252). Inclusion of Prussia and Austria to agreement was considered strange by Urquhart as they had not battled. There was neither loser nor winner of the treaty. No war compensation was paid and there was not any loss of territory. As a result of the treaty; Russia; enemy of Ottoman State, and allies of Ottoman State just regulated how they would interfere into internal affairs of Ottoman State (Free Press, 4 January 1860, p. 4).

5. ACTIVITIES OF DAVID URQUHART BETWEEN 1856-1876

5.1. Foreign Affairs Committees

Foreign Affairs Committees were organisations which were established and structured by David Urquhart in 1850's, in order to hold down then foreign policy and inform public opinion regarding foreign policy. It aimed to demonstrate how foreign policies influenced ordinary people's lives in Britain. Foreign Affairs Committees based on organizations which created by Urquhart during Chartism movement in 1840's. Especially, the committees reorganized with the Urquhart's campaigns with Crimean War. Foreign Affairs Committees continued their activities effectively by organizing meetings, media organs and various activities until few years later of Urquhart's death.

Committees had worked through the topics related Ottoman State. Hundreds of articles regarding Ottoman State were published via their media organ, *Free Press* and *Diplomatic Review*; and many workshops were carried out in committee meetings. They advocated the rights of Ottoman State, which was intervened in by European countries with reforms, in international arena and warned British government about Russia's aims on Ottoman State's. Moreover, they organized Turkish Bath Movement which was conceived by Urquhart personally and gave wide coverage to developments in their media organ. The committees which were organized in different significant cities of Britain and expanded to whole country disbanded in few years after Urquhart's death.

5.1.1. The Foundation and Formation of Foreign Affairs Committees

Foreign Affairs Committees were established after the organization started by David Urquhart during Chartism movement in 1840s with Crimean War. Newcastle

and Sheffield were the centres of Urquhartite activity and committees were firstly formed in those cities. Sheffield was one of the headquarters of Chartism movement in 1840's and it became centre of large-scale industry since 1850's. Therefore, a lot of workingmen were living in the city. Isaac Ironside who was industrialist in Sheffield during 1850's and member of Central Democrat Party established by old Chartists, was impelling person in Sheffield. Additionally, Ironside was the owner of *The Sheffield Free Press* (Salt, 1968, pp. 352-353). Anti-Russian feelings were dominated in city. Ironside made an honest war call against Russia in January 1854. Also, economic conditions of the people in region. Urquhart cooperated with Ironside and started to write articles in *The Sheffield Free Press*. They were working in coordination as they were both thinking Palmerston and some prominent Whig statesmen were Russia's agent (Salt, 1968, pp. 358-359). Sheffield was the place in which the great Urquhartite meeting has been held. Those meetings would be held in many other cities later. Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee was established in June 1855 (Armytage, 1955, pp. 473-482).

Newcastle was also a significant centre for Urquhartite movement. Urquhart mentioned that Foreign Affairs Committees were triple committees; "A blacksmith, a carpenter and a blind beggar" (Robinson, 1920, pp. 124-125). *Constitutional Remedies*; a pamphlet which was formed from one of Urquhart's speech; was a guide book for committee members. Urquhart recommended all members to read that pamphlet to make their aims comprehensible. Pamphlet was about how the laws and associations should be regulated to take government activities under control. It referred how Foreign affairs should be conducted and workingmen lives were affected severely. (Free Press (supplements), 18 February 1857, pp. 1-8).

Committees expanded rapidly from city to city. Urquhart dedicated himself for organization of committees for whole year. Generally, Foreign Affair Committees consisted of workingmen and also there were merchants, shopkeepers and labourers. During the year 1854; Urquhart held meetings in many cities of Britain and met with those people and conducted a meeting in Manchester with sixty people that he had chosen during those meetings. They stayed in Manchester for three months and attended many meetings and workshops. They gathered at 10:00 a.m. every morning and attended the lectures about Law of Nations and Constitution of England and then they were separated in smaller groups for team working regarding social and political topics. By the end of the day, Urquhart met with those groups and made discussions on their topics. At the end of the three months, a public meeting was held, and leading statesmen, attorneys and reverends were invited, and a deputation was formed within that group (Robinson, 1920, pp. 125-126).

There were some important matters that Urquhart wanted to teach the committee members. Although, laws and codes had taken government actions under control, modern governments gravitated to be centralised. They aimed to debar people from information about foreign affairs. Whether it was monarchical or democratic; guarantee of a state was to provide people to know and aware of their country's own both foreign and domestic internal affairs. There was no security in a country which was ruled by a government that have a secret committee. He mentioned that Foreign Affair Committees should prevent this and it would be done "by your own knowledge, your own sincerity, and your own convictions" (Robinson, 1920, p. 128).

Number of committees increased between February 1857 and March 1858, especially, in Manchester region and West Riding Yorkshire (Taylor, 1991, p. 39).

The article named "A Day with One of the Committees" by A. G. Stapleton, who was

biographer and close friend of George Canning, gave significant information about committees. Stapleton mentioned that; he was welcomed by group of thirty members when he visited Bradford Foreign Affairs Committee in 1857. He surprised that all members were wearing work uniform except Chairman. He mentioned that some workers had uniforms which were suitable to their job and those were old and coarse outfits. However, he stated that there was not anything that those people did not know about international relations. They knew all treaties, their stipulations, why the treaties were given rise to, reasons from past and expected influences in future, by heart. They had knowledge of all about foreign policy. Stapleton indicated that it was an unexpected circumstance and he had talked with a hundred different people during the meeting. Moreover, he stated that their main opinion was their country had been denigrated in the eyes of whole world, lost its influence and they thought it was because of Lord Palmerston's systematically disrespect for international law (Diplomatic Review, April 1875, pp. 161-163).

Robinson indicated that totally 145 committees were established in villages and metropolis. Committees in villages met among themselves once a month and they came together in cities like Leeds and Manchester once in three or six months. Those were called as "district meetings". Generally, Urquhart was attending those meetings and he called those meetings as "School of Public Law". According to Urquhart's point of view, first duty of committees was work, second one was denunciation and the third one was prophecy (Robinson, 1920, pp. 136-141).

Committees criticized Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston harshly and accused them to be Russian agent and being Tsar's men via their media organs since they were established (Free Press, 5 April 1856). They did not quit campaigns against Palmerston even after his death in 1865. In addition to their campaigns against

government, they made publishing, organized meetings and sending petitions to parliament in order to influence public opinion (Salt, 1968, p. 361). Special works and researches which were made by committees were sharing with other committees and public via media organs. For instance, *Free Press* reported that Bradford Foreign Affairs Committee's stated meeting was made, and Turkish commercial tariff studies were carried out during meeting (Free Press, 24 November 1855, p.2).

Committees specialized in Ottoman State because of Urquhart's interest and went in further detail about all issues about Ottoman State. Furthermore, Turkish bath movement was organized by committees. Committees accompanied Sultan Abdülaziz during his Britain visit and organized some speeches and activities. Urquhart and Foreign Affairs Committees conducted a campaign against Declaration of Paris Respecting Maritime Laws for twenty years. Declaration of Paris was signed on 16 April 1856. Austria, Prussia, Russia, Ottoman State, France, and Britain had signed that declaration. Main purpose of the declaration was prohibition of piracy. In addition, attacks on merchant ships during war time was subjected to law of modern armed conflicts (Batır, 2011, pp. 87-88). According to Urquhart, that weighed against Britain as he claimed that weapons could be carried by merchant ships. Foreign Affairs Committees made petitions to parliament and Queen to prevent approve of that law as they thought that the declaration was eliminating the rights of Britain's maritime rights. They indicated that they lost Right of Search by the declaration. According to Urquhart, Britain's existence was based on strength of maritime power (Robinson, 1920, pp. 149-150). Moreover, they made opposition regarding Indian mutiny and Italian Unity issues. They have sent a representative to French consulate after Franco-Prussian war and indicated their opinions.

Urquhart considered himself as in charge for works of committees and training of the members until the year 1864. Reports of conversations and privates' letters on propaganda were sent directly to Urquhart. Thereafter, Urquhart had to leave Britain in 1864 because of his illness. He did not return to Britain except his short visits in 1867 and 1874 and Foreign Affairs Committee tours. His men were left unconfined as Urquhart was trying to hold them together only with the letters he had sent. According to Stapleton's statement, by year of 1875, there were committees at least sixty-nine cities and towns. They achieved to survive for fifteen years though Urquhart had gone but after Urquhart's death, only few of them could stand for several years (Robinson, 1920, pp. 137-140).

5.1.2. Free Press and Diplomatic Review

David Urquhart and his companions used their media organ *Free Press* and *Diplomatic Review* to express and share and views of Foreign Affairs Committees to public. Those two media organs were edited firstly as *Free Press* and then as *Diplomatic Review* and were published between the years 1855 and 1877, for twenty-two years and had been representing Urquhartite movement's views on foreign and domestic politics.

During winter of 1854, Urquhart cooperated with Ironside and began to write for The *Sheffield Free Press*. The newspaper started to country-wide publishing in October 1855 and was known by name *Free Press*. London became headquarter and it was totally under control of Urquhart (Taylor, 1991, p. 24). Urquhart and his spouse were publishing articles in many newspapers and their views generally took place in editions. *The Sheffield Free Press* had been published until 26 December 1857 (Salt, 1968, p. 363).

Stewart Erskine Rolland, who was a notable Urquhartite; stated that because of the criticisms during Crimean War, London newspapers closed their columns to Urquhart and his companions and *The Sheffield Free Press* was the only newspaper which could be aware of Russian and British Foreign Affairs ministers' lies. He indicated that afterwards that newspaper turned into *Free Press*. Rolland stated that the newspaper was sharing the source of information with committees. In same article, Rolland also remarked first issue of *Free Press* published in August 1856 but there were issues of the year 1855 (*Free Press*, 1 June 1864).

Free Press had been published weekly at first. On 6 September 1856, they announced that they would publish supplements to establish a diplomatic library and supplements would be published once a month (*Free Press*, 6 September 1856, p. 28). As the first supplement, *The Story of the War*, which was written by Urquhart's spouse, published on 17 September 1856 and after 28 March 1858; they turned into monthly edition by publishing every last Wednesday of each month. From 4 January 1860, it was started to be published every first Monday of month.

In an article which was published in April 1866; significant information was given about principles of the journal. It was indicated that *Free Press* had been carrying on its works for ten years and the institution named Newspaper Press Directory; which classified the newspapers according to its principles; defined *Free Press* as liberal at first and afterwards as national. Moreover, from 1862, *Free Press* was known as neutral and defined as "It advocates a return to the law, which it contends the nation has forgotten; and the restoration to the Crown, Privy Council, and Parliament of powers of which it deems them to have been deprived by the encroachments of the executive, over whose acts it contends Parliament should have control." (*Free Press*, April 1866).

Foreign Affairs Committees stated that a major change took place after Lord Palmerston's death as there was no dilemma between acceptance and approve rightness of crime and admire to criminals anymore. People who only glanced down the *Free Press* and put it in drawer, could buy it public and put it on their table. *Free Press* would not be read only to find out what nation had done and was doing; also, to find out how it was saved from difficulties, danger and hot to prevent those matters in future. It should be studied on and kept. It had been published not for daily circulation but for history. In addition, it was upheld that more time to work was provided by altering the newspaper from weekly to monthly and opportunity to give much more terse reference to future was taken. *Free Press* was an exclusive newspaper and different than others. It analysed all developments in their own procedures and seek for correcting British citizens' personal judgements. It purposed to re-establish British constitution in its own integrity, equality in justice and provide ordinary citizen and rulers to be punished in the same manner. Their motto was "The state can be maintained only by the highest justice". Those were the principles of *Free Press*, which was indited by Foreign Affairs Committee members (Free Press, April 1866).

The newspaper was published by name *The Free Press: A Diplomatic Review and Journal of the Foreign Affairs Committees*, from April 1866 and after 1 August 1866; it was started to be published with name *Diplomatic Review*.; it was announced that a French edition would be published upon received requests and some articles would be in French. With the amendment on 7 August 1867, it was announced that the newspaper would be published quarterly after June issue as January, April, July and October issues. By that amendment, they would have comprehensive knowledge of the subjects and wide range of chapters would be included. Furthermore, the volumes could be formed as library reference.

Free Press and *Diplomatic Review* were systematically publishing works for committees as information about the topics which were worked on by committees in that week or month; committee meetings, significant announcements and the topics that should be worked on in future. Topics regarding Ottoman State were generally taking place in every issue. Principalities, Persian-Ottoman Relations, Ottoman-British economic relations, Turkish Bath Movement, Jeddah and Syria revolts, situation of Christians' in Ottoman State, Crete revolt, Suez Canal and Britain visit of Sultan Abdülaziz were some of the topics.

There were some notable personages who wrote articles for *Free Press* and *Diplomatic Review*. Popular philosopher and economist John Stuart Mill and philosopher Karl Marx were two of those. Especially, the relationship between Marx and Urquhart was considerable. In 1853, Marx was gotten offer to write on Eastern Question in *New York Tribune*. On the other hand, Marx had not so much knowledge about that topic. He began to read the articles written by Urquhart with Friedrich Engel's recommendation and realized that Eastern Question topic was pretty significant for the period. Urquhart's effect could be considered obviously when Marx started to write in June 1853 (Carr, 1934, pp. 120-123). Marx criticized British government's politics harshly, and fault them for supporting Russia. He stated that Lord Aberdeen's politics was only to be in cooperation with Russia and that was encouraging Russia (Marx, 1897, pp. 40-53). Urquhart's name was mentioned respectfully in his articles and his maintaining a stance against Palmerston was praised. Marx considered that Urquhart's views would be the prevailing view in future (Marx, 1897, p. 213).

Marx and Urquhart's thoughts were on the same wavelength. Both was against to Palmerston and British bourgeoisie. Marx warmed up by Urquhart's impeachment

for Palmerston as a native British and blasting away him (Carr, 1934, pp. 121-123). Both disgusted with Russia, were against its offensive politics and believed that Russia should be kept away from Ottoman State. Meanwhile, Ironside enabled Marx to write in *The Sheffield Free Press* for analysing Blue Books. His article created a tremendous impression and he was received special thanks from Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee (Armytage, 1955, p. 476). But afterwards, Ironside and Marx fell out with each other because of postponement of payment and Ironside's criticism as articles were wordy (Salt, 1968, p. 354).

Urquhart had read some of Marx's articles about the Palmerston and admired. He sent one of his speeches to Marx to convey his regards. Marx sent it to *New York Tribune* after attaching introduction and conclusion. In February 1854, Urquhart and Marx was met for the first time but that conversancy caused their relationship breakdown. Marx found out that they were only agree on Palmerston and became disinterested. Afterwards, he described Urquhart as romantic reactionary. However, he continued to support Urquhart's works after Urquhart declared open season to secret diplomacy with outbreak of war (Carr, 1934, pp. 124-127). Until spring of 1857, Marx's articles on 18th century diplomatic history had been taken place in *Free Press* but never after that time.

In 1866, last issue of the media organ which converted from *Free Press* to *Diplomatic Review*, was published in January 1877. In all likelihood, edition was suspended after Urquhart's death. Thereafter, Collet Dobson Collet, who was one of the notable members of committee, published those editions in volumes. Moreover, *Diplomatic Fly-Sheets* which includes Urquhart and Committee members' articles from 1877 to 1891, had been published in six volumes by Collet.

5.1.3. Members of Foreign Affairs Committees

Foreign Committee members were typically the ordinary workers of the region that the committee was established. Besides, one of the founding purposes of the committees was inform those people about importance of the country's conditions and foreign affairs. Moreover, there were members as some merchants, shopkeepers, and labourers. Other than, old Chartist movement members and notables of the region were among the members.

In the article "Autobiography of a member of a committee" which was published in *Diplomatic Review*; information about how an ordinary workingman became a committee member was given. The workingman indicated that he did not aware of the foreign policy had influenced the internal policy and working class's condition that much before he read Urquhart's articles. He stated that he met with Urquhart through his articles published in *Morning Advertiser* and he had found out the importance of cheap grain import from Ottoman dominions for their own welfare and how Russia's plans were dangerous for them to the credit of Urquhart. He explained that; with that knowledge, he joined the St. Pancras Foreign Affairs Committee and had carried on works for the benefit of working class. Moreover, he added that he found opportunity to work with jewels (*Diplomatic Review*, April 1873).

Besides those ordinary people, there were Urquhart's accompanies who were on significant duties in committees. The most important one of those was George Crawshay. Crawshay was born in 1821; and was partner of the manufacturing company named Hawkes, Crawshay & Sons in Gateshead. He established one of the initial committees, Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee, after he attended

Urquhart's speech in Newcastle (Shannon, 1974, pp. 250-251). *Free Press* was sponsored by Crawshay during the editorship of Collet Dobson Collet. Additionally, he was one of the primary supporters of Turkish Bath Movement. He had a wide Turkish bath built in his house (Shield Daily News, 13 July 1893, p. 3). Moreover, he was one of the committee members who was hosted in Buckingham Palace by Sultan Abdülaziz in 1867 and the technician who constructed the old Galata Bridge (Çelik, 1994, pp. 38-39). Crawshay made visit to Ottoman State in 1874 for eight weeks and visited the cities İstanbul, İzmir and Bursa. He described that visit as a milestone of his life. He researched about Muslim life in Ottoman State and he shared his views and observations on Bâb-ı Âli and other Ottoman traditions with *Diplomatic Review* readers. Crawshay identified Urquhart as a Turk more than Turks and had been supporter of Urquhart whole his life (*Diplomatic Review*, January 1875, p. 81).

Another important accompany of Urquhart was Collet Dobson Collet. Collet was born in 1812 in London and he was a music director. He took an active role in Chartist movement and worked as Secretary of the People's Charter Union. Moreover, between the years 1851-1870, he had worked as Secretary of Association for the Repeal of Taxes on Knowledge (Robinson, 1920, p. 136). In 1866; he was assigned as editor of *Diplomatic Review*. Collet was one of the most loyal friends of Urquhart and his wife and he had kept on publishing his pamphlets after Urquhart's death.

Another active member of the committees was H.A. Munro Butler Johnstone. Johnstone was born in 1837 in Edinburgh and he was a wealthy person. He became an active member of committees in 1856. He served as deputy between the years 1862 and 1878 and he was one of the ones who harshly reacted William Gladstone who was agitating against Ottoman State during Bulgarian rebellion. He published books about

Turks and visited İstanbul in 1876 for the first time. For his first visit, he was assigned to relay the letter from Foreign Affairs Committees to Sultan Abdülaziz. The letter was on the issues as quitting foreign borrowing and refusing foreign intervention. Relaying the letter to Sultan was prevented by British envoy Henry Elliot but the letter was translated into Turkish by Ali Suavi and published in Paris (Çelik, 2001, pp. 580-581).

Apart from those people, there were other important committee members whom we could not obtain information about but were at the forefront of Urquhart's correspondences as Steawart Erskine Rolland, John Johnson, and A.E. Robinson. Johnson had been on important duties for Stafford and Manchester Foreign Affairs Committees and then he worked as Turkish bath manager in London. On the other hand, Rolland published a book named *The Growth of Russian Power Contingent on the Decay of British Constitution* in 1858 and Robinson was the father of Gertrude Robinson who had written biography of Urquhart.

5.1.4. Turkish Bath Movement

David Urquhart has been known with his contrary politic views, as leader of the campaign against Palmerston and Russia and as a Turcophile but also, he has been known as the one who had brought Turkish bath to Britain. *The Times* reported news as Urquhart had done favour to Britain by introducing Turkish bath to country and made people to know that great thing (The Times, 28 May 1877, p. 11). Because both the long times that he had spent in Ottoman State and his illness, Urquhart had a strong interest in Turkish bath. He had had neuralgia disease since his youth. The warmth in Turkish bath was the first cure which had been good for his disease and relieved his pains. From late 1850's, he started Turkish bath movement through

Foreign Affairs Committees and had many Turkish baths opened in Britain. As result of that campaign, more than a hundred Turkish baths in British territory started to serve.

Urquhart's interest in Turkish bath started during his duty as diplomat in Ottoman State. Afterwards, his book *The Pillars of Hercules* in which he told his Morocco and Spain visits, he detailed Moroccan baths and also touched on Turkish baths. In the second volume of the book which consisted of two volumes, there are two chapters as "Ruins of Bath" and "Bath". Urquhart stated that Turkish baths are more detailed and complementary than Moroccan baths and so Turkish Baths are more acceptable. Furthermore, he indicated that Turks have bath with running water as compared with British and that was remarkable for cleaning (Urquhart, 1850, p. 38). Afterwards, in the book named *Manual of the Turkish Bath* which was written by Sir John Fife, who was a prominent surgeon and Urquhart's friend from Chartist movement period; there were conversations with Urquhart on Turkish Bath. Moreover, Turkish Baths' influence on people and animals was analysed in depth (Fife, 1865).

As his first attempt to open a Turkish bath in Britain; Urquhart had cooperated with Doctor Richard Barter who was living in Ireland. Barter was a hydropathist and he was expert on treating illnesses with water. His interest in treatment process with water started after the cholera pandemic in 1832. After doing lots of scientific studies, he opened his own hydropathical establishment, St. Anne's Hill in Blarney, Cork, in 1843. After he had read Urquhart's *The Pillars of Hercules*, he invited Urquhart to visit St. Anne. His purpose was asking help from Urquhart for building of a Turkish bath for the patients (Webb, 1878, p. 13). Urquhart had accepted Barter's invitation and gone Blarney with his wife in 1856. It can be considered that Urquhart had spent

three or four months there. They tried out to construct a Turkish bath there together. Urquhart demanded committees to be affective in Turkish bath Movement as he had given information about the baths that he was trying to be built through *Free Press*. Urquhart and Barter's efforts on Turkish Bath Movement in Ireland, took place in the *Free Press* dated 23 August 1856 (*Free Press*, 23 August 1856). According to the information was given by Mrs Urquhart, 120 workers had helped for bath building both in Urquharts' residence and St. Anne (Bishop, 1897, pp. 137-140). By this knowledge, we comprehend that Urquhart's has a bath in their residence in Blarney. In addition, it was mentioned that the house had a Palestinian style as there was a tent in the garden which was looking like a desert tent and furnished in eastern style (Bishop, 1897, p. 139). It is comprehensible that building of the Turkish bath, which was owned by Barter, had been completed and put into service in 1859 (*Cork Constitution*, 4 August 1859).

Urquhart thought and defended that Turks were generally more clean-handed compared to British and tried to indicate the importance of using hot water to British people (Bishop, 1897, p. 137). He was suffering because of his illness and Turkish bath was the only thing that made him feel better. He had Turkish bath built in everywhere he had lived. Furthermore, he did not put the bath into only for his own and his family's service, he had put the bath in his house in London Rickmansworth; into service of needy and working-class people for free (Avcıoğlu, 2011, pp. 270-271). The bath of his chalet in Savoy was also kept open to all villagers and mountaineers who were living there (Robinson, 1920, p. 175). Urquhart also indicated that, there was a hot room which was used as bath in their house in Geneva, 1864 (Bishop, 1897, p. 194). Moreover, Jermyn Street Hammam which Urquhart had it built in person and had been running by the company named London & Provincial

Turkish Bath Co Ltd; opened in 26 July 1862 and was used as bath until 1940 (Avcioğlu, 2011, pp. 284-285; Hampshire Chronicle, 2 August 1862).

Urquhart desired Foreign Affairs Committees to take an active role in Turkish bath movement and lead the movement. He expected that the prominent members' contributions to opening of new baths. He also used the official media organ, *Free Press*, as propaganda facility for that purpose. In accordance with that purpose, the first bath for public use had been built and put into service by William Potter in Manchester, in 1857, who was the secretary of Manchester Foreign Affairs Committee. The opening of that first bath was announced in *Free Press* dated 22 July 1857 (*Free Press*, 22 July 1857). In addition, Potter had a writing named *Roman or Turkish Bath: Its Hygienic and Curative Properties*, in which he had given information about Turkish baths. Baths were expanded rapidly in the cities in northern region industrial areas in which committees were affective. Lots of baths were opened and run by committee members. In his article date 30th August; Charles Attwood described Turkish bath, as baths were consisted of many rooms with different functions and using those rooms made people feel relax and cleanness. In same article, he also mentioned about establishment of a bath committee and meeting that would be held with participation of Urquhart (*Free Press*, 30 August 1856). Prominent members of the committees had Turkish bath built in their own houses as Isaac Ironside had a Turkish bath in his house in Sheffield (*Newcastle Journal*, 7 March 1857, p.5). Another member who had Turkish bath built in his house was George Crawshay as there was Turkish bath in his Tynemouth House which was located in north-eastern of Newcastle (Fife, 1865, pp. 203-213). One of the committee members, Joseph Foden, had written about his visit to new Turkish bath, which was opened in Stockport, in 1860, in his letter to John Johnson. Foden outlined the plan of the bath

as there were a well-equipped cooling room, well-lit room by ceiling lights with lounges, a warm room, large hot air room and washing room (1860, Foden to Johnson, Urquhart Papers, I14). Furthermore, in the newspaper article about the new Turkish bath that was opened in Bradford, it was indicated that the bath was opened according to Urquhart's recommendations and instructions (Bradford Advertiser, 10 April 1858, pp. 4-5). On the other hand, Mrs Urquhart indicated that Foreign Affairs committee had a Turkish bath built in which the Turkish bath festival in Keighley was held with attendance of 800 people and that was a great success (Bishop, 1897, pp. 180-181).

Turkish bath movement which was launched by Urquhart and run by contribution of Foreign Affairs Committees achieved a great success. In the upcoming years, a great number of Turkish baths were opened in Britain. It is possible to come across with information and advertisements about recently opened Turkish baths by researching newspaper archives. In advertisements, opening information, session schedules for men and women and rates could be seen (Glossop Record, 15 October 1859; Barnsley Chronicle, 15 October 1859; The Ashton Weekly Reporter, 3 December 1859; Sheffield Daily Telegraph, 24 Friday 1860; London City Press, 30 May 1863; Shepton Mallet Journal, 27 September 1867). Urquhart's influence was not effective only in Britain, also led opening of Turkish baths in USA and France (Avcıoğlu, 2011, pp. 285-299).

5.2. Visit of Sultan Abdülaziz to London

Ten years had passed over Paris Peace Treaty that had signed after Crimean war. However, Ottoman State's problems had not been solved, yet. Ottoman State was in difficulty because of the problems in Moldavia and Wallachia, Serbia issues,

Montenegro revolt and recent events in Bulgaria. On the other hand, revolt in Crete island got the Eastern question back out. Beside internal revolts, financial crisis and external stress; the internal opposition gained strength at the same time. During that period, government; especially grand vizier Ali Pasha and foreign affairs minister Fuad Pasha, brought forward an idea about Sultan Abdülaziz's participation to international exhibition by Napoleon III for having France as an ally against Russian plots. An Ottoman Sultan's visit to a Christian country was unprecedented and they thought it would work a treat. Indeed, French press had focused on that event when it came up. After necessary correspondences had been completed and invitations had been received; it was decided that Sultan Abdülaziz would depart for Paris on 21st June 1867. By his travel to Europe, the Sultan was the first and only Ottoman Sultan who had visited a Christian country. (Aksüt, 1944, pp. 82-86). Due to the subject, only the Britain part of Abdülaziz's Europe visit will be considered.

After Sultan's visit to France had been determined, government demanded to add a Britain trip to the agenda. Ottoman statesmen believed that a visit to Britain which was ally of Ottoman State during Crimean War would be for the benefit of Ottoman State. That intention was relayed to British government by Ali Pasha and Musurus Pasha who was the Ottoman envoy in Britain and British government replied as they would be pleased for the visit. Sultan's visit was considered particularly important in Britain. The main reason was the Muslims who had been living in India. It was considered that accommodation of Ottoman Sultan who was also the Islam caliph, would be influential on entire Muslim population (Şehsuvaroğlu, 1967, pp. 41-42). Foreign Affairs Committee members also determined that the visit was important and favourable. They thought that this visit would create an absolute alliance opportunity between Britain and Ottoman State against Russian plots. It was believed

that Fuad Pasha and Lord Stanley's unmediated meeting would be essential for two countries' common interest, power, and danger (Diplomatic Review, 3 June 1867).

Sultan and his suite started to be prepared for journey to Britain after France part of the visit had been completed. Sultan had a large suite whom his elder son Yusuf İzzettin Efendi, his nephew and his heir Murat Efendi, his nephew Abdülhamid Efendi and Foreign affairs minister Fuad Pasha. Sultan and his suite had departed from Paris at seven o'clock on 11th July and arrived in the city Boulogne at same night between eleven and twelve. In the next morning, they had sailed with the Reine Hortense to Dover. Queen's steam frigates escorted to Sultan's ship through Liverpool and Phoebe. They arrived in Dover port at eleven o'clock. Sultan saluted crowded greeters. Prince of Wales, Egypt viceroy and Ambassador Musurus Pasha were among the greeters. Sultan departed from Dover after he had his breakfast at Lord Warden Hotel. He was accompanied by Prince of Wales and Duke of Cambridge in train. Charing-cross station in London was decorated with flowers and flags for the welcome event. Train had arrived in station at two thirty and the crowd cheered over. Sultan and his suite left the station within state carriages and moved toward to Buckingham Palace that they would stay (Pall Mall Gazette, 12 July 1867). Prince of Wales, Duke of Cambridge and Fuad Pasha were in sultan's carriage. Sultan was welcomed with cheers along the road. He was wearing a golden embroidered blue frock coat. They arrived in Buckingham Palace at about three o'clock and the brass band played Turkish Hymn (Morning Post, 13 July 1867). Wide range of arrangements had been done in Buckingham Palace for Sultan and his suite and ten rooms were allocated for them (Grantham Journal, 13 July 1867).

It is understood clearly that British public opinion considered Sultan's visit especially important out of detailed welcome event news and press coverage of his

travel programme of Britain visit in British press. Additionally, in newspapers, there were articles on Sultan's life in which the details like he was reformist, maintaining reform programmes which had been started by Mahmud II, aiming to keep the balance between Muslims and Christians and was the first Ottoman Sultan who travelled to abroad were mentioned (Stirling Observer, 11 July 1867; Windsor and Eton Express, 13 July 1867). The *Times* interpreted Sultan's visit as a great historical development. It was mentioned that Abdülaziz was obeyed in the region from Danube to Persian Gulf and Ottoman State was one of the greatest empires in world despite Greek revolt and Russian occupation. Moreover, it was stated that Sultan and his family were revered during their stay and the most significant issue was not the solemnities but coming the governments of two countries to an agreement and finding out their common interest. *Morning Star* stated that Sultan's visit was a noteworthy event of the time and he had broken down the prejudices by being the first person of his race who travelled abroad. Particularly, it was not only remarkable but also important that Islam caliph to set foot in Christian land as a guest. On the other hand, *Daily News* had interpreted the developments in a negative manner. It was stated that Sultan demanded to turn his west trip into an advantage for his state as he was not come to find out Britain's power but origination of the resources and trick of it. They described Ottoman State as an old ally and thought that Sultan had come to discover how free countries were growing and improving. British people were sustaining their own empire from a little island and supporting other empires which were in distress by financial aids (Aberdeen Press and Journal, 17 July 1867).

Sultan Abdülaziz had received many visitors and made visits during his Britain trip. He visited the Queen in Windsor on 13th July; after the day he had arrived. Queen had secluded herself in Windsor since his husband died. A private

train with sixty-person capacity was prepared for Sultan's travel to Windsor (Morning Post, 13 July 1867). On 14th July morning he met with Egypt viceroy at Buckingham Palace, then he visited Prince and Princess of Wales at Marlborough House at noon and he returned to Buckingham after his meeting with Duke of Cambridge at Gloucester House (Liverpool Mercury, 16 July 1867). On 15th July, he received diplomat visitors and British ministers during afternoon. Afterwards, he visited Zoological Gardens in Regent's Park and attended the opera at evening time. At last, Sultan attended the reception by Duke and Duchess Sutherland in Staffor House. He firstly visited Woolwich shipyard on 16th July and attended an organization for his honour at Crystal Palace (Inverness Courier, 18 July 1867). He went to Portsmouth to see navy drill which Queen also came to watch. Sultan had watched the drill next to Queen with the viceroy, Prince of Wales and Duke of Cambridge. Although the weather conditions were not appropriate, they continued the drill because Sultan was there. Queen presented Knight of Garter to Sultan during the drill (Exeter and Plymouth Gazette, 19 July 1867). He continued his trip by visiting London centre on 18th July and attended the dinner for his honour that hosted by a commission which London Mayor Lord Maire was also among the members. Notable people from cabinet like Disraeli, Lord Derby and Lord Stanley had also attended that dinner. Sultan had a trip on Thames River and saw remarkable places in London. At night, he attended the ball for his honour hosted by Indian Council of Foreign affairs ministry. That night's programme was magnificent indeed (Congleton & Macclesfield Mercury, 21 July 1867). Merely, sudden death of Musurus Pasha's wife made them upset and Sultan had to leave early (Star of Gwent, 27 July 1867).

On 20th July, Abdülaziz received many visits in Buckingham Palace. One of them was the visit by Foreign Affairs Committee members. People in commission

were, R. Monteith, S. E. Rolland, G. Crawshay, Ironside, F. Francis, Rule, E.B. Neill, C. Wells and representatives from Birmingham, Sheffield, Newcastle, Preston, Keighley and other fifteen cities. David Urquhart could not attend that visit as he was living abroad because of his illness. The commission presented an address to Sultan by Monteith in English and translated to Turkish by Wells. Sultan had surprised and pleased for Well's having the command of Turkish and congratulated him. A Turkish copy of the address was signed by committee members and presented to Sultan (Diplomatic Review, 7 August 1867). Address was prepared briefly and contained Urquhart's well-known ideas. In the address, it was stated that Ottoman State was show a generous hospitality by heroically accepting asylum requests of Christians who were suffered from other Christians. It was mentioned that European Governments who had boosted tax receipt three times in an age and taxes weighed upon working class. Moreover, it was remarked according to committee members, which was mostly consisted of working class, have learnt from David Urquhart who had enlightened as he had lived in Ottoman country; Islam law forbidden to interfere in other's internal affairs besides imposing random taxes to pretend for interference. They interpreted that Ottoman State had been distressful as a result of interference to its internal affairs by Christian countries and continued as because of those mentioned above, they had discovered that there were common bonds between Ottoman State and their community which was advising their citizens to quit their religious and political greed and to invite their government to stay at law, therefore they became friends of Ottoman State. It was specified that they were trying to challenge with the source of doctored news and common wrong ideas that were spread in Europe about Ottoman State and protest them even if they could not prevent. They mentioned that the visit was a great opportunity for forming a friendship between Britain and

Ottoman State which would prevent an extreme hazard by referring to dismemberment of the Ottoman State. They stated that although that hazard had been seen to threaten only Abdülaziz's reign, it would affect and ruin all western nations. In conclusion, they mentioned that for the reasons above, they temped to present that address to verbalize their true friendship and respect to Muslims by taking advantage of Islam caliph's first visit to Europe. Full text of the address was published in *Liverpool Daily Post* at first (*Liverpool Daily Post*, 5 August 1867). Afterwards it has been published as a supplement in *Diplomatic Review* (*Diplomatic Review*, Supplement, 4 September 1867).

Rest of Sultan's visit was saturnine part because of Musurus Pasha's wife's sudden death. Some visits were received in Buckingham Palace, Wimbledon and Parliament had been visited. On 23rd July, Sultan and his suite left Britain after eleven days stay. Sultan had donated 2500£ to Lord Mayor for doling poor people in London and Lord Mayor conveyed his thanks for the donation (*Congleton & Macclesfield Mercury*, 27 July 1867). Queen had sent telegram to Sultan for sending her good wishes to have rest of his trip nice and Sultan replied as he was pleased to visit Britain and conveyed his thanks (*Liverpool Daily Post*, 26 July 1867). Herewith, Sultan had completed his Britain visit and departed to Belgium.

5.3. Old Age of David Urquhart

David Urquhart left Britain because of his health issues. He did not turn back Britain except his short time visits to Foreign Affairs Committees. He spent rest of his life in his house that he had designed for himself and his family at St. Gervais on Savoy Mountains. British statesmen, French bishops and some Turkish functionaries had visited him there. He spent wintertime at his house in Nice (Robinson, 1920, p.

205). Foreign Affairs Committees maintained their work during that period. *Diplomatic Review* was being published with his efforts and sponsorship, but Urquhart was powerless to speak up or to write deep during last period of his life.

Urquhart had improved his philosophic ideas about modern state during the years he spent in Savoy. According to his point of view, European countries should be conducted by Catholic Church. He stated that the states should have left their own traditions aside and church should have left its doctrines and return to moral norms. Urquhart's belief in power of the church was endless during his youth, but he was upset late in his life because he worried about that an organization with such power was not able to use its power and had no influence on global developments. He thought that Canon Law should have been restored (Robinson, 1920, pp.280-291). Those ideas of Urquhart enabled him to connect with famous economist and sociologist Le Play and Bishop Dupanloup who was one of the leaders of liberal Catholicism in France (Carlyle, 1899, p. 45). In the meantime, Pope Pius IX had given order to Ecumenical Council to convene. Urquhart attempted to join that council via his connections. In November 1869, he had gone to Rome with his wife for this purpose and he joined that council and attend the first session took place on 8th December 1869. Moreover, he visited pope on 9th February 1870 (Urquhart Papers, 1L5). Urquhart had presented a list with twelve articles. Most remarkable articles of the list were the determination about the disaster would occur because of Russia's aims on Eastern Christians and request Pope to start diplomatic relations with Ottoman State. He stated that, herewith Christian population in East would reunite and Russia's plans would fail (Robinson, 1920, p. 266).

David Urquhart did not remain unresponsive to the revolts had risen in Ottoman State. He indicated his views whether directly via *Diplomatic Review* or via

Foreign Affairs Committees. According to Urquhart's point of view, the main reason of Christian revolts in Ottoman State was as a result of Russian provocation. In the article named "World of Kings and Sultans" which was published in *Diplomatic Review*, Ottoman Sultan and Pope were compared and it was stated that Pope was the only person who undertook the temporary sovereignty and spiritual leadership at the same time, except Ottoman sultan. Moreover, it was indicated that Pope rejected Russia to put its plans into effect and presentation of revolutionary desires and violence as legal rights of the sovereignty and convened the Ecumenical Council to prevent Russia to take its plans into practice (*Diplomatic Review*, 6 November 1867, pp. 172-173). Furthermore, in an article named "Roman Catholics in Ottoman State" which was published in *Diplomatic Review*; demands of *Eastern* Christians' were interpreted as unreasonable. By referring Crete revolt, it was indicated that Greeks were laying plots by Russian provocations to make Ottoman State collapse. With influences of European governments, other Christians also had expectations for disaster which would cause collapse of Ottoman State (*Diplomatic Review*, 4 September 1867, pp. 140-141). In the article, "Christendom compared with the Ottoman State", Urquhart stated that Ottoman State's future depend on not imitating and being like Europe. Urquhart mentioned that the threat for Ottoman State were not Christian citizens but Muslim citizens as taking the western sermonizers in Bâb-ı Âli in consideration was the main danger for Ottoman State. Ottoman State should protect its own traditions and get rid of the statesmen who were fascinated to European lifestyle (*Diplomatic Review*, 3 April 1867). In another article referring Crete revolt; it was known that Christians in Ottoman State were not suffering oppression and remarked that Christians had privileges as self-governing, religious immunity, exemption from military service, financial and administrative issues which people did

not have in any European country except Switzerland. According to Foreign Affairs Committees, revolt in Crete was a result of Russia's perennial efforts (Diplomatic Review, June 1867). In the letter from Urquhart to Fuad Pasha during Crete revolt, he remarked that Ottoman State should stand upright against rebels and Russia was not powerful to wage a war on Ottoman State (Diplomatic Review, 7 April 1869). On the other hand, another issue that Urquhart pointed out was the debts of Ottoman State. Ottoman State had got into debt first during Crimean War. According to Urquhart's point of view, France, and Britain harmed Ottoman State although they were allies in 1854. Ottoman State was become indebted and developments for the benefit of Russia were observed. Urquhart believed that if Britain and France were true friends of Ottoman State, they would prevent it becoming indebted and encourage increasing its production. Urquhart mentioned that, he had been charged to offer loan to Ottoman State in 1836 but astute executives of that period refused the money and he appreciated them. According to Urquhart, the first issue that had made inroads on Ottoman finance was 1838 Trade Agreement. Urquhart prepared the agreement himself, but Britain spoiled the agreement by adding article. The custom rate was increased by 5 percent and then 12 percent. Even rate was increased ten times for some export goods. Muslims had withdrawn from customs and Rums; Armenians and Christians took their place. Afterwards, that impact continued by foreign indebtedment. According to Urquhart, Ottoman State spent approximately five million pounds during Crete revolt. The solution that was presented by Urquhart was only principal repayment, not interests. Furthermore, custom tariffs between provinces which were implemented refer to 1838 agreement should be remitted. State lands should be run by state. Thus, Ottoman State had capacity to repay its foreign debts readily. Urquhart

gave order to Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee to convey that information to Sultan (Diplomatic Review, January 1876).

David Urquhart visited Britain in 1874 for the last time. In the year 1875, he and his wife advocated Ottoman State against Bulgarian and Herzegovina revolts by their writings although his illness got worse (Bishop, 1897, pp. 327-328). In 1876, his health status became difficult. In the meantime, Butler Johnstone became his close student. The last writing by Urquhart, recorded by his wife, was the letter to Sultan Abdülaziz which he gave Butler Johnstone to convey. In the letter, he wrote his ideas that he was advocating for years as stopping foreign debts, preventing foreign intervention and distrust west. Moreover, it was mentioned that Ottoman State's survival depended on protecting its own traditions, customs, and the order (Urquhart papers, Urquhart to Sultan Abdülaziz, 1C14, 1876). David Urquhart had gone to Egypt for last chance to ease his pains, but he needed to turn back when his conditions got worse. He died on 16 May 1877 in Naples on his way back. He was buried in Montreux, Switzerland (Carlyle, 1899, p. 45).

6. CONCLUSION

During the nineteenth century, the hardest period of its history, relations with the west was critically important for Ottoman State. France and Britain had been playing the most significant role in those relations. David Urquhart was one of the rarely seen people who had taken Ottoman State's side in Ottoman-British relations during that period although he did not take place in literature widely. Urquhart's life should be considered in three main parts. Firstly, his coming to Ottoman State during Greek revolt, his achievements and the period he was assigned as diplomat, in the second place; his works as a deputy and civil when he had come back to Britain and thirdly his occupations late in his life and declining years should be examined.

During Greek revolt, Urquhart was captive by Philhellenism as many young people in Europe and came to that region to fight for Greeks against Ottoman State. In consequence of his experiences during his visits to Ottoman State and during the war which he had been promoted as Lieutenant and his personal experiences, he became a Turcophile. The experiences which he had gained both during and after Greek revolt and by visiting different parts of the region were extremely important. What he had learned in region opened his doors to diplomacy. The years he had spent as a diplomat in Ottoman State, contributed him to build his ideas well-grounded.

According to his point of view, Britain's interests were depending on to cooperation with Ottoman State as Russia's plans were on to capture Ottoman State completely and that would conflict with Britain's interests. Therefore, Britain should keep in with Ottoman State. During that period, his problems with Lord Palmerston and Lord Ponsonby doomed his diplomatic career. Indeed, third of them was thinking ahead of British economy but only Urquhart was anti-Russian because he was Turcophile. Due

to the problems he had with Palmerston; he attributed his diplomatic career's ending to Palmerston and his antagonism towards Palmerston had begun and been continued during rest of his life.

After his diplomatic career ended up and he turned back to Britain, he maintained to uphold the significance of cooperation with Ottoman State for Britain's interest. According to Urquhart, Britain should cooperate with Ottoman State but not interfere its own values. As to Ottoman State, it should preserve its own secular values and norms and never be within a movement from west which was trying to change them. Urquhart stated that the problems Ottoman State had encountered were the result of Russia's policies. Those policies were serving Russia's purpose to dismember Ottoman State and also conflicted with Britain's interest. If ever Ottoman State was allowed and supported to preserve its own manners and customs, it would have power to resist to Russia, but British government had disallowed that by its misguided policies. Most especially, Urquhart's pro-Ottoman attitude during Crimean war and his criticisms at false moves of Britain created public opinion. During the campaign process he had launched, Urquhart held the view that Britain should support Ottoman State and the false moves of British government were totally serving for Russia's interests. In addition, the conflicts between Urquhart and Lord Palmerston should not be neglected.

Foreign Affairs Committees which were founded by efforts by himself during his declining years and led working class to concern with political issue were critically important. They released their ideas to British public with their studies and use of media organs effectively. They tried to make British people understand the importance of relations with Ottoman State. They started Turkish Bath Movement in Britain and represented Turkish culture as a conducive for opening of whole range of

Turkish baths. Foreign Affairs Committees met with Sultan Abdülaziz during his Britain trip and indicated that they considered the problems of Ottoman Christians had been occurred because of foreign intervention and they were supporting Ottoman State's policies. According to Urquhart, the main reason of the problems of Christians who were living in Ottoman State based on Russia and it should not be allowed. During his declining years, he believed that the issue would be solved by forming good relations between Ottoman State and Pope and he had already conveyed his opinions to Pope himself.

During his whole life, Urquhart had defended his opinion on cooperation with Ottoman State having vital importance for British interests. For that purpose, he contributed greatly to introducing Turkish and Islam culture in Britain by campaigns and his writings. In Britain, Urquhart was best known as a Turcophile together with his impeach Lord Palmerston for treason and being a Russian spy. Due to his position, he had a special place within nineteenth century Ottoman-British relations.

In conclusion, throughout the years he was effective; David Urquhart defended the opinion Britain should take Russia on and cooperate with Ottoman State as it would make both Britain and Ottoman State gain economic and political interest. He stated that Ottoman State's internal problems were only based on Russia's plots. He objected to intervention in Ottoman State's internal affairs as he believed that Ottoman State had had the power to strengthen itself by preserving its own manners and customs.

REFERENCES**Primary Sources****The National Archives**

FO 78/209

FO 78/249

FO 78/266

FO 78/301

FO 78/309

FO 97/409

Urquhart Papers at Balliol College

1A6

1C5b

1C10

1I4

1L5

1C14

Palmerston Papers at University of Southampton

PP/GC/CA/286

PP/GC/CA/201

PP/GC/CA/219

PP/GC/CA/293

PP/GC/CA/221

PP/GC/CA/229

Newspapers

Aberdeen Press and Journal: 17 July 1867

Ashton Weekly Reporter: 3 December 1859

Barnsley Chronicle: 9 July 1859

Belfast Commercial Chronicle: 4 June 1832

Birmingham Journal: 17 June 1854, 7 July 1855

Bradford Advertiser: 10 April 1858 pp. 4-5

Carlisle Journal: 12 October 1849

Congleton & Macclesfield Mercury: 21 July 1867, 27 July 1867

Cork Constitution: 4 August 1859

Cork Examiner: 1 December 1847, 26 December 1849

Derbyshire Advertiser and Journal: 6 August 1847

Diplomatic Review: 3 June 1867, 7 August 1867, 4 September 1867 (Supplement),

April 1873, January 1875, April 1875, 6 November 1867, 4 September 1867, 3

April 1867, June 1867, 7 April 1869, January 1876

Dublin Evening Post: 10 December 1839

Dublin Weekly Nation: 7 August 1847

Edinburgh Evening Courant: 4 June 1832

Exeter and Plymouth Gazette: 19 July 1867

Freeman's Journal: 21 December 1853

Free Press: 24 November 1855, 18 February 1857 (supplements) pp. 1-8, 5 April
1856, 23 August 1856, 30 August 1856, 6 September 1856, 22 July 1857, 4
January 1860, 2 May 1860, 1 June 1864, April 1866

Free Press Serials: No:14, p. 19

Globe: 18 June 1836

Glossop Record: 15 October 1859

Grantham Journal: 13 July 1867

Hampshire Chronicle: 2 August 1862

Hereford Times: 13 September 1834

Inverness Courier: 18 July 1867

Liverpool Daily Post: 5 August 1867, 26 July 1867

Liverpool Mercury: 16 July 1867

London City Press: 30 May 1863

London Daily News: 8 December 1849

London Evening Standard: 29 November 1839

London Gazette: 15 August 1837

Morning Advertiser: 3 September 1832, 2 July 1836, 24 February 1848, 11 November 1856, 28 September 1853, 5 October 1853, 3 November 1853, 12 January 1854, 2 June 1855, 4 June 1855, 15 June 1855, 16 June 1855, 6 July 1855, 9 July 1855, 16 July 1855, 31 July 1855

Morning Chronicle: 10 April 1833, 21 May 1833, 24 February 1848, 20 November 1856

Morning Herald: 28 September 1853, 2 November 1853

Morning Post: 2 July 1836, 28 November 1839, 19 December 1853, 13 July 1867

Newcastle Journal: 2 December 1854, 9 June 1855, 7 March 1857

Pall Mall Gazette: 12 July 1867

Sheffield Daily Telegraph: 24 August 1860

Shepton Mallet Journal: 27 September 1867

Shield Daily News: 13 July 1893

Sun: 6 May 1834, 8 September 1834, 1 July 1836, 18 June 1836, 17 June 1837, 20 November 1856, 20 December 1853

Sussex Advertiser: 4 July 1836,

Staffordshire Advertiser: 7 August 1847, 11 September 1847, 1 October 1853, 15 October 1853, 15 April 1854

Star of Gwent: 27 July 1867

Stirling Observer: 11 July 1867

Times: 28 May 1877

Weekly Chronicle: 27 February 1848

Wexford Conservative: 8 May 1833

Windsor and Eton Express: 13 July 1867

Urquhart's Writings

Urquhart, D. (1833). *Turkey and Its Resources*. London: Saunders and Otley.

Urquhart, D. (1835). *England, France, Russia & Turkey*. London: James Ridgway & Sons.

Urquhart, D. (1838a). *The Spirit of the East*. Vol I, London: Henry Colburn.

Urquhart, D. (1838b). *The Spirit of the East*. Vol II, London: Henry Colburn.

Urquhart, D. (1840). *The Crisis: France in face of the four powers*. London: James Fraser.

Urquhart, D. (1841). *Diplomatic Transactions in Central Asia from 1834 to 1839*. London: Thomas Brettell.

Urquhart, D. (1843). *A Fragment of the History Servia*. London.

Urquhart, D. (1850). *The Pillars of Hercules*. Vol I, II, London: Richard Bentley.

Urquhart, D. (1853). *Progress of Russia in the West, North and South*. London: Trubner & Co.

Urquhart, D. (1854). *Recent Events in the East*. London: Trübner&Co.

Urquhart, D. (1855a). *Limitations of the Supply of Grain by the Past Action of British Diplomacy*. London: Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Urquhart, D. (1855b). *The New Hope for Poland*. London: E. Tucker.

Urquhart, D. (1855c). *The Spider and The Fly*. London: E. Tucker.

Urquhart, H. (1857). *The Story of the War*. London: David Bryce.

Urquhart, D. (1860). *The Lebanon: A History and a Diary*. Vol I, II, London: Thomas Cautley Newby.

Urquhart, D. (1865). Islam as a Political System. In Henry Stanley (Ed.), *The East and the West: Our Dealings with Neighbours* (pp. 139-208). London: Hatchard & Co.

Urquhart, D. (1869). *The Military Strength of Turkey*. London: Effingham Wilson.

Secondary Sources

Aksan, V. (2011). *Kuşatılmış Bir İmparatorluk Osmanlı Harpleri 1700-1870*. (Trans. Gül Çağalı Güven). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.

Aksüt, A.K. (1944). *Sultan Azizin Mısır ve Avrupa Seyahati*. İstanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası.

Aktepe, M. (1981). Dünkü Fransızlar: Blak Bey ve Oğlu. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 33, pp. 255-271

Armaoğlu, F. (1997). *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789-1914)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Armytage, H. (1955). Sheffield and The Crimean War. *History Today*, 5 (7), pp. 473-482

Avcioğlu, N. (2011). The Turkish Bath in the West. In N. Ergin (ed.), *Bathing Culture of Anatolian Civilizations: Architecture, History and Imagination* (pp. 267-304). Paris: Peeters.

Bailey, E.B. (2012). Palmerston ve Osmanlı Reformu 1834-1839. In H. İnalcık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 303-352). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Batır, K. (2011). *Yirmibirinci Yüzyılda Deniz Haydutluğu ve Uluslararası Hukuk*. Ankara:

Usak Yayınları.

Baysun, C. (1940). Mustafa Reşit Paşa. Tanzimat Vol. II (pp. 723-746). İstanbul: Maarif

Matbaası.

Bell, J. (1840). *Journal of a Residence in Circassia*. Vol 1. London: Edward Moxon.

Beydilli, K. (2006). TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi. Mustafa Reşid Paşa (pp. 348-350). Vol

XXXI, İstanbul: Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları.

Bishop, M.C. (1897). *Memoir of Mrs. Urquhart*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner &

Co.

Bolsover, H. (1934). Lord Ponsonby and the Eastern Question 1833-1839. *The Slavonic and*

East European Review, 13 (37), pp. 98-118.

Bolsover, H. (1936). David Urquhart and the Eastern Question 1833-1837: A Study in

Publicity and Diplomacy. *The Journal of Modern History*, 8(4), pp. 444-467.

Bulwer, H. (1870). *The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston: With Selections*

from His Diaries and Correspondence. Vol II. London: Richard Bentley.

Byrne, L.G. (1964). *The Great Ambassador: A Study of Diplomatic Career of the Right*

Honourable Stratford Canning. Ohio: State University Press.

Carlyle, E. I. (1899). Dictionary of National Biography, David Urquhart (pp. 43-45).

Vol LVIII, London: Smith, Elder & Co.

Carr, E. (1934). *Karl Marx*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Cevdet Paşa. (1953). *Tezakir 1-12*. (Ed. Cavid Baysun). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

- Cleveland, L. W. (2008). *Modern Ortadoğu Tarihi*, (Trans. Mehmet Harmancı). İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.
- Crawley, C.W. (1929). Anglo- Russian Relations 1815-1840. *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, 3(1), pp. 47-73.
- Çadırcı, M. (2012). Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Karşılaşılan Güçlükler. *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 199-207). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Çelik, H. (1994). *Osmanlı Yanlısı İngiliz Dış İşler Komiteleri*. İstanbul: İnkılab Yayınları.
- Çelik, H. (2001). TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, H.A. Munro Butler Johnstone (pp. 580-581). Vol XXIII, İstanbul: Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları.
- Çelik, H. (2012). TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, David Urquhart (pp. 180-181). Vol XLII, İstanbul: Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları.
- Danişmend, H. (1972). *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*. Vol. 4. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.
- Esiner, A.M. (2019). "Doğu Sorunu" Çerçevesinde İngiliz-Rus İlişkileri ve 1844 Tarihli Gizli Sözleşme. In T.E. Biber (eds.), *Bozkırım Oğlu Ahmet Taşağul'a Armağan* (pp. 493-514). İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.
- Fife, J. (1865). *Manual of the Turkish Bath*. London: John Churchill and Sons.
- Figes, O. (2012). *Kırım Son Haçlı Seferi*. (Trans. Nurettin Elhüseyni). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları
- Foreign Policy and Commerce. (1838). *Speeches delivered at a dinner given by the commercial community of Glasgow to David Urquhart*. London: Hooper.

- Gleason, J. (1950). *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain*. London: Oxford University Press
- Hearnshaw, F. (1970). The European Revolution and After 1848-1854. In A.W. Ward and G.P. Gooch (eds), *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy 1783-1919*, Vol. II, (pp. 287-358). New York: Octagon Books.
- Hovell, M. (1918). *The Chartist Movement*. Manchester: University Press.
- İnalcık, H. (2012). Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler. In H. İnalcık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 171-195). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- İpek, N. (1995). Churchill Vakası (1836). *Belleten*, 59 (226), pp. 661-713
- Jelavich, B. (2003). *Balkan Tarihi 18. Ve 19. Yüzyıllar*. V1, İstanbul: Küre.
- Jenks, M. (1964). *The Activities and Influence of David Urquhart 1833-1856, with Special Reference to the Affairs of the Near East*. (Yayınlanmamış Tez). University of London, London.
- Jorga, N. (2017). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*. (Trans. Nilüfer Epçeli). V. V. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları.
- Karal, E.Z. (2011). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. V. V, VI, VII. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu
- Karal, E.Z. (2012). Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu'nda Batı'nın Etkisi. In H. İnalcık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 113-132). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Kurat. A.N. (1990). *Türkiye ve Rusya*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

- King, C. (2007). Imagining Circassia: David Urquhart and the Making of North Caucasus Nationalism. *The Russian Review*, 66 (2), pp. 238-255
- Kütükoğlu, M. (1974). *Osmanlı-İngiliz İktisadi Münasebetleri (1580-1838)*. V. I. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Lamb, M. (1981). The making of Russophobe: David Urquhart, The formative years, 1825-1835. *The International Historical Review*, 3 (3), pp. 330-357
- Lamb, M. (1993). Writing up the Eastern Question in 1835-1836. *The International History Review*, 15 (2), pp. 239-268
- Luxembourg, N. (1998). *Rusların Kafkasya'yı İşgalinde İngiliz Politikası ve İmam Şamil*. (Trans. Sedat Özden). İstanbul: Kayıhan Yayınları
- MacDonell, J. (1908). Dictionary of National Biography, Jeremy Bentham (p. 268-280). V II, London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Manneh, B. (2012). Ali ve Fuad Paşaların Bâb-ı Âli'deki Nüfuzlarının Kökeni (1855-1871). In H. İnalçık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 477-490). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Mardin, Ş. (2012). Tanzimat Fermanı'nın Manası: Yeni Bir İzah Denemesi. In H. İnalçık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 147-165). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Martin, K. (1963). *The Triumph of Lord Palmerston*. London: Hutchinson.
- Miller, W. (1923). *The Ottoman State and its Successors 1801-1922*, Cambridge: University Press.

- Marx, K. (1897). *The Eastern Question*. (Eds. Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling).
London: Swan Sonnenschein.
- Noviçev, A. D. (2012). 1839 Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu ve Dış Politikadaki Boyutları. In H. İnalçık and M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 355-367). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Poole, S.L. (1888). *The Life of the Right Honourable Stratford Canning*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Poole, S. L. (1988). *Lord Stratford Canning'in Türkiye Anıları* (Trans. Can Yücel). İstanbul: Yurt Yayınları.
- Potter, W. (1859). *Roman or Turkish Bath: Its Hygienic and Curative Properties*. London: Simkin & Marshall.
- The Annual Register, or a View of the History and Politics of the Year 1853*. (1854). London: F&J Rivington.
- The Portfolio* (Vol. 1). (1836). London: James Ridgway and Sons, Piccadilly.
- Rich, N. (1985). *Why the Crimean War? A Cautionary Tale*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England.
- Roberts, J. (2003). *The Origins of Conflict in Afghanistan*. London: Praeger.
- Robinson, G. (1920). *David Urquhart*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Rolland, S. (1858). *The Growth of Russian Power Contingent on the Decay of British Constitution*, London: Robert Hardwicke.
- Ross, D. (1836). *Opinions of the European Press on the Eastern Question*. London: James Ridgway and Sons.

- Salt, J. (1968). Local Manifestations of the Urquhartite Movement. *International Review of Social History*, 13 (3), pp. 350-365.
- Senior, H. (1950). *The Activities of David Urquhart in British Diplomacy and Politics 1830-1841*. (Yayınlanmamış Tez). McGill University, Montreal.
- Shannon, R. (1974). David Urquhart and the Foreign Affairs Committees. In P. Hollis (eds.), *Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England* (pp. 239-261). London: Edward Arnold.
- Şehsuvaroğlu, B. (1967). Sultan Abdülaziz'in Avrupa Seyahati, *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, S1, pp. 41-51.
- Taylor, M. (1991). The Old Radicalism and the New: David Urquhart and the Politics of Opposition 1832-1867. In E. Biagini and A. Reid (eds.), *Currents of Radicalism* (pp. 22-43). London: Cambridge University Press.
- The Taylor Papers*. (1913). In Ernest Taylor (eds.). London: Longmans and Green Co.
- Temperley, H. (1933). Stratford de Redcliffe and the Origins of the Crimean War. *The English Historical Review*, 48(192), pp. 601-621.
- Temperley, H. (1936). *England and the Near East: The Crimea*. London: Longman, Green & Co.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Tukin, C. (1999). *Boğazlar Meselesi*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Tuncer, H. (2013). *Metternich'in Osmanlı Politikası (1815-1848)*, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

- Turan, Ş. (1951). 1829 Edirne Antlaşması. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Dil-Tarih ve Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9 (1-2), pp. 111-151
- Türkgeldi, A. (1987). *Mesail-i Mühimmme-i Siyasiyye*, Vol. 1, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Wallerstein, I. (2011). *The Modern World System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant 1789-1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Webb, A. (1878). *Compendium of Irish Biography: Comprising Sketches of Distinguished Irishmen and Of Eminent Persons Connected with Ireland By Office or By Writings*, M.H. Gill & Son
- Webster, C. (1947). Urquhart, Ponsonby and Palmerston. *The English Historical Review*, 62 (244), pp. 327-351
- Woodhouse, C.M. (1969). *The Philhellenes*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Woodhouse, C.M. (1981). The 'Untoward Event': The Battle of Navarino 20 October 1827. In Richard Clogg (Ed.), *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence* (pp. 1-17). London: The MacMillan Press.
- Woodward, E.L. (1938). *The Age of Reform 1815-1870*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yıldız, G. (2009). *Neferin Adı Yok: Zorunlu Askerliğe Geçiş Sürecinde Osmanlı Devleti'nde Siyaset, Ordu ve Toplum (1826-1839)*. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları
- Zurcher, E. J. (2016). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (Trans. Yasemin Saner). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

FO: Foreign Office

UP: Urquhart Papers

PP: Palmerston Papers

FAC: Foreign Affairs Committees

CA: Canning

Trans.: Translation

Ed.: Edited