

## Foreign Ministry and Its Peculiar Position in General Administration of Ottoman Empire in the Era of Reforms (1836-1871)<sup>1</sup>

Erhan EZİCİ\*

Taşansu TÜRKER\*\*

Geliş Tarihi (Received) 13.12.2022– Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 07.03.2023

### Abstract

With the importance of the use of diplomacy in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, Foreign Ministry gained an effective position in the state administration. As a result of the increase in the use of diplomacy and political relations after the Egyptian Crisis and the Crimean War, the influence of the foreign minister in the administration level has increased. This prominence had a direct impact on implementation of reforms at larger scale which was the general characteristics of the era. Therefore, Foreign Ministry stood out among the other institutions of the state due to some of its characteristics and bureaucrats from Foreign Ministry undertook important state duties. These features can be listed as the continuous ministry organization and superior position of the Ministry, the effects of Mustafa Reşid, Âli and Fuad Pashas, the qualified personnel and the effect of the Translation Room, incubator role, pioneering ambassadors and the unique institutions created. This article focuses on the reasons of Foreign Ministry playing a more active role than other institutions during Ottoman Empire's era of modernization in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As a result, the accuracy of the claim that the Foreign Ministry had a superior role in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Turkish public administration due to certain qualities it possesses; has been explained in details by using archive documents, the sources of the period and literature review.

**Keywords:** Ottoman Empire, Foreign Ministry, Modernization, Reform, Turkish Public Administration.

## Hariciye Nezareti ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun XIX. Yüzyıl Genel İdari Reform Sürecindeki Üstün Konumu (1836-1871)

### Öz

XIX. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda diplomasi kullanımının önem kazanmasıyla birlikte Hariciye Nezareti, devlet yönetiminde etkili bir konum kazanmıştır. Mısır Krizi ve Kırım Savaşı sonrasında diplomasi kullanımının ve siyasi ilişkilerin artması sonucunda hariciye nazırının yönetim kademesi içindeki etkisi artmıştır. Bu durum reformların yürütülmesini de doğrudan etkilemiştir. Dolayısıyla bu süreçte Hariciye Nezareti sahip olduğu kimi özellikler nedeniyle devletin diğer kurumları arasında öne çıkmış ve hariciye kökenli bürokratlar, önemli devlet görevleri üstlenmişlerdir. Bu özellikler Nezaretin kesintisiz bakanlık örgütlenmesi ve üstün konumu, Mustafa Reşid, Âli ve Fuad Paşaların etkileri, sahip olduğu nitelikli personel ve Tercüme Odası'nın etkisi, kuluçka niteliği, öncü sefirler ve oluşturulan özgün kurumlar olarak sıralanabilir. Bu çalışmada XIX. yüzyıl Osmanlı modernleşmesi sürecinde Hariciye Nezaretinin diğer kurumlara göre etkin bir rol kazanmasının sebepleri incelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak sahip olduğu kimi nitelikler neticesinde Hariciye Nezaretinin XIX. yüzyıl Türk kamu yönetiminde üstün bir role sahip olduğu iddiasının doğruluğu; arşiv belgeleri, dönemin kaynakları ve ayrıntılı literatür taraması kullanılarak test edilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Hariciye Nezareti, Modernleşme, Reform, Türk Kamu Yönetimi

<sup>1</sup> This study is derived from Erhan Ezici's Ph.D. thesis named "*Hariciye Teşkilatı; Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Bir Modernleşme Modeli*", under supervision of Prof. Dr. Taşansu Türker, Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, in 2020.

\* Research Asist., Dr., Uşak University, Department of Public Administration, Uşak, Turkey. e-mail: erhan.ezici@usak.edu.tr. ORCID:0000-0003-2370-509X.

\*\* Prof., Dr., Ankara University, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Ankara, Turkey. e-mail: tturker@politics.ankara.edu.tr. ORCID:0000-0002-0044-3755.

## Introduction

An examination on the institutions of Ottoman Empire shows that Foreign Ministry played a more active role than the other institutions with special regard to implementation of reforms in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Akyıldız states that Foreign Ministry, along with the Supreme Council (*Meclis-i Vâlâ*), was the preeminent institution and they functioned as a powerhouse during the era of reforms (Akyıldız, 1993: 90, 305). Moreover, Findley emphasizes that through their supervisory role over the reforming bodies, Foreign Ministry and the Supreme Council “*defined and monitored*” reforms (Findley, 1997: 179). Pointing out how relatable foreign affairs and reforms, Zürcher states that Foreign Ministry takes a principal role in the era of reforms (Zürcher, 2009: 94). Additionally, there are several other studies in which reformist characteristics of the Foreign Ministry are touched upon through the reformist characteristics of Foreign Ministry directors and officers, and the role of Translation Office (*Tercüme Odası*) during the era of reforms (Ortaylı, 2014a: 124; Findley, 2014: 147, 162; Lewis, 1996: 117-118; Shaw and Shaw, 2005: 61-65; Turan, 2015: 353; Turfan, 2013: 149; Kinross, 2009: 474). Further literature reviews could yield more examples in this regard. Concordantly, it is conspicuous that Foreign Ministry held a special position for Ottoman Empire during the era of reforms in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The main objective of this study is an analysis on the characteristics that prioritizes Foreign Ministry over other state institutions.

### 1. Peculiar Position of the Foreign Ministry and Continuous Ministry Organization

Foreign Ministry (*Hariciye Nezareti*) and Ministry of Interior (*Dâhiliye Nezareti*) were established in 1836. These two institutions pioneered ministerial-type organization in Ottoman system of government. These institutions were preceded by other institutions that had been named ministry. Ministry of Religious Foundations (*Evkaf Nezareti*) and Ministry of Finance (*Mukataat Nezareti*), for instance, are not regarded as ministerial organizations despite their names involving the word ministry (Dik, 2012: 25). In this context, considering the institutional functions and personnel structure of Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Interior, it can be argued that these are the first western type ministerial organizations.<sup>2</sup> This argument can be further strengthened given the fact that European predecessors of these Ministries were based on what

---

<sup>2</sup> Herein, it should be noted that although Foreign Ministry is considered to be the first ministerial type of organization, it took until 1880s for institutions that incorporated traditional institutions from *reis 'ül küttab* to be established. See, Ortaylı, 2014a: 146; Ortaylı, 1985: 279-280.

is considered to be standard duties of states, namely foreign affairs, defense, justice, treasury and internal affairs (Karaer, 1990: 48).

Establishment of Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Interior in 1836 were followed by establishment of other ministries such as Treasury, Defense and Justice. However, none of these institutions played as essential a role as Foreign Ministry in terms of implementation of reforms. Besides, these institutions, contrary to Foreign Ministry, are far from establishing a model for Turkish public administration.<sup>3</sup> The first reason for that is lack of a continuous ministerial organization in the abovementioned institutions unlike that of Foreign Ministry. Foreign Ministry remained active from its establishment in 1836 to the fall of Ottoman Empire, and was inherited by the Republic of Turkey. As a second reason, one can refer to the fact that establishment of the institutional identity of these other institutions took a longer time than it did with Foreign Ministry. In this context, the first reason is directly related to the first one. Also, Ortaylı states that Foreign Ministry sets the best example in terms of basing establishment of other institutions on classical grand vezirate (*Sadaret*) institutions. Therefore, many researchers studying improvement of foreign affairs were influenced by the unique progress of this institution and examined the uninterruptedness of Ottoman tradition through this institution (Ortaylı, 2008: 486). An examination on other ministries established in the same period such as internal affairs, treasury, justice and defense reveals that the institutional continuity of these institutions were interrupted. This caused a latency in terms of establishment of institutional identities of these institutions.

The Office of the Lieutenant of the Grand Vezir (*Sadaret Kethüdalığı*) was transformed into Ministry of Government Affairs (*Umur-ı Mülkiye Nezareti*) through an imperial edict (*hatt-ı hümayun*) issued by Mahmud II in 1836. Shortly after, the institution was renamed Ministry of Interior (Takvîm-i Vekâyi, 9 B 1253: No.155). Through a regulation made in 1839, this Ministry was abolished and until its re-establishment in 1869, its duties were undertaken by undersecretariat, *mektubî* office, grand vezirate and other units (*dâhiliye kitabeti*, *dâhiliye kalemi*, and other sub-units) (Akyıldız, 1993: 29). Upon abolition of Ministry of Interior, undersecretary of ministry of interior, too, was transformed into undersecretary of grand vezir. As a matter of fact, examination on the documents of the period clearly shows that undersecretary of grand vezir undertook internal affairs (İ.DH.341.22423; İ.DH.121.6167; Akyıldız, 1993: 29-30). Upon decease of Fuad Pasha in 1869, it was decided to re-establish

---

<sup>3</sup> For detailed information regarding Foreign Ministry as a modernization model for Turkish Public Administration, See, Ezici, 2020.

Ministry of Interior as execution of all duties became difficult when grand vezirate and foreign ministry was assumed by Ali Pasha (Shaw and Shaw, 2005: 71-72; İpşirli, 1993: 414). After two years of operation, Ministry was reincorporated into grand vezirate with a new change in 1871 and undersecretary of grand vezir was re-established (Akgündüz, 2015: 198). Findley attributes this change to the underdevelopment of central organs of Ministry of Interior and to determination of Sublime Porte governors to gather authorities in as few people as possible (Findley, 2014: 208).

Ministry of Interior was re-established for a third time in 5 February, 1877 and Ahmet Cevdet Pasha was appointed as the minister (Akgündüz, 2015: 201; Takvîm-i Vekâyi, 24 M 1294: No.1862). From this date on, the Ministry gradually developed and the centralist approach shown by Abdulhamid II, in particular, contributed greatly to this development. However, even through this stage of development, many changes were made within this institution. According to İpşirli, there were around ten to twelve offices under this institution, however, the Ottoman yearbooks (*salnâme*) suggest that there were over a hundred units established and abolished within Ministry of Interior between 1877 and 1910 (İpşirli, 1993: 415). This clearly shows the hardships that took place during establishment of institutional continuity and institutional identity. As of this date, Ministry of Interior became an important ministry within the Empire.

Another institution established within the framework of State's standard duties is Ministry of Finance (*Maliye Nezareti*). Although important reforms were implemented during *Tanzimat* period to ensure fiscal centralization, these initiatives were often interrupted (Ortaylı, 2008: 475). Thus, examination on period of establishment of the Ministry of Finance clearly shows the development of the unstable process. Ministry of Finance was established through an imperial rescript issued on 28 February 1838 (Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi, 1302: 104). However, Ministry of Finance was abolished later on, and the Imperial Treasury Financial Office (*Hazine-i Amire Defterdarlığı*) and Financial Office of Treasury of Army (*Hazine-i Mukataat Defterdarlığı*) were established. During the *Tanzimat* period, new units were established under central and provincial organization for a tax collection system and abolition of *iltizam*. While *Muqata'ah* Financial Office was abolished to be united under Treasury of the Army, the Imperial Treasury was merged under the name Imperial Treasury Financial Office (*Hazain-i Amire*). This unit was established to undertake tax-related duties in places where *Tanzimat* was not applied. Ministry of Finance was re-established in 19 January 1840 to deal with financial affairs of the units where *Tanzimat* was implemented. Imperial Treasury Financial Office was

abolished in April, 1840, and Ministry of Finance was made the sole responsibility of financial affairs (Akyıldız, 1993: 111-114).<sup>4</sup>

The judicial organization in Ottoman Empire also developed late compared to other ministries. Western law elements were transferred through *Tanzimat*, and the foundation for Ministry of Justice (*Adliye Nezareti*) was established with organizational arrangements (Demirel, 2003: 24). Despite all developments, Ministry of Justice was the only body that was not completely established during *Tanzimat* period. Establishment of Ministry of Justice was delayed until 1870 due to establishment of *nizamiye* courts and expansion of jurisdiction of *nizamiye* courts against ecclesiastics (*şer'i*) courts (Ortaylı, 2014a: 162). At this point, it should be noted that pre-*Tanzimat* judicial system underwent significant changes during *Tanzimat* period. Becoming a court of appeal through some changes after its establishment, Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Divan-ı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye*) was incorporated into Ministry of Justice. Consequently, appellate courts and courts of appeal became separate organizations within this ministry (Aydın, 1994: 388). Significant changes were made within the organization through *Islahat-ı Adliye Hakkında Şeref Sadır Olan Ferman-ı Âli*, (imperial order for the reform of justice system) enacted in 12 December 1875 shortly before which Cevdet Pasha was appointed as the court minister (1 December 1875). The Ministry was referred to as Ministry of Justice in the documents issued after these developments. Following this transition period, organization of Ministry of Justice was completed through the first organization regulation made in 1879 (Demirel, 2003: 25-26).

There were latencies in ministerial organization of military services, too. After abolition of the Janissaries (*vaka-i hayriye*), military affairs were undertaken by Headquarters of the Commander in Chief (*Bâb-ı Seraskerî*). Appointed as the grand vezir for a second time in 1863, Fuad Pasha had to undertake Headquarters of the Commander in Chief services. Ministry of War was established so that bureaucratic affairs could be carried out. However, this institution had the characteristics of an office under Headquarters of the Commander in Chief rather than a ministry. The actual transition of Headquarters of the Commander in Chief into Ministry of War would take place in 1879. Although this institution was restored to its former structure in 1884, it was re-established in 22 July 1908 (Özcan, 1997: 119).

At this point, it is seen that institutional continuity of many institutions established within the context of standard duties of the state was interrupted. It can also be seen that such

---

<sup>4</sup> As of this date, changes in the financial organization continued. See. *ibid*, p.114-127.

interruptions did not take place within Foreign Ministry. However, it does not mean that there were no changes made within Foreign Ministry. Reasons such as the importance of maintaining diplomatic affairs due to conditions of the period, the need for expert personnel to carry out these affairs, institution directors being important statespersons gave prominence to Foreign Ministry during implementation of the reforms. The fact that grand vezirate and foreign ministry were undertaken altogether caused these duties to be intertwined (Ortaylı, 2014a: 146). Also, the fact that ministers of foreign ministry simultaneously undertook duties in other institutions as well contributed to the importance of foreign ministry. For example, Âli Pasha and Fuad Pasha undertook High Council of Reforms (*Meclis-i Âli-i Tanzimat*) duties along with serving as ministers of foreign ministry. There are other similar examples that took place during the period (Taşkesenlioğlu, 2014: 87-88; Takvîm-i Vekâyi, 26 Ş 1271: No.523; Kunalalp, 1999: 1-11). An addition to these reasons could be the fact that Minister of Foreign Ministry became the most effective title after the grand vezir as a result of increasing importance of conducting diplomatic affairs (Karal, 2011: 118). Concordantly, according to some researchers, even though Foreign Ministry was within Sublime Porte, it had an independent position due to its effectiveness in foreign affairs. Due to these characteristics, this office operated under direct responsibility to the Sultan (Sakaoğlu, 1985: 1284).

## **2. The Three Pashas of the Tanzimat**

Following the abolition of the Janissaries, with a short-term exception in 1876, the military was not a politically influential force until 1908. After the Egyptian Crisis, the power of the Palace passed on to the foreign-ministry-origin pashas that were raised in Translation Office, could communicate with Europe through their foreign language skills, and were supported by European states (Akşin, 2014: 34-35; Baykara, 1994: 269).<sup>5</sup> Also, the rise of this class was influenced by the personal characteristics of the Sultans who ascended the throne after Mahmud II, and the legal security granted to this civil bureaucratic class in 1830s. With the directors that came out of this class, Sublime Porte went through its most prestigious period until 1871. Civil bureaucracy gaining power had a direct impact on the era of reforms (Findley, 2014: 176-177).

Influential statespersons such as Mustafa Reşid, Âli and Fuad Pashas played an active role in giving new civil bureaucrats prominence. This paved the way for these people to steer

---

<sup>5</sup> This activity ended in 1871 with decease of Âli Pasha and the French defeat against Prussia. See. Akşin, *ibid*, p.36.

the process of reforms. Initiated during Mustafa Reşid Pasha's period, "*vuzera* (plural for vezir) *hegemony*" continued through Âli and Fuad Pasha. This is an important development in terms of understanding the power gained by high bureaucracy during *Tanzimat* (Mardin, 1957: 12). After the death of Mustafa Reşid Pasha in 1858, Âli and Fuad Pashas were the most prominent names in terms of implementation of the reforms. Âli and Fuad Pashas undertook duties of grand vezirate between the death of Âli Pasha on 6 August 1861 and 6 September 1871, except for a thirteen-month period. Also, he, who was not the grand vezir at the time, undertook duties of minister of foreign ministry. After the death of Fuad Pasha in 1869, these two offices were combined and governed by Âli Pasha (Davison, 2005: 115, 244). In summary, grand vezirate, foreign ministry and other important state affairs were undertaken by one of these three pashas, there were even times when these affairs were gathered under one person.

These three important statespersons served in the most important levels of the state from 1850s onward. During the twenty-five-year period between September, 1846 when Mustafa Reşid Pasha was first appointed grand vezir and September, 1871 when Âli Pasha deceased, there is only a period of five years and seven months during which either of these statespersons did not serve as the grand vezir. A similar situation takes place with foreign ministry, as well. Mustafa Reşid Pasha was appointed to this office for the first time between July, 1839 and March, 1841, and for a second time in December 1845. From this date until September, 1871, there is only a thirteen-month period during which foreign ministry was not undertaken by one of these three statesmen. This shows that these three statesmen carried out the foreign affairs of the Empire. Another institution where these statesmen were effective is the Council of *Tanzimat*. Three of the six chairmen of this council during its period of active operation (1854-1861) were these three pashas. During the five years and nine months this council operated, the period of absence of one of these three names is two years. In short, these three pashas were the most effective statespersons in general administration and foreign policy administration between 1845 and 1871 (Kuneralp, 1999: 1-11).

The fact that these three statesmen were the most prominent ones during this period had a direct impact on implementation of reforms. At this point, it can be seen that one of the reasons as to why Foreign Ministry was the most prominent institution during the era of reforms was its directors.

### 3. Qualified Foreign Ministry Personnel and Translation Office

During the modernization period of Ottoman Empire, bureaucrats who had foreign language skills and could communicate with the West had a special position. These qualified personnel had the opportunity to monitor and understand Europe. Thus, the practices of European states were transferred to the Empire. As a matter of fact, the state took initiatives to train such personnel; schools and other institutions where this kind of personnel are to be trained were established by the state itself. With this policy, the state aimed to create a supportive force in implementation of reforms (Belge, 2012: 51). This new civil bureaucratic class gaining power resulted in confrontation with other active groups in the Empire. They underwent important differences of opinion with the janissaries, *ulema* and the Sultan (Mardin, 2000: 136). However, bureaucracy gained a significant amount of power as of 1840s and they became the most effective group within the state.

The new civil bureaucratic class taking an active role in implementation of the reforms resulted in a need for qualified personnel to undertake duties in such implementations. As a matter of fact, there was a lack of qualified personnel in the implementation of reforms in Mahmud II and *Tanzimat* periods. This situation complicated implementation of the reforms as planned (Ortaylı, 2008: 407). For instance, Fuad Pasha points out that the Empire has vast territories and there is a lack of qualified personnel in some parts of the Empire.<sup>6</sup>

A similar problem occurred in implementation of regulations in rural areas, as well. This problem faced by the high administration level was eliminated by training personnel who were educated by Sublime Porte offices and knew the rules of correspondence known as scribal profession (*kitabeta*) (Çadırcı, 1985: 223). In an imperial order dated 1854, it is emphasized that unqualified people should not be involved in state affairs and within the context of employing competent people, the personnel should be literate, competent in order and law, and skillful. It is also clearly stated in this imperial command that a new regulation should be made and the personnel must be disciplined without delay in case of deliberate violation of the rules (İ.HR.113.5509). In a document related to establishment of *Mekteb-i Ma'ârif-i Adliyye* (School of Justice Education) during *Tanzimat*, it is mentioned that it was decided to establish a school around Sublime Porte so that qualified personnel could be trained as the scribes who were trained in old fashions knew only the rules of correspondence rather than being capable of writing in Arabic and Persian, and the personnel to undertake duties in internal and foreign

---

<sup>6</sup> Karal states that the journal that involves this text is in his personal library. See. Karal, 2011: 31.



affairs of the state were not competent in mathematical and geographical sciences (Akyıldız, 1993: 54-55).

The need for qualified personnel emerged not only at lower levels but also at senior levels. For example, during the period when diplomacy became prominent, people with knowledge and experience were assigned to relevant positions. As mentioned above, the most important examples of this trend are Mustafa Reşid Pasha, Âli Pasha and Fuad Pasha. There were similar developments that took place during Abdulhamid II's reign. According to Bouquet, this is limited to relevant examples. At this point, it is highly likely that it is because of the lack of experienced and qualified personnel that same people carried out relevant duties for long periods (Bouquet, 2016: 469). There is a similar case with ministers of Foreign Ministry and Sultan's Private Treasury (*hazine-i hassa*) ministers.<sup>7</sup>

One of the main characteristics of the need for qualified personnel during the reform process is related to foreign language skills. Translation emerged as an essential need during this process. To address this need, reformers added French classes to Western-style education institutions to have foreign languages taught and translations made from them, as well as establishing Translation Office (Deren, 2012: 385). Establishment of Translation Office resulted in training of important bureaucrats. Assignment of these bureaucrats to embassies enabled these personnel to obtain/improve foreign language skills, get to know Europe closely and gain experience in the field of international affairs (Yalçinkaya, 2010: 185).

Translation Office<sup>8</sup> took up important duties for other institutions as well as training Muslim personnel who speak foreign languages. According to İsmail Hakkı, Translation Unit, as one of the three units within Directorate General of Political Affairs (*Umûr-ı Siyasiye Müdiriyeti Umumiyesi*), is an important one. Hakkı also mentions that not only Foreign Ministry, but also Grand Vezirate and Ministry of Interior sent documents to this unit for translation as it bears Sublime Porte Translation Office title (İsmail Hakkı, 1328: 151-152). Additionally, Translation Office personnel undertook duties in terms of translation of official newspapers (*Takvîm-i Vekâyi*) to French, bringing telegram to Ottoman Empire, working in institutions in the scientific field such as *Encümen-i Daniş* (Council of Counsel) and Ottoman

---

<sup>7</sup>A total of forty two people were appointed as grand vezir that witnessed seventy nine re-appointments between 1839 and 1922. Twenty four people were appointed as minister of Privy Purse that witnessed thirty nine re-appointments in total between 1839 and 1909. There were only thirty four ministers of the Foreign Ministry that witnessed sixty eight re-appointments 1839 and 1922. See, Kunalp, 1999: XV-XIX.

<sup>8</sup> Foreign languages were taught in other institutions such as The Imperial School (Galatasaray) in addition to Translation Office. This school stands out as an institution where staff of foreign ministry were trained. See, Findley, 1996: 166-167. Quataert has a similar opinion on the Imperial School. See, Quataert, 2005: 82.

Society of Science (*Cemiyet-i İlmiyye-i Osmaniyye*) and translation of dictionaries and many other works (Balçı, 2019: 133-162).

#### 4. Incubator Role

During transition to ministerial-type organization in the Empire, Foreign Ministry and partially Ministry of Finance undertook an incubator role. These units were established within ministry in the form of expert councils (Ayman Güler, 2013: 177). The fact that some units that would later gain an independent ministry identity were established within Foreign Ministry is important in terms of demonstrating the effectiveness of Foreign Ministry. As a matter of fact, a literature review on this issue shows that extra duties of governments are undertaken by ministries of internal. Therefore, ministries of internal have undertaken various duties including communications, highways, education, commerce, agriculture, church affairs, fight against poverty, security and public order. Within the process, these services were organized as separate ministries (Chapman, 1970: 40). For example, this is how the process developed in France (Gournay, 1971: 132).

This process followed a different path in Ottoman Empire's perspective. These duties were undertaken by Foreign Ministry as Ministry of Interior was unable to establish a developed institutional structure until 1870s. The fact that Foreign Ministry worked closely with Grand Vezirate and had powerful directors must have had an impact on this process. Also, it is known that these councils established within the Ministry had international qualities. This shows that Foreign Ministry undertook broad and extensive duties and minister of foreign ministry became the second most powerful position after grand vezir (Findley, 2014: 2012).

One of the units established within Foreign Ministry is related to agriculture. Efforts to improve agriculture and agricultural economy is important in this period because a significant portion of the state revenue is obtained from this area (Eren, 1979: 735). The need to improve this area and to train qualified personnel became the main goal (Güran, 1998: 45). For this reason, a council named "*zira'ât ve sına'ât*" (agriculture and industry) was established under Foreign Ministry (HAT.492.24121; Akyıldız, 1993: 259). This council was formed under Mustafa Reşid Pasha's supervision (Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi, 1302: 128; Kaynar, 2010: 99). In this context, the establishment of this Council under Foreign Ministry and submission of its decisions to Mustafa Reşid Pasha is an important indicator of the effectiveness of Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Foreign Ministry (Akyıldız, 1993: 259; Karal, 2011: 221). Nuri Efendi,

Undersecretary of Foreign Ministry was appointed as the chairman of this council. At this point, it can be understood that this was also a conscious decision. As a matter of fact, it is known that Nuri Efendi who had served at the embassies to Paris and London, made examinations in economic and agricultural areas during this period (Önsoy, 1986: 1687). The Council was shortly after renamed as Council of Public Works (*Meclis-i Umûr-ı Nâfi 'a*) (Takvîm-i Vekâyi, 13 C 1254: No.170; Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi, 1302: 128). Later, this council was transferred to the Ministry of Trade (*Ticaret Nezareti*) (Akyıldız, 2007: 507; Akyıldız, 1993: 260-261).<sup>9</sup>

Another unit established under Foreign Ministry is the Quarantine Board (*Karantina Meclisi*). After the plague outbreak in Istanbul, Mahmud II initiated a quarantine initiative in compliance with international rules. It is known that this decision was discussed within the established boards (Çadırcı, 2013: 305). In order to prevent the epidemic and to be able to take necessary measures, the Quarantine Board was established by the Sultan Mahmud II in 1838, as a result of the necessity to establish a separate unit from administration of medicine (*Tibbiye*) (Sarıyıldız, 1994: 332-334). It was established on 20.05.1838 in the form of two units as High Council of Quarantine (*Meclis-i Tahaffuz-ı Ūlâ*) and Second Quarantine Board (*Meclis-i Tahaffuz-ı Sanî*) (Salnâme-i Nezâret-i Umûr-ı Hâriciyye, 1318: 440). The former unit was incorporated into Foreign Ministry (BEOAYN. d. Nr.1714: 17; Sarıyıldız, 1994: 338; Akyıldız, 1993: 269). It should also be noted that the quarantine had international and commercial aspects and foreign ambassadors were contacted regarding this issue. Thus, through the decision to involve foreign ambassadors in this unit, it gained an international character (Akyıldız, 1993: 272; Salnâme-i Nezâret-i Umûr-ı Hâriciyye, 1318: 440-445). It is seen that this board was later transferred to different units.<sup>10</sup>

In addition to establishment of councils mentioned above, there are other duties that Foreign Ministry undertook. For instance, Foreign Ministry took part in execution of some legal cases. However, due to the heavy workload, this kind of tasks were then transferred to the Ministry of Justice (*Deâvi Nezareti*). However, Foreign Ministry continued to execute cases and lawsuits related to foreign and non-Muslim merchants and patriarchates (Akyıldız, 1993: 81, 170). Foreign Ministry taking on tasks in the field of press (Yazıcı, 1994: 82), appointing

---

<sup>9</sup> Also Akyıldız states that the council lost its privileged position due to being incorporated by the Ministry of Trade. See, *ibid*, 261.

<sup>10</sup> This board was incorporated by Imperial Artillery, and Ministry of Interior, Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Trade. See, Sarıyıldız, 1994: 340; Akyıldız, 1993: 274-275.

government employees to civil service exams and government duties (Akyıldız, 1993: 55, 226) can be seen as other examples.

## 5. Pioneering Role/Ambassadors

Foreign Ministry is the Empire's institution that establishes relations with Europe, and for this reason developments in Europe were conveyed to the Empire through this institution. In this context, ambassadors made significant contributions in the era of reforms through the experiences they gained in the countries where they served. For example, Mustafa Efendi who was sent to in Austria in 1730 relayed information about not only his journey, but also about the developments in the West and particularly the Austrian State (Unat, 1987: 65-66). Similarly, while Ahmed Resmi Efendi conveyed information about founding, internal and financial affairs of Austria where he was appointed to serve in 1757, Ahmed Azmî Efendi relayed valuable information about internal order, social life, state organization, treasury and army of Prussia where he was sent to serve in 1790. Ebubekir Ratip Efendi, on the other hand, conducted the first detailed examination on European military, administrative and financial organization of Europe for Ottoman Empire in 1791 (Unat, 1987: 104, 152, 158). In addition, these ambassadors conveyed important information about positive sciences to the Empire (Kuran, 2013: 4-8). This is exactly what was expected from these officials. The expressions in instructions of an ambassador sent to France regarding an examination of regulations on this state's administration, order, navy and military that would be useful for the Empire, and willingness of the officials working under the ambassador to be educated about languages, sciences, education and positive sciences that could be useful for the Empire corroborate this perspective (Karal, 1988: 200).<sup>11</sup>

It is seen that as of 18<sup>th</sup> century, ambassadors examined Europe with a different perspective from their predecessors, and included information from their examinations in their memoirs (*sefâretnâme*). Thus, while pre-18<sup>th</sup> century reform recommendations included precautions to be taken based on Ibn Khaldun's theory of fall, from 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards, such information was based on active observation (Ortaylı, 2014b, 37-38). For example, the way Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmet Efendi describes Paris where he was appointed to work is regarded as a perspective of an experienced official (Tanpınar, 1976: 43-44). During his term in office, he conveyed important information based on his observations about quarantine, women's place

---

<sup>11</sup> For a document with similar statements, see. HAT.305.18002.

in the social life, public works, parliament, protocol practices, ministers, foreign minister, order of military units, opera, health practices, botanical studies and the use of observatory (Uçman, 1975). Many of these subjects seem to be new to the Empire.

Ebubekir Ratip Efendi can be seen as another example on this matter. Taking up important state duties, he took important actions within the context of New Order (*Nizâm-ı Cedîd*) and assisted Selim III in terms of implementation of reforms (Karal, 1956: 347-349). Thus, it is noteworthy that the institutions he observed were the correspondents of those in Istanbul on which reforms were planned to be implemented. For this reason, he consciously turned to areas where there are aims of reform. His goal to reach regulations on military institutions in particular is an important example (Yeşil, 2002: 101-103).

The instructions he wrote during his term as an ambassador to Austria are regarded as important reform texts. His memoirs about Austria (*Nemçe sefaretnamesi*) includes information about his journey, two types of prime ministers (administrative affairs and foreign affairs), mines, some Austrian institutions (library, academy and hospital), and cultural activities such as ball, theater, carnival and opera (Uçman, 2012: 9-42). Similarly, his *layiha* (explanatory and counseling document) also includes important views that are new to the Empire (Unat, 1987: 156; Uzunçarşılı, 1975: 58).

Sadık Rıfat Pasha is among the Ottoman ambassadors who transferred important information. He provided the first examples of the idea of *Tanzimat* in his texts. His views had an impact on Mustafa Reşid Pasha who implemented reforms (Seyitdanlıoğlu, 1996: 116; Mardin, 2000: 177). His texts were considered to be new perspectives. For example, he is the first person to have mentioned the notion of state of law which is one of the fundamentals of *Tanzimat* period. There are important examples in texts related to this subject (Sadık Rıfat Paşa, 1264a: 5; Sadık Rıfat Paşa, 1264b: 45).

When the texts he wrote are examined, it can be seen that Sadık Rıfat Pasha suggested a different perspective from the ongoing classical Ottoman politics (Kuran, 1976: 1452-1453). Many of Sadık Rıfat Pasha's views that he expresses in his *Avrupa Ahvâline Dair Risalesi* (article about European current conditions) was implemented during *Tanzimat* period. These views include concepts such as security of life, property and chastity, prevention of bribery, information about military service, training of military officers, taxation according to financial condition of individuals, use of paper money known as banknotes, and the police organization (Sadık Rıfat Paşa, 1264a: 1-12). It is known that similar views are included in other texts of Sadık Rıfat Pasha. For example, there is no doubt that the idea that governments are for the

people and not the other way around is much closer an understanding to the Western liberalism than it is to Ottoman's classical understanding of administration (Seyitdanlıoğlu, 1996: 116). Also, in this text, he also touches upon the equality of Muslim and non-Muslim subjects which is one of the important elements of *Tanzimat* (Sadık Rıfat Paşa, 1264b: 47). Again, it can be seen that the subject of institutionalization (Sadık Rıfat Paşa, 1264b: 45) on which Sadık Rıfat Pasha emphasizes corresponds exactly to the idea of institutionalism advocated by Mustafa Reşid Pasha (Mardin, 2012: 151, 158). Another element that was introduced by Sadık Rıfat Pasha is regarding the field of economics. Ideas such as the invisible hand, direct relation of state's power with its economic condition, private property, and free trade without state intervention point to the views of the classical economists and physiocrats of the period (Mardin, 2012: 164-165).

It is possible to provide more examples throughout Ottoman history. These are important indicators of the fact that many ideas and developments that emerged in Europe were transferred to the Ottoman Empire. This is another important factor that boosts the effectiveness of Foreign Ministry personnel during the era of reform.

## 6. Unique Institutions

Foreign Ministry is established by new units just as the formation of expert councils within itself. For example, the position of undersecretary and Foreign Affairs Directorates (*umur-ı ecnebiyye müdürlükleri*) are important institutions in this regard.

Constituted through establishment of Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Interior, and inherited by the Republic of Turkey in Turkish public administration system, undersecretary (*müsteşarlık*) is associated with the word counsellor (*müşavir*), but these two concepts are used to specify different tasks (Baysun, 1979: 836). According to some sources, the term which is the Ottoman Turkish equivalent of counsellor is used to refer to general secretary working in the ministry or undersecretary of the state in the West. It is stated that the term is a conjugation of the word counsellor (*müşir*) which means a person who provides consultancy (Deny, 1993: 732-733; Baysun, 1979: 836). According to Baysun, the term is probably used as a correspondent of *conseiller d'ambassade* (Counsellor of Embassy) and *sous secrétaire d'état* (Undersecretary of State) during the period influenced by the West. Examining Ottoman history, it is known that this term is used in the pre-ministerial period, as well. However, it was also used to specify different tasks before ministries in the Ottoman history (Baysun, 1979:

836). In this context, this unit was established through establishment of Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Government Affairs, and then used in other ministries. Thus, after establishment under Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Interior, this unit was established under other ministries such as undersecretary of Navy and undersecretary of Ministry of Finance in 1837, and undersecretary of Ministry of Religious Foundations in 1838. In this context, undersecretary of Ministry of Trade and undersecretary of Grand Vezir can also be mentioned. In the process, there was an increase in the number of undersecretaries and counsellors were appointed to assist ministers who were not included in the council of ministers. This characterization continued to be used for different units, as well (Baysun, 1979: 836-837).

Another unit established under Foreign Ministry is Provincial Foreign Affairs Directorates. Although it may seem interesting at first glance that Foreign Ministry established units in the provinces, considering the conditions of the period, it can be said that this situation was a result of a need. Examination of this example is important in terms of monitoring development of departments outside the central organization. Two examples that one can refer to in this context are Provincial Foreign Affairs Directors and translators of these units. These units undertook duties to address issues experienced by representatives of foreign consulates and residents who are stated as foreign nationals, and the problems that reflected on provinces caused by diplomatic crises in the Empire. It is seen that these units were examined in 1864 and 1871 Provincial Regulations (*Vilayet Nizamnameleri*) (Findley, 2014: 218-219). Also, it is known that these units, which consist of directorates and interpreters, were established in many regions of the Empire (*Hâriciye Nezâret-i Celîlesinin Salnâmesi*, 1306: 313-315). At this point, it can be seen that undersecretaries and provincial foreign affairs directorates are unique institutions that were established under Foreign Ministry.

Examination on Foreign Ministry shows that it was an institution that was in close relation with the West. However, Findley argues that the West did not play a role in organization of Foreign Ministry. According to Findley, there is no evidence in early 19<sup>th</sup> century Foreign Ministry central organization that suggests that Foreign Ministry was established based on a Western precedent (Findley, 2014: 300). This suggests that Foreign Ministry was established and shaped within the framework of the needs of the Empire.

## Conclusion

Foreign Ministry officials who had skills and knowledge about diplomacy, therefore the Foreign Ministry itself, functioned as an important institutional structure until 1871 since its establishment in 1836. This institution played a significant role in not only maintaining foreign affairs but also transferring reforms to the Empire and implementation of them. Due to some of its characteristics, Foreign Ministry was more preeminent than other institutions during the era of reforms.

The first reason behind this preeminence is the uninterruptedness of Foreign Ministry's organization and the superior position that it holds among other ministries. When examined the institutions established within the framework of state's standard duties such as Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, and Ministry of War, it can be seen that either institutional processes of these institutions were interrupted or it took them longer to institutionalize. Additionally, it is seen that Foreign Ministry gained a superior position among the other institutions during this period. The primary reason for this superiority is the importance that the institution gains due to undertaking diplomacy services. Replacing the military power of the state, diplomacy was used as an important tool for the continuity of the state. Another reason behind this superiority is that Foreign Ministry was often carried out in close contact with grand vezirate.

The secondary reason as to why Foreign Ministry played an active role during era of reforms is directly related with the first one. It should be noted that Mustafa Reşid Pasha, Âli Pasha and Fuad Pasha who guided the fate of the Empire and served as grand vezir and foreign ministers were originally from Foreign Ministry. In addition to maintaining foreign affairs, these three important statesmen played a primary role in the era of reforms. It can be seen that this continued until Âli Pasha deceased in 1871. Therefore, similar to how it went in government levels, Foreign Ministry personnel became prominent due to their qualities. Having gained valuable experiences in terms of foreign languages and reforms in embassies, Foreign Ministry staff took up important duties upon their return to Istanbul. At this point, it should be stated that Translation Office staff, as well as Foreign Ministry staff, had similar characteristics as some of the Foreign Ministry staff were already from the Translation Office.

An additional reason why Foreign Ministry gained power during the era of reforms is that some institutions were established under this ministry. Units such as the Quarantine board and agriculture council were established within Foreign Ministry and were later transferred to other ministries. Considering the international qualities of these units, and the fact that they



were established to bring new practices to the Empire, it does not seem surprising that they were established under Foreign Ministry.

Given that Foreign Ministry was a gateway to the West, it can be said that diplomacy was used as an important tool to transfer reforms to the Empire. In this context, ambassadors appointed abroad since *reis ül-küttab* period, ensured transfer of many important innovations to the Empire. It is known that many officials working under ambassadors returned to the Empire having acquired important information.

When examined some of the institutions that were established under the Foreign Ministry, another factor that played a role in this ministry's prominence emerges. Undersecretaries and Provincial Foreign Affairs Directorates are unique institutions for the Empire. It is known that undersecretariat was first established under Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Government Affairs, and later on was used by other units. Provincial Foreign Affairs Directorates and their interpreters are noteworthy examples in this regard in that they were provincial organizations with international qualities. As one can see, Foreign Ministry, due to both conditions of the period and its institutional characteristics, took up a more active role in implementation of reforms than other institutions.

## **REFERENCES**

### **Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye Directorate of State Archives**

Babıali Evrak Odası Ayniyat Defterleri: Nr.1714.

Hatt-ı Hümayun (HAT): 00492.24121; 305.18002.

İrade Dahiliye (İ.DH): 00341.22423; 00121.006167.

İrade Hariciye (İ.HR):00113.005509.

### **Official Publications**

*Hâriciye Nezâret-i Celîlesinin Salnâmesi*, (1306), Matba'a-i Osmaniye.

*Salnâme-i Nezâret-i Umûr-ı Hâriciyye*, (1318), Dersaadet: Matba'a-i Osmaniye.

*Takvîm-i Vekâyi*, Nr. 170, 13 C 1254 (03.09.1838).

*Takvîm-i Vekâyi*, Nr.155, 9 B 1253 (09.10.1837).

*Takvîm-i Vekâyi.*, No.523, 26 Ş 1271 (14.05.1855).

*Takvîm-i Vekâyi*, No.1862, 24 M 1294 (08.02.1877).

### **Book, Article and Thesis**

Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi, (1302), *Tarih-i Lûtfî (ez-Tarih-i Ahmed Lûtfî)*, Vol. 5.

Akgündüz, Ahmed, (2015), *Arşiv Belgeleri Işığında Dâhiliye Nezâreti Tarihi* (Ankara: Tiav).

Akşin, Sina, (2014), *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi).

Akyıldız, Ali, (1993), *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilâtında Reform (1836-1856)* (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık).

Akyıldız, Ali, (2007), “Osmanlılar: Modern Dönem”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 33: 506-509.

Aydın, M. Âkif, (1994), “Dîvân-ı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 9: 387-388.

Ayman Güler, Birgül, (2013), *Türkiye'nin Yönetimi-Yapı-* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi).

Balcı, Sezai (2019), “Tanzimat Döneminde Babıâli Tercüme Odası ve Yenileşme Faaliyetlerine Etkisi”, , Dönmez, Ahmet (ed.), *Osmanlı Modernleşmesi, Reform Çağında Çözüm Arayışları*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi): 133-162.

Baykara, Tuncer, (1994), “II. Mahmud'un Islahatında İç Temeller: 1826-1839 Arasında Anadolu”, *Tanzimat'ın 150.Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu, Ankara: 31 October - 3 November 1989* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu): 263-270.

Baysun, M. Cavid, (1979), “Müsteşar”, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8 (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı): 835-837.

Belge, Murat, (2012), “Batılılaşma: Türkiye ve Rusya”, Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur (ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, Vol. 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları): 43-55.

Bouquet, Olivier, (2016), *Sultanın Paşaları (1839-1909)* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları) (çev. Devrim Çetinkasap).

Chapman, Brian, (1970), *İdare Mesleği, Avrupada Devlet Memurluğu* (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları) (çev. Cahit Tutum).

Çadırcı, Musa, (1985), “Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Ülke Yönetimi”, Belge, Murat (ed.), *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları).

Çadırcı, Musa, (2013), *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapısı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Davison, Roderic H., (2005), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Reform, 1856-1876* (İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı) (çev. Osman Akınhay).

Demirel, Fatmagül, (2003), *Adliye Nezareti’nin Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri (1876-1914)*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, İstanbul University.

Deny, J., (1993), “Mustashar”, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. VII, New Edition, (Leiden: E. J. Brill): 732-733.

Deren, Seçil, (2012), “Kültürel Batılılaşma”, Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur (ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, Vol. 3, (İstanbul: İletişim): 382-402..

Dik, Esra, (2012), *Türkiye’de Bakanlık Sistemi ve Geleceği*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ankara University.

Eren, A. Cevad, (1979), “Tanzimât”, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol.11, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi):709-765.

Ezici, Erhan, (2020), *Hariciye Teşkilatı; Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Bir Modernleşme Modeli*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ankara University.

Findley, Carter V. Findley, (2014), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Bürokratik Reform, Babıâli, 1789-1922* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları).

Findley, Carter V., (1996), *Kalemiyeden Mülkiyeye, Osmanlı Memurlarının Toplumsal Tarihi* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları) (çev. Gül Çağalı Güven).

Findley, Carter V., (1997), “Hariciye Nezâreti”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 16, (İstanbul): 178-180.

Gourney, Bernard, (1971), *Yönetim Bilimine Giriş, Çağdaş Topumlarda Kamu Yönetimi* (Ankara: TODAİE) (çev. İhsan Kuntbay).

Güran, Tefik, (1998), *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Tarımı Üzerine Araştırmalar* (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık).

İpşirli, Mehmet, (1993), “Dahiliye Nezâreti”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8, (İstanbul): 414-416.

İsmail Hakkı, (1328), *Hukuk-ı İdare* (Dersaadet: Kanaât Matbaası).

Karaer, Tacettin, (1990), “Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Devlet Bakanlığı Sorunu”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 23 (2): 47-74.

Karal, Enver Ziya, (1956) “Ebu Bekir Ratıb Efendi'nin ‘Nizam-ı Cedit’ Islahatında Rolü”, *V. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, 12-17 Nisan 1956, (Ankara): 347-355.

Karal, Enver Ziya, (1988), *Selim III'ün Hat-tı Hümayunları, Nizam-ı Cedit, 1789-1807* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Karal, Enver Ziya, (2011), *Osmanlı Tarihi, Islahat Fermanı Devri 1856-1861*, Vol. 6, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Kaynar, Reşat, (2010), *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Kinross, Lord, (2009), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi).

Kuneralp, Sinan, (1999), *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkân ve Ricali (1839-1922) Prosopografik Rehber*, (İstanbul: İsis).

Kuran, Ercüment, (1976), “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda İnsan Hakları ve Sadık Rifat Paşa (1807-1857)”, *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, 11-15 Ekim 1976, Vol. II, (Ankara): 1449-1453.

Kuran, Ercüment, (2013), *Türkiye’nin Batılılaşması ve Millî Meseleler* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı).

Lewis, Bernard, (1996), *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu) (çev. Metin Kıratlı).

Mardin, Şerif, (1957), “Yeni Osmanlıların Hakikî Hüviyeti, I: Tanzimat Bürokrasisi”, *Forum*, 7 (79): 1 July.

Mardin, Şerif, (2000), *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought, A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, (Syracuse University Press).

Mardin, Şerif, (2012), “Tanzimat Fermanı’nın Manâsı: Yeni Bir İzah Denemesi”, İnalcık, H. ve M. Seyitdanlıoğlu, (ed.), *Tanzimat, Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları): 147-165.

Önsoy, Rifat, (1986), “Tanzimat Döneminde Sanayi ve Ticaretle İlgili Meclisler (1839-1876)”, *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, 22-26 Eylül 1986, Vol. 4, (Ankara): 1685-1696.

Ortaylı, İlber, (1985), “Osmanlı Diplomasisi ve Dışişleri Örgütü”, Belge, Murat (ed.), *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 1, (İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları): 278-281.

Ortaylı, İlber, (2008), *Türkiye Teşkilât ve İdare Tarihi* (Ankara: Cedit Neşriyat).

Ortaylı, İlber, (2014a), *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları).

Ortaylı, İlber, (2014b), “Osmanlı’da 18.Yüzyıl Düşünce Dünyasına Dair Notlar”, Aklan, Mehmet Ö. (ed.), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce, Cumhuriyet’e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, Cilt 1, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları): 37-41.

Özcan, Abdülkadir, (1997), “Harbiye Nezâreti”, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 16: 119-120.

Quataert, Donald, (2005), *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Sadık Rıfat Paşa, (1264a), “Rıf’at Paşa Merhumun Viyana’da İbtidaki Sefaretinde Avrupa’nın Ahvaline Dair Yazdığı Risaledir”, *Müntahâbât-ı Asâr*.

Sadık Rıfat Paşa, (1264b), “İdare-i Hükümetin Bazı Kava’id-i Esasiyesini Mütezammın Rıf’at Paşa Merhumun Kaleme Aldığı Risaledir”, *Müntahâbât-ı Asâr*.

Sakaoğlu, Necdet, (1985), “Padişahlık ve Sadrazamlık Kurumu”, Belge, Murat (ed.), *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 5, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları): 1278-1285.

Sarıyıldız, Gülden, (1994), “Karantina Meclisi’nin Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri”, *Bellekten*, 58 (222):329-376.

Seyitdanlıoğlu, Mehmet, (1996), “Sadık Rıfat Paşa ve Avrupa’nın Ahvâline Dâir Risâlesi”, *Liberal Düşünce*, No.3:115-124.

Shaw, Stanford J. ve Ezel Kural Shaw, (2005), *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Vol. 2: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi, (1976), *On Dokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (İstanbul: Çağlayan).

Taşkesenlioğlu, Muhammed Yasin, (2014), *Kuruluşu, Yapısı ve Uygulamalarıyla Meclis-i Âli-i Tanzimat (1854-1861)*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Atatürk University.

Turan, Namık Sinan, (2015), *İmparatorluk ve Diplomasi, Osmanlı Diplomasinin İzinde*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları).

Turfan, M. Naim (2013), *Jön Türklerin Yükselişi, Siyaset, Askerler ve Osmanlı’nın Çöküşü* (İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım) (çev. Mehmet Moralı).

Uçman, Abdullah (haz.), (2012), *Ebûbekir Râtib Efendi’nin Nemçe Sefâretnâmesi* (İstanbul: Kitabevi).

Uçman, Abdullah (haz.), (1975), *Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmet Efendi’nin Fransa Sefâretnâmesi* (Tercüman Yayınları).

Unat, Faik Reşit, (1987), *Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Sefaretnameleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı, (1975) “Tosyalı Ebûbekir Ratib Efendi”, *Belleten*, 39 (153): 49-76.

Yalçınkaya, M. Alaaddin, (2010), “II. Mahmud Dönemi Osmanlı Diplomasisi”, Yılmaz, Coşkun (ed.), *II. Mahmud, Yeniden Yapılanma Sürecinde İstanbul* (İstanbul): 179-190.

Yazıcı, Nesimi, (1994), “Tanzimat Dönemi Basını Konusunda Bir Değerlendirme”, *Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu, Ankara: 31 Ekim-3 Kasım 1989* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu): 55-84.

Yeşil, Fatih, (2002), *III. Selim Döneminde Bir Osmanlı Bürokratı: Ebubekir Ratib Efendi*, Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis, Hacettepe University.

Zürcher, Eric Jan, (2009), *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları).

## Geniřletilmiř zet

XIX. yzyılın bařları, Osmanlı İmparatorluęu aısından nemli bir dnemi ifade etmektedir. Yařanan Mısır krizi ve devletin, kendi valisi karřısında aldıęı maęlubiyetlerin devleti nemli bir krize srklemesi olayının uluslararası bir boyut kazanması, İmparatorluęun sonraki dnemi iin nemli deęiřimleri beraberinde getirmiřtir. zellikle 1826 yılında Yenieri Ocaęının kaldırılması sonrasında askeri elitin geici g kaybı da dikkate alındıęında, ilgili dnem yeni grevlilerin ykseliřine tanıklık etmiřtir. Bu yeni grevliler ise yabancı dil bilen, Avrupa ile iliřki kurma kabiliyetine sahip sivil brokratlardır. zellikle diplomasi konusunda bilgi ve becerisi olan hariciye grevlileri ve dolayısıyla Hariciye Nezareti, kurulduęu 1836 yılı sonrasında 1871'e kadar nemli bir kurumsal yapı iřlevini yerine getirmiřtir. Bu kurum devletin dıř iliřkilerinin yrtlmesinin yanında, reformların da İmparatorluęa aktarılması ve uygulamaya konulmasında nemli bir rol stlenmiřtir. Bu kapsamda Hariciye Nezareti sahip olduęu kimi zellikler nedeniyle reformların yrtlmesi srecinde dięer kurumlara gre etkin bir rol stlenmiřtir.

Osmanlı İmparatorluęu'nda bakanlık tipi rgtlenme dıřiřleri, iiřleri, maliye ve ordu gibi geleneksel alanlarda bařlatılmıřtır. II. Mahmud tarafından ıkarılan bir fermanla 1836 yılında kurulan Hariciye ve Dhiliye Nezaretleri, bakanlık tipi rgtlenmenin ilk rnekleri olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bylece devletin temel alanları olarak kabul edilen harici ve dhili iřler bakanlık teřkilatı altında yapılandırılmıř ve uzmanlařma sreci bařlamıřtır. Buna ek olarak XIX. yzyıl Osmanlı İmparatorluęu aısından diplomasi kullanımının nem kazandıęı bir dnemdir. İlgili dnemde İmparatorluęun korunmasında diplomasi bir ara olarak kullanılmıřtır. Mısır krizi ve Kırım Savařı sonrasında diplomasi kullanımının ve siyasi iliřkilerin artması sonucunda hariciye nazırının ynetim kademesi iindeki etkisi artmıřtır. Bu ereve de diplomasi kullanımının nem kazanması ile dnemin uluslararası konjonktr dikkate alındıęında doęrudan Hariciye Nezaretinin dięer devlet kurumlarına gre n plana ıkmasına yol amıřtır. Hariciye Nezaretinin sahip olduęu bu nitelik, reformların yrtlmesini de doęrudan etkilemiřtir. İmparatorluęun dıř dnya ile ve zellikle Avrupa ile iliřkilerinin yrtlmesinden sorumlu olan kurum, Avrupa'daki yeniliklerin İmparatorluęa aktarılmasında birincil derecede etkili olmuřtur. Dolayısıyla bu srete Hariciye Nezareti sahip olduęu kimi zellikler nedeniyle, devletin dięer kurumları arasında reformların yrtlmesinde etkin bir rol kazanmıřtır.

Hariciye Nezaretinin dięer devlet kurumlarına gre n plana ıkmasında bazı faktrlerin etkili olduęu grlmektedir. Bunlardan ilki Hariciye Nezaretinin dięer bakanlıklara gre kesintisiz bir bakanlık rgtlenmesine sahip olmasıdır. Nitekim Nezaret, kurulduęu 1836 yılından İmparatorluęun hukuken sona erdięi 1922 tarihine kadar faaliyet gstermiř sonrasında ise Trkiye Cumhuriyetinin kurulması ile Hariciye Vekleti oluřturulmuřtur. Dięer nezaretler incelendięinde, hibirisinin Hariciye Nezareti gibi kesintisiz bir bakanlık rgtlenmesine sahip olmadıęı grlmektedir. rneęin Hariciye Nezareti ile birlikte kurulan Dhiliye Nezareti, 1839'da ilga edilerek mteřarlıęa dnřtrlmř ve Sadaret atısı altında grevlerine devam etmiřtir. 1869 yılında tekrar oluřturulan Nezaret, 1871'de tekrar sadaret mteřarlıęına dnřtrlmřtir. 1877 tarihinde nc defa oluřturulduktan sonra giderek geliřim gsteren bir kurum olmuřtur. Benzer Őekilde 1838 tarihinde oluřturulan Maliye Nezareti kısa bir sre sonra Hazıne-i mire Defterdarlıęı ve Hazıne-i Mukataat Defterdarlıęı olarak blnmřtir. Nezaret, 1840 yılında tekrar oluřturulmuřtur. Adliye Nezaretinin kuruluř tarihi 1870, Harbiye Nezaretinin kuruluřu ise 1879'dur. Grldę zere temel bakanlıklar iinde kesintisiz bakanlık rgtlenmesine sahip olan tek kurum Hariciye Nezaretidir.



İkinci olarak 1836-1871 yılları arasında Hariciye Nezareti, diplomatik kökenli görevlerden yetişen Mustafa Reşid Paşa, Âli Paşa ve Fuad Paşa gibi önemli yöneticilerin nazırlık görevini yürüttüğü bir kurum olmuştur. Tanzimat'ın üç paşası olarak anılan bu üç önemli isim, 1836-1871 yılları arasında hariciye nazırlığı ve sonrasında birçok kez sadrazamlık görevini üstlenmiş, üst düzey meclislerde başkanlık yapmışlardır. Dolayısıyla bu dönemde yapılan reformların yürütülmesinde birincil derece de etkili olmuşlardır. Bu isimler ilgili dönemde sivil bürokratların kazandıkları gücün görülmesi açısından önemlidir. Bu nedenle hariciye kökenli yöneticilerin ilgili dönemdeki modernleşme sürecine yön verdikleri görülmektedir.

Hariciye Nezaretinin ön plana çıkmasında etkili olan üçüncü özellik, sahip olduğu nitelikli personel yapısı ve Tercüme Odası kökenli birçok personeli bünyesinde barındırmasıdır. Tercüme Odasından yetişen ya da sefirliklerde görev alan personel, ilgili dönemde önemli bir özellik olan yabancı dil bilgisine sahiptir. Ayrıca görevleri nedeniyle Batı ile temasta bulunan bu memurlar, reformları doğrudan inceleme fırsatına sahip olmuş ve sonrasında bu reformları kendi bilgi ve tecrübeleri ile harmanlayarak İmparatorluğa aktarmışlardır.

Hariciye Nezaretinin bir diğer özelliği, sahip olduğu kuluçka niteliğidir. Hariciye Nezareti ve kısmen Maliye Nezareti yeni işlevlerin kurumsallaşması ve sonrasında bakanlıklara dönüşmesinde kuluçka vazifesi üstlenmişlerdir. Bu nedenle birçok kurum/birim öncelikle Hariciye Nezareti bünyesinde oluşturulmuştur. Sonraki dönemde bu şekilde oluşturulan birimlerin, ayrı nezaret yapıları olarak yapılandırıldıkları da bilinmektedir. Buna ek olarak kimi yönetsel işlevler, Nezaret bünyesinde uzman meclisler olarak kurularak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Örneğin Nezaret bünyesinde oluşturulan kurumlardan birisi tarım ve ziraatla ilgilidir. Bu kapsamda “*zira'ât ve sina'ât*” isimli bir meclis oluşturulmuş ve kararlarını Mustafa Reşid Paşa'ya sunmuştur. Bir süre sonra meclisin adı Meclis-i Umûr-ı Nâfi'a olarak değiştirilmiş sonrasında ise Ticaret Nezaretine aktarılmıştır. Hariciye Nezareti bünyesinde kurulan bir diğer önemli birim de Karantina Meclisi'dir. Karantina uygulamasının ticari ve harici boyutları olduğu da göz önüne alındığında, neden Hariciye Nezareti bünyesinde oluşturulduğu sorusu kısmen cevap bulmaktadır. Bu görevlere ek olarak Hariciye Nezaretinin kimi hukuki süreçlerin yürütülmesinde de görev aldığı görülmektedir.

Hariciye Nezareti, İmparatorluğun Avrupa ile ilişki kuran kurumudur ve bu nedenle Avrupa ile ilgili gelişmeler bu kurum tarafından İmparatorluğa aktarılmıştır. Bu kapsamda ilgili ülkelerde görev yapan sefirler edindikleri tecrübeler sonucunda, reform sürecine önemli katkı sağlamışlardır. Bu özellik, Hariciye Nezaretinin ön plana çıkmasını sağlayan bir başka unsurdur. Önemli Avrupa başkentlerinde görev yapan sefirler, bu ülkelerle ilgili önemli bilgileri İmparatorluğa aktarmışlardır. Hariciye Nezaretinin kurulması öncesinde de Avrupa başkentlerine giden Osmanlı sefirlerinin, önemli bilgiler ile İmparatorluğa döndükleri bilinmektedir. İngiltere, Fransa, Avusturya, Prusya ve Rusya gibi ülkelerde görev yapan sefirler bu ülkeler hakkında bilgi edinmişler, yapılan reformları yerinde incelemişler, imparatorluk açısından önemli bilgiler toplayarak bunları rapor etmişler ve sefirlik bünyesinde birçok personel yetiştirilmesine katkı sağlamışlardır. Yine birçok reformun ilgili ülkeler incelenerek, İmparatorluğa aktardıkları bilinmektedir. XVIII. yüzyılda Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi, Ebubekir Ratib Efendi gibi sefirler, Batı hakkında önemli bilgilerin Osmanlılar tarafından öğrenilmesini sağlarken, XIX. yüzyılda ise Sadık Rifat Paşa örneğinde görüleceği üzere Tanzimat sürecinin altyapısının oluşturulmasında rol almışlardır. Yine tüm bu isimleri diplomasinin gelişimi, yabancı uzmanların ülkeye getirilmesi, yurtdışına öğrenci gönderilmesi gibi çoğaltılabilecek birçok örnek üzerinden İmparatorluğun modernleşmesine katkıda buldukları görülmektedir.

Hariciye Nezaretinin sahip olduđu bir diđer özellik, bünyesinde özgün birimlerin oluşturulmasıdır. Bu çerçevede ele alınacak ilk birim müsteşarlıklardır. Hariciye ve Dâhiliye Nezaretleri bünyesinde oluşturulan müsteşarlık, sonrasında sadaret ve diđer nezaret yapıları içinde oluşturulmuş ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin kurulması sonrası oluşturulan bakanlıklar bünyesinde de (2017 Anayasa değişikliğine kadar) varlığını sürdürmüştür. Müsteşarlıkların bakanlık yapılanmaları içinde önemli roller üstlendikleri bilinmektedir. Hariciye Nezareti bünyesinde oluşturulan bir diđer birim Vilayet Hariciye Müdürlükleri'dir. Dışışlerinin taşra da bir birim oluşturması ilk bakışta ilginç gibi görülse de, ilgili dönemin koşulları göz önüne alındığında bu durum bir ihtiyaç neticesinden kaynaklanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada XIX. yüzyıl Osmanlı modernleşmesi sürecinde Hariciye Nezaretinin diđer kurumlara göre etkin bir rol kazanmasının sebepleri incelenmiştir. Literatürde Hariciye Nezaretinin reform sürecinde etkin bir rol üstlendiği doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak ifade edilse de, neden olduğu sorusu cevaplanmamaktadır. Bu çalışmada Hariciye Nezaretinin, modernleşme sürecinde diđer kamu kurumlarına nazaran neden ön plana çıktığı sorusu cevaplanmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu kapsamda arşiv belgeleri, dönemin resmi kaynakları ve ayrıntılı literatür taramasına başvurulmuştur. Elde edilen sonuçlar, Hariciye Nezaretinin kesintisiz bakanlık örgütlenmesi ve üstün konum, Tanzimat'ın üç paşası olarak ifade edilen Mustafa Reşid, Âli ve Fuad paşaların etkileri, sahip olduğu nitelikli personel ve Tercüme Odası'nın bu süreçteki etkisi, kuluçka niteliği ile yeni kurumları bünyesinde oluşturması, öncü sefirler ile birlikte Batı'daki gelişme ve reformlardan haberdar olma imkânı ve bünyesinde özgün kurumlar oluşturması gibi özelliklere sahip olması nedeniyle diđer kamu kurumları içinde reformların yürütülmesinde etkin bir rol üstlendiğini göstermektedir. Görüldüğü üzere Hariciye Nezareti 1836-1871 yılları arasında sahip olduğu özellikler nedeniyle diđer kamu kurumları arasında öne çıkmış ve modernleşme sürecinde önemli bir rol üstlenmiştir.