Where Does Power Lie? (17\textsuperscript{th} – 18\textsuperscript{th} Centuries) pt. 1
Social change: new elites

Social Mobility:

- earlier times through military, state institutions (devshirme, janissaries)
- late 1600s, shifting to urban-based ‘new elites’
- clothing laws re-established to identify classes, ‘fix’ mobility
Social change: new elites

Sultan no longer centre of power:

- Ghazi ‘warrior skills’ given way to military administrators: ‘Pashas’, ‘viziers’
- new powerful urban elites: ‘imperial troops’, janissaries, bureaucrats, *ulema* (‘Effendi’)
- royal military and administrative offices: source of wealth and power
Social Change: new elites

- new elites competing for positions, access to wealth (eg tax-farms)
- pashas, wealthy ‘notables’: trained clients, dependents, apprentices -- ‘clientage’
- political strategies placed them in court – jostling for ‘favours’
- competed directly with devshirme, janissaries

Successful: replacing them within palace
Janissary-class in transition:
- poorly paid (rebellions 17th C.)
- sought independent means: using/abusing power
- developed links to local merchants, guilds
- ‘elite’ status translated into urban context: became “voice of the people”
- now Muslim by birth
- devshirme in decline
Social change: *devshirme*

After first generations, janissary families reproduced:
- fathers arranged for sons to move into system
- self-reproduction fulfilled state needs
- along with: rise in power of *viziers*, pashas, ‘noble households’ putting forward clients
- led to decline in demand for *devshirme*
Struggling for Identity

Ottoman’s view of themselves:
- Kalib Chelebi (geographer) argued Ottomans needed to exceed own reference points of knowledge [military, economic]
- ulama: Ottomans need to return to ‘days of old’ (warrior sultan, centralized power, ‘pure’ morality)
- attacked ‘harem’, immoral women’, taverns, tobacco, coffee houses
- Siege of Vienna, itself (and events leading up to, following) mirrors competing nature of power, influence and authority in Empire
Decades between Treaty of Vasvar, 1664 and March on Vienna, 1683 reflected evolution of Ottoman-European relations.

Treaty of Vasvar:
- Negotiated peace treaty with Hapsburgs.
- Ottomans still had ‘worrying’ level of influence in ‘Europe’.
- Hungarian nobility resistant to Hapsburg rule sought support from Ottoman representatives in Transylvania
- wanted war from which they could gain autonomy
- Hapsburgs responded by granting more local power
- not enough: 1682, delegation appealed directly to Sultan

Siege of Vienna, 1683
Siege of Vienna, 1683

- Ottomans accepted Hungarian prince as ‘vassal’
- Refused to renew Treaty of Vasvar: not-so-subtle declaration of war
- France offered to stay neutral should Ottomans return to war ‘temporarily’
Siege of Vienna, 1683

Sultan reluctant to return to war with Hapsburgs
- Grand Vizier determined
- found support with Janissary agha
- possible Vizier solicited false reports of problems in border region to bolster argument
- sought support from Religious hierarchy: did not receive it
Siege of Vienna, 1683

- nevertheless, put Hapsburg envoy under house arrest
- 1683 ‘went to war’
- Sultan not in agreement but headed out with army to Belgrade
- ‘entourage’ too large -- included harem – settled in for season in Belgrade
Vizier took army straight to Vienna:
- plan had been to attack and control fortress that was particularly important for trade
- Vizier defied Sultan’s plan by going directly to Vienna
- Sultan ‘impotent’ to do anything about independent activity of his Vizier and army
Initial siege successful:
- Hapsburgs did not expect the immediate attack
- scrambling to find European allies among Polish commonwealth (including Austrians, Germans)
- Ottomans succeeded in breaching outer wall in one place

[Reference ‘Turkish Prayer’, “Additional Readings”]
Next two months ‘stalemate’
- no further victory for either side
- European support in form of 60,000 additional troops approaching
- Ottomans unable to shift forces away from siege (some 30,000 including Walachians, Moldavians and Tatars)
Siege of Vienna, 1683

12 September: one day decisive battle

- Ottomans ‘swept away’
- “those who had not been cut to pieces by end of Day, fled” [Finkel]
- siege was lost
- Ottomans literally left behind everything: tents, armaments, ammunition, personal belongings…

[reference ‘…the secret history of… Jan Sobieski’,” Additional Readings”]
Response of Sultan:
- when word reached Belgrade, he was “furious”
- threatened Grand Vizier responsible (Kara Mustapha Pasha) with execution
- demanded he present himself in Belgrade
- Pasha ‘declined’ on grounds of illness
- Sultan and household forced to return Edirne
Siege of Vienna, 1683

Mustapha Pasha:
- in turn blamed defeat on governor who had opposed his decision to go straight to Vienna
- had him killed, sizeable estate confiscated, turned over to treasury
In Edirne:
- Vizier’s enemies ‘plotted’ to take advantage of his situation to have him overthrown
- fabricated reports about his ‘failures’
- emphasized his ‘disloyalty’
- keeper of stables referred to him as ‘Our Enemy’; supported by Chief Black Eunuch (of harem) and 3rd ranked Vizier
Siege of Vienna, 1683

Plot successful:
- Grand Vizier executed
- 3rd Vizier took his place, representing interests of ‘palace coup’
Siege of Vienna, 1683

Another Victim:
- prominent preacher (effendi) of puritanical ‘faction’ religious clergy who had accompanied the siege to Vienna
- sent from court to ‘estate’ in Bursa, later exiled
Siege of Vienna, 1683

Failure of the Siege:

- in Europe, major psychological impact (especially Hapsburgs, but elsewhere as well)
- historians speak of failed Siege of Vienna’ as first in chain of defeats that would end in humiliating treaty of Karlowitz, 1699

[see website ‘Turkish Face of Vienna’, “Additional Readings”]