

Christian August Graf Seilern (1717-1801) as a diplomat

Dissertation for obtaining the **doctoral degree**
at the
Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the
University of Vienna

submitted by **Christine Nowak**
(Doctorate on May 20, 1969)

Vienna 1968



Translated from German. Not proofread.

Disposition

I. Biographical data.....	2
II. Seilern's appointment as a diplomat to Regensburg from 1752-61	8
III. Seilern as Plenipotentiary at the Augsburg Peace Congress	21
IV. Seilern as ambassador to England from 1763-69.....	25
Closing remarks.....	47
Appendix.....	48
References	52

I. Biographical data

The Family - Youth

The information about the origin of the Seilern family is not too numerous.¹ In old heraldic books, the Seilern family is counted among the Swabian knights who sat in Pforzheim, as well as in St. Gallen in Switzerland and finally in the Upper Palatinate. But they also appeared as the patricians of Nuremberg. According to Stumpfer's "Swiss Chronicle", the Counts Seilern would have come from St. Gallen to Nuremberg. A Burkhard von Seilern was already settled there as a patrician and he was buried in the St. Sebaldus Church, as a gravestone proves.² In 1430 they had demonstrably settled in Switzerland.

The Seilern family came to Austria with Johann Friedrich I at the end of the 17th century and remained here. They were knighted with a diploma dated 28 October 1684. In 1693 they were made barons and on 4 November 1713 they were elevated to the rank of imperial count.

¹ For the following, see: Wurzbach, Constant: Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich, 34th part, Vienna 1877, p. 19 f.

² Turba, Gusta: Reichsgraf Seilern aus Ladenburg am Neckar 1646-1715, Heidelberg 1923, pp. 15-20

First, a sketch of the trunk (according to Wurzbach):

N.N. Seilern

Christian Ritter von Seilern

Johann Friedrich I.

b. 1645 - d. 8.1.1715

adopted his nephew

Johann Friedrich II.

Johann Friedrich II.

first count 1713

b. 1675 - d. 18. 6. 1751

married to

Anna Maria Countess Lengheim

b. 1690 – d. 15.10.1772

Christian August

b. 22.4.1717 – d. 15.10.1801

married to

Charlotte Countess Solms Sonnenwalde³

b. 1725 – d. 28.3.1783

Christian August Graf Seilern was born on 22 April 1717 as the son of Johann Friedrich II and Countess Anna Maria von Lengheim. After a careful upbringing and legal studies, he was appointed a government councillor in 1737, at the age of 20.⁴ On 19 January 1741 he was appointed real imperial chamberlain. He was by no means a man of importance at that time, as we can infer from a remark in the diary of Count Khevenhüller⁵.⁶ "The ... The gentlemen arrived in the city in the morning and at about 10 o'clock the Empress gave the first solemn audience to the papal nuntio, for which he was fetched by the imperial chamberlain and imperial councillor Count Seilern per commissario imperatoris et reginae.

I had proposed him for no other reason than that he had a fine carriage, and as the Bishop of Olomouc's was his exceedingly magnifique, I wished that the Commissarius should not look so dirty, otherwise I would not have preferred Count Seilern to so many other colleagues of his who had sprung from such illustrious families, because of his small extraction."

³ Gustav Turba, in his work on Reichsgraf Seilern, deals in detail with the genealogy of the Counts Seilern.

⁴ Cf. Gschieder, Oswald: The Imperial Court Council, Meaning and Constitution, Fate and Occupation of an Imperial Authority 1559-1806, Vienna 1942, pp. 435-37.

⁵ Prince Joseph Khevenhüller-Metsch, b. 3.7.1706, d. Vienna 18.4.1776, became Oberhofmeister in 1742, then Oberkämmerer and Oberhofmarschall. Wurzbach, Part 11

⁶ Khevenhüller-Metsch and Schlitter, Hans: Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Joseph Khevenhüller-Metsch Bd. 2, Vienna 1908, p. 117 f.

In 1745 he was appointed Imperial Court Councillor. Seilern belonged to the Herrenbank of the Reichshofrat, to which he had been admitted at the request of his father. He remained there until 1752.

In the same year, Seilern joined the diplomatic service. However, it is not known what prompted him to do so. He was appointed royal envoy to the Electorate of Bohemia at the Imperial Assembly in Regensburg. In 1761 he was appointed ambassador of the imperial court at the Augsburg Peace Congress.⁷ Originally, the ambassador accredited to Paris was Count Georg Adam von Starhemberg⁸ but it was thought more advisable to leave him there, as he was already familiar with the customs of the French court. Chancellor Kaunitz⁹ After some deliberation, he had sent Seilern to Augsburg, as he was in the vicinity.¹⁰

In 1763 Seilern was appointed ambassador to the English court, where he remained until 1769. After this foray into diplomacy, for which Seilern did not seem to be particularly suited, he returned to administration.

After his return from London to Vienna, Seilern was appointed governor of Lower Austria. After the conclusion of the Peace of Hubertusburg in 1763, this post was taken over by the

Count Franz Ferdinand von Schrattenbach¹¹. Seilern became his successor and remained in this office until 1779.

We do not know too much about Seilern's activities as governor,¹² however, we do know that Maria Theresa came into close contact with him to discuss matters concerning police measures.¹³ It was at this time that the curious case of Beaumarchais occurred:

⁷ The Augsburg Peace Congress was supposed to take place from 1761-63, but was not held for various reasons. For more information, see below. S.

⁸ Prince Georg Adam Starhemberg was born on 1.8.1742 and began his statesmanlike career at an early age. In 1755 he entered the diplomatic career as minister plenipotentiary in Portugal, then in Spain and France. He died on 19.6.1807. Wurzbach, 37th part.

⁹ Count Wenzel Anton Kaunitz-Rietberg was born on 2.2.1711 in Vienna. He studied law and law in Vienna, Leipzig and Leyden. In 1737 he was appointed Imperial Councillor and in 1753 Minister of Foreign Affairs. Soon after, he became a secret house, court chancellor and chancellor of state. He died on 27.6.1794. Wurzbach, 11th part.

¹⁰ Cf. Instructions of Chancellor Kaunitz to Seilern, 18 April 1761, Rescripta 72, Fasz. 19 (. F.A.)

¹¹ Franz Ferdinand von Schrattenbach, b. 1707, d. 1785. Wurzbach, Part 31.

¹² There is no material about his activities in the archive of the governor of Lower Austria.

¹³ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Geschichte Maria Theresias, vol. 9, Vienna 1879, pp. 415 ff.

Beaumarchais had come to the Viennese court under strange circumstances to send news to Maria Theresa concerning her daughter Marie Antoinette. To this end, Beaumarchais, under the name of de Ronac, made himself known to Maria Theresa's first secretary of the cabinet, Baron de Neny, and asked him to obtain an audience with the Empress under the seal of secrecy. But it could also use an intermediary. After some hesitation, Maria Theresa chose Seilern as her intermediary, as she was convinced of his tact and reliability. Seilern summoned the stranger, who informed him that he had been sent to London by the French court with dispatches. In the course of carrying out his mission, he had also come to Germany and there he had been attacked by robbers.

After Maria Theresa had agreed to an audience, Beaumarchais finally explained the reason for his appearance. His mission had been to investigate and destroy diatribes about Marie Antoinette. However, since he had been attacked by robbers, these documents were still in circulation and he asked the Empress to prevent this.

The further course of the investigation revealed that Beaumarchais himself was the author of these diatribes, and it was only through the diplomatic intervention of France that Beaumarchais was set free and indemnified with 1,000 ducats.

Seilern took up his last post in 1779. He was president of the Supreme Court of Justice for 12 years and retired from this position in 1791.¹⁴ Seilern had tried several times to resign from office, but Joseph II did not accept his resignation, although his relationship with Seilern was not very good. In a letter to the Emperor, Seilern makes his impression that he "excluded from the mercy of his society."¹⁵

Further evidence can be found in the fact that Seilern was admitted to Josef for the first time, after he asked for permission to resign his office for the fourth time.¹⁶

¹⁴ The files on Seilern's activities as President of the Supreme Court of Justice were destroyed in 1927 when the Palace of Justice burned down.

¹⁵ Seilern writes in a letter whose exact date is not known (Vienna 178?), Fasz. 28 (F.A.) to the Emperor: "For I can no longer conceal my keen feelings, that on all occasions when you have granted others the grace of your society, I am excluded from it. Although I do not fail to recognize that no one has a right to do so, I believe that, as those who are anxious to earn your Majesty's grace have no claim to it, it is at least permissible, in a case which may seem indifferent, but which entails a conspicuous public esteem, respectfully to make an introduction.

From my youth I have endeavored to maintain universal respect, following the example of my parents and foreparents, who for an uninterrupted period of more than 100 years held the first and most important positions of honor..."

¹⁶ Majesty petition of Christian August I for the Golden Fleece to Emperor Leopold II, Vienna 10.5.1790. The transcript is attached. Cf. Brunner, Sebastian: Die theologische Dienerschrift am Hofe Joseph II., Vienna 1869, pp. 464-68.

Seilern was greatly astonished at this arrangement, but attributed this circumstance to the emperor's already declining strength. Even stranger to Seilern was the Emperor's manner. Seilern was distressed by the condition in which the Emperor found himself, and therefore wished to postpone the second part of his lecture to another audience. The Emperor, however, urged him to stay, and Seilern set out the second part of his request in half-broken words and with the greatest brevity. At the end of his lecture, the Emperor grabbed his arm, led him to the door, and told him that he had "stupid eyes and had been here for the first time." He probably meant for the last time.

Seilern's relationship with the Emperor must have been very bad, and this depressed him all the more since his relationship with Maria Theresa had been an excellent one. I could not find out the reasons for this discord. I can only surmise that it was either a personal matter, which Seilern did not mention, or a political dislike. Since Seilern was a follower of Maria Theresa and her confidants, he may not have been able to familiarize himself with Joseph's ideas and therefore met with rejection.

In May 1790, Seilern applied for the award of the Order of the Golden Fleece. His intention was both to increase the honour of the House of Seilern and to give satisfaction to his person, since Maria Theresa had repeatedly given him not unjustified hopes of a high honour.¹⁷

Seilern does not receive this award, citing envy and jealousy of his person as the reason for it.

After his repeated offer of resignation, Emperor Leopold II finally approved his request for retirement on August 18, 1791. His health was very poor at the time, and he himself stated that he only lived on water.¹⁸ Until his death on 15 October 1801, Seilern lived in his house in Vienna's city centre.

The Wiener Zeitung of ¹⁹ 17.10.1801 dedicated the following obituary to him: "On October 15, 1801, Count Christian August von Seilern, Sr. k. k. Majesty Chamberlain, real privy councilor and recipient of the Grand Cross of the Order of St. Stephen, died here in the 85th year of his age, of which he spent 54 years with proven zeal and loyalty in the highest service with Roman distinction. In 1737 he was employed as a real regimental councilor, and in 1745 he was appointed a real imperial court councillor. Immediately afterwards he became Electorate of Bohemia's envoy to the Imperial Assembly, and from then on he was appointed ambassador to the proposed peace congress in Augsburg, and then he was appointed as a real imperial and royal ambassador to England. After holding this position for seven years, he was employed by the government of Lower Austria as governor, from which position he was promoted to supreme president of justice in 1779 and remained in this office until 1791."

¹⁷ The copy of the memorandum is attached.

¹⁸ Cf. Memorandum to Leopold II, dated 10.7.1791, in: Brunner, Sebastian: Die theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Joseph II, Vienna 1868, pp. 464-68.

¹⁹ Wiener Zeitung 1801, p. 3733.

Count Seilern's first marriage was to the Imperial Countess Solms. The contract of marriage²⁰ dates from 30.1.1741 and confirms the validity of the marriage between Imperial Count Christian August von Seilern and Maria Carolina Imperial Countess Solms, Queen Maria Theresia Chamberlain. The treaty was signed by Count Friedrich Eberhard von Solms and Johann Friedrich II as fathers. A second contract ²¹ dated February 5 is signed by the newlyweds and 15 other personalities. The Countess Solms promises to bring a lot of 10,000 guilders into the marriage.

Seilern entered a second marriage after the death of his first wife in 1783. The marriage contract²² between Christian August von Seilern, President of the Supreme Court of Justice, and Maria Theresa von Mährental dates from 7.4.1783.

One of Seilern's friends was Baron Josef von Sonnenfels²³, whose patron Seilern came to the fore. Sonnenfels went in and out of the house of Count Seilern. It was also Seilern's merit that Sonnenfels was accepted into the Empress's favour.

"My heart has led me beyond the goal indicated, it remembers with pleasure the benefactors I have received, among whom I am obliged to consecrate an excellent place to the governor Count von Seilern. You know that in his preface to the best Empress I have to attribute my present happy state. I always like to boast a little about the fact that I have earned his kindness."²⁴

Seilern's friendship also proved its worth when he helped Sonnenfels settle a difficult situation in which his brother had brought him. Seilern made a statement to the Emperor that was sufficient to dismiss proceedings against him. Sonnenfels said of Seilern: "Count Seilern esteems me highly enough to leave me to my own justification in a very unpleasant incident, where the confluence of unfavorable circumstances seemed to bring me into suspicion, and then to rejoice that he had not been mistaken about me, that I could dispense with his protection in my defense."²⁵

After Maria Theresa's death, both Seilern and his friend Sonnenfels seemed to have lost the trust of the imperial family. Under Emperor Josef, Sonnenfels had the task of examining government decrees, among other things, but his influence seemed to be steadily declining. Above all, he stood in sharp contrast to the Josephines Rautenstrauch and Kresl, whose influence was far greater than that of Sonnenfels.²⁶

²⁰ Marriage contract dated 30.1.1741 in the F.A. of the Counts Seilern in Brno, Fasz. 29. Cf. Wurzbach, Constant: Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich, Vienna 1877, Part 34, page 19 et seq.

²¹ Marriage contract dated 5.2.1741 in the F.A. of the Counts Seilern, Fasz. 29.

²² Marriage contract dated 7.6.1783, F.A. der Grafen Seilern, Fasz. 29.

²³ Josef Freiherr von Sonnenfels was born in Nikolsburg in 1732. He was of Jewish descent, but attended the Piarist grammar school in Nikolsburg. Since his father was in need of money, Sonnenfels enlisted in the military for 5 years. There he had a lot of time to read and he made up for what he had missed at school. Through the mediation of Prince Trautson, he obtained his release. He studied law and listened in particular to Martini's lectures. He embarked on a career as a civil servant in order not to be preserved by his father. In 1779 he became a lecturer at the Study and Censorship Commission. In 1794 and 1796 he was appointed Rector Magnificus of the Philosophical. of the Faculty of Law. /cf. Wurzbach, Part 37).

²⁴ Letter from Baron Josef von Sonnenfels to ... quoted here from: de Luca: Das gelehrte Österreich, vol. 2, Vienna 1776, pp. 144-170.

²⁵ Brunner, Sebastian: The Mysteries of the Enlightenment in Austria 1770-1800, Mainz 1869, p.66 f.

²⁶ Winter, Eduard: The History of Austrian Reform Catholicism 1740-1848, Berlin 1962, p. 143 f.

In the family archives of the Counts Seilern there is no reference to the relations between the Count and Sonnenfels, the name is not even mentioned, although there must have been a close friendship between the men.

II. Seilern's appointment as a diplomat to Regensburg from 1752-61

1. Introduction to the political situation

In the years between the Wars of Succession and the Seven Years' War, both Frederick II of Prussia and Maria Theresa were concerned with the training of their troops.²⁷ Frederick was concerned with increasing the effectiveness of his troops, Maria Theresa with a reorganization of the army by Count Daun.²⁸ These were no reasons for other powers to suspect a new struggle in Europe. In Vienna, people were understandably warlike, because Maria Theresa could not get over the loss of Silesia. She considered a counter-attack on the part of Prussia to be possible only in the event of a complete change in the situation in Europe. Their wish was to isolate the King of Prussia, who had become the main opponent. Count Kaunitz made this formulation as a negotiator in the secret conference of Aachen. However, this goal could not be achieved with the help of the old allies, the maritime powers, but only through an alliance with France, which had been sought since the beginning of the century. When Kaunitz went to Paris in 1750 to carry out his plan, it turned out that a quick overcoming of the contradictions was out of the question. There were too many prejudices that had to be overcome.

The Russian attempt to gain influence in Sweden had brought Prussia and France together. The election of Hanover in 1750/51 to make Archduke Josef Roman Emperor also caused some unrest in the empire. The countermeasures emanating from Prussia and the Palatinate found the support of Versailles. Kaunitz returned to Vienna without having accomplished anything, and there they decided on a policy of waiting. In 1753, Maria Theresa appointed Kaunitz as Bartenstein's successor, as his cool, calculating manner made him particularly capable of foreign policy.

²⁷ cf. Gebhardt, Bruno: Handbook of German History, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1955, pp. 281-84.

Uhlirz, Karl and Mathilde: Handbook on the History of Austria and its Neighbouring Countries, vol. 1, p. 304 ff.,

Graz-Leipzig-Vienna 1927-44.

Hantsch, Hugo: The History of Austria, vol. 2, 2nd ed. Vienna-Graz 1947, p. 177 ff.

²⁸ Count Leopold Joseph Maria Daun was born on 25.9.1705 and died on 5.2.1766. He made improvements to the Austrian army and was particularly prominent during the Seven Years' War. He was a Field Marshal and Knight of the Golden Fleece. Wurzbach, Part 3.

The revival of colonial antagonisms between France and England also led the two German powers to become politically active again. Since there was a danger for England that France would seize Hanover in the event of a resumption of war and attack England from the Belgian coast, England called on Austria to secure the defense of the Netherlands. The English government sought the friendship of Saxon-Poland and Russia, as well as the neutrality of Prussia. In Vienna, however, they did not want to be involved in a war with France, as this was bound to lead to a weakening of the front.

Here was only the possibility for Kaunitz to return from his plan of 1749, namely to unite with threatened France. There was even the possibility of persuading France to renounce the alliance with Prussia by means of far-reaching offers.

The plans proved to be a success insofar as the envoy Count Starhemberg²⁹ and made no attempt to occupy Belgium. However, it was not yet possible to speak of a political turn. Friedrich himself came to Kaunitz's aid in this difficult situation. He had advised France to occupy Hanover immediately but had evaded France's counter-proposal that he should do so himself, as he would have faced Austria and Russia. When he received requests from England for peace in Germany, he agreed after some hesitation, especially as Russia was about to conclude a subsidy treaty with England. By bringing Russia to an understanding with England, he believed that he would put Russia, which was ill-disposed towards him, in chains and isolate Austria. The Western Ministers' Convention concluded on 16 January 1756 between the two countries, which undertook to jointly repel any attack by a foreign power in Germany, had quite different consequences than the two partners suspected. France, which had sent a plenipotentiary to renew the alliance with Prussia, was deeply wounded. Louis XV was now ready to sign a treaty of neutrality and defence concluded with Austria. English influence in Moscow was not strong enough to dissuade Tsarina Elizabeth from her will to fight on Austria's side. In response to a request from Vienna, she agreed to the Austro-French agreements. It went even further by presenting Poland with a comprehensive offensive alliance and urging a swift attack. Before that, however, Kaunitz wanted to secure the help of France in the event of an attack by Prussia. The negotiations had already progressed to a large extent when Frederick II unexpectedly started the war.

The news of the Russian preparations for war had torn him out of his illusions. When the news of an attack by Austria planned for the spring of 1757 was confirmed, he ordered his regiments to move into the Saxons.

²⁹ Prince Georg Starhemberg, 1st Prince of the House was born on 10.8.1724 in London and died on 19.6.1807. He began his statesmanship career at an early age. In 1755 he entered the diplomatic career as minister plenipotentiary in Portugal, then in Spain and France. In 1767 he became Minister of State and Conference. Wurzbach, Part 33.

His hope of shattering Kaunitz's plans by rapid intervention had only the opposite effect. The renversement des alliances was completed. France also promised Austria an active participation with troops and money on the basis of the defensive alliance, after promising the cession of the Netherlands in return, and after the alliance with France was established, Sweden also took the side of the coalition. At the German courts, Austrian and French diplomats now tried together to mobilize the Reich against the peacebreaker. At the beginning of 1757, it was decided to arm and execute Prussia. Although the Corpus Evangelicorum prevented an imperial outlaw, in addition to Bavaria, Palatinate and Cologne, Protestant estates such as Württemberg and Mecklenburg-Schwerin were persuaded to sign subsidies and military conventions with France. The states of Hanover, Hesse-Kassel, Brunswick and Gotha, which were under the influence of England, fought on the Prussian side. However, the support of the allies on the continent was not vigorously pursued. As William Pitt³⁰ When Hanover's desire for neutrality was pushed aside and an army was raised in NW Germany to repel a French advance across the Rhine.

2. Seilern's activities until the conclusion of the neutrality treatise of 1756

After his arrival in Regensburg, Seilern had to deal with the affairs of the Roman election of the king for the archbishop of Joseph.³¹ The Viennese court was in a difficult position, as the election proposal had come from Hanover. A Reich Conference had been convened to decide whether the matter should be presented to the Reichsrat.

The King of Prussia, who opposed the election of Joseph, raised the question of whether the election of a king during the emperor's lifetime was necessary and useful at all. He had granted France, as the guarantor of the Peace of Westphalia, a certain amount of say.³²

Württemberg, Brunswick, Hanover and Mainz had also spoken out in favour of such a right, and there were now fears in Vienna that France would take this right for itself.³³

³⁰ William Pitt, 1st Earl of Chatham, lived from 1708-1778. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Oxford. In 1735 he became a Member of Parliament, where he opposed Walpole. In 1746 he was promoted to chief paymaster of the troops. In 1756 he was appointed Secretary of State for the Southern Department, and at the same time he was appointed Leader of the House of Commons. When Lord Temple was dismissed in 1757, Pitt went with him. On June 29 of the same year, he was again appointed to the government. When Lord Bute was appointed Secretary of State in 1761, Pitt resigned. In July 1766 Pitt was again appointed to the government, holding the position of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal and receiving the title of Earl of Chatham. From May 1767 to October 1768 he kept completely away from the outside world, and then asked for his resignation. From 1770-73 his health was so poor that he was unable to attend the House of Lords. He died of a seizure he suffered during a parliamentary debate. Dictionary of National Biography, London 1889.

³¹ Archduke Joseph was elected King of the Romans on 27 March 1764

³² Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Geschichte Maria Theresias, vol. 5, Vienna 1875.

³³ Cf. Rescript of a letter from Maria Theresa dated 14.12.1752, in: Rescripta von der Majestät der Kaiserin nebst Schreiben von des Herr Hof- und Staatskanzlers Grafen von Uhlfeld Excellency, Fasz. 18, (F.A.)

In June 1753³⁴, Seilern was commissioned from Vienna to campaign for Prince Ludwig von Wolffenbüttel, who was applying for the post of Imperial Field Marshal. They want to get ahead of any other applicant in Vienna. This position belonged to a Protestant, and of course one wanted to see someone friendly to the Viennese court in this position. Kaunitz himself emphatically points out that Prinz von Wolffenbüttel is to be supported.

In October of the same year, Seilern was asked to investigate whether there was any truth³⁵ in the possession of the deceased superintendent of Regensburg in the possession of some letters from Austrian prelates in which they asked to assist them in their efforts to gain the protection of the King of Prussia. These requests, in their opinion, could not cause any difficulties for the superintendent since they had sufficient funds. However, the superintendent is said not to have taken this request seriously and did not recommend the petitioners to the King of Prussia. The Empress was anxious to know whether the rumour was true, and which prelates were involved.³⁶ Seilern, however, was unable to find out anything in this regard.

In May 1755³⁷, Seilern learned of the revolt of the Warsdiners from Vienna. The Croatian and Slavonian border dwellers, who were free to enjoy the land assigned to them, had to feed and clothe themselves, and were also allowed to perform regular military service, instigated the uprising.

Since their officers wanted to introduce a change in their Hungarian bonnets and the colour of their clothing, this revolt of the Varasdinians took place. They had gathered in large numbers and killed some of their officers. Whereupon Maria Theresa immediately sent Colonel Beck, who commanded a Slavic frontier regiment, and called on the Varasdins to remain calm and wait for their further orders. The Warasdinians were allowed to send deputies and bring up supposed complaints against their officers. These had also arrived, but the spirit of unrest had spread so widely among the former border dwellers that they were committing general excesses. The Empress had decided to send an imperial commissioner with several battalions and 300 horses to restore peace.

In the meantime, however, the vice-zupan had seized militia and attacked the rioters, and 50 of them, including the ringleaders, were executed by martial law.

Kaunitz reported this to Seilern in order to tell him the true state of affairs, since the newspapers only published incorrect representations of it.

3. Conclusion of the Treaty of Neutrality and its Reasons

In February 1756, the Austrian ambassador in London, Count Colloredo, reported that a treaty had been concluded between England and Prussia.

³⁴ Cf. Maria Theresa's rescript of 1.6.1753 and Kaunitz's rescript of 4.6.1753, Fasz. 18, (F.A.)

³⁵ The name of the superintendent is not mentioned in the files.

³⁶ Cf. Rescript Kaunitz of 6 October 1753. 18. (F.A.)

³⁷ Cf. letter from Kaunitz of 14 May 1755, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

That contract was concluded on 16 January and was worded as follows: 'Que parle le Préambule du dit Traité les Parties contractants déclarent: que comme les Différends, qui se sont élevés entre la France et l'Angleterre ne sont pas encore ajustés et que la Tranquillité de l'Europe en est menacée, elles sont d'accord de concert de mesure pour conserver la Tranquillité de l'Europe en générale, et en particulier cette de l'Allemagne. Qu'a cette fin elles ont convenues.

1) Que ni l'une ni l'autre des Parties contractantes n'envahira la Possession de l'autre, mais qu'au contraire elles se serviront de tous les moyens possibles auprès de leur Allient respectifs pour empêcher pareille Entreprise de leur part.

2) Qu'en cas, que contre toute attente et dans la vue des troubles de Tranquillité de l'Allemagne, que les contractantes ont Envie de conserver, aucune Puissance étrangère faisait marcher Prouver en aucune Partie de l'Allemagne, S.M. Britannique et S.M. Prusse ne joindront leurs forces pour s'y opposer

3) Que les Engagements déjà subsistants entre les Parties contractantes soient renouvelés.³⁸

Maria Theresa told Seilern that the war that had broken out between France and England in America did not concern her in part and that it was therefore not considered necessary to conclude a treaty with anyone.³⁹ However, they had now come to the conclusion that a treatise should be concluded with the French court. For this reason, the Austrian minister at the French court, Count Starhemberg, was given the necessary powers to enter into negotiations. Agreeing with the negotiated terms, the treaty was ratified on 19 April.

"It is therefore all the less possible to make a well-founded exhibition of our neutrality and defensive alliance entered into by France, since this connection is perfectly consistent with the present system, and is to be regarded as its necessary consequence. The Republic of Holland is also said to have expressed itself to the effect that it does not recognize the *Casum Foederis*, and that strict neutrality is observed in the present war."⁴⁰

The contract contains the following clause:

"Sa majesté très chrétienne, de son conténe voulant envelopper aucune autre Puissance dans sa querelle particulière avec l'Angleterre. "It' s just a defensive contract.

In July, the plenipotentiary minister in Berlin announced that Prussia was making war arrangements.

³⁸ cf. letter from Kaunitz of 5.2.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.), Seilern writes about this in his report of February 10, 1756: "Otherwise, the treaty recently drawn up between England and Prussia arouses an immense rejoicing among the Protestant legations, but all the greater attention among the Catholic ones."

And to Kaunitz he writes in his covering letter of the same date: "By means of your Excellency's letter of the 5th of this, I receive in the most obedient gratitude the confirmation of the important news of the treatise. As little as the English minister knows about Keith's true contents, it is probable that he is likely to be contained in it, no doubt more than is presented." Fasz. 21. (F.A.)

³⁹ Cf. letter of Maria Theresa of 24.5.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

⁴⁰ cf. letter of Maria Theresa of 24.5.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

Maria Theresa, who was very dismayed by this news, could not imagine an immediate attack on the part of Prussia, since she had given no reason for it. However, it had the troops gathered in Bohemia and Moravia in order to have a sizeable army there for emergencies.

But she is even more concerned about the reliable news that the news is being spread at all the Protestant courts that secret articles have been added to the alliance of friendship with France, dealing with the utter suppression of the Protestant religion.

Seilern, on the other hand, wrote the following to the Viennese court: "Besides, the path recently taken by your Imperial Royal Majesty with France, which aims not only at the preservation of one's own hereditary land, but also at the greater consolidation of the general tranquillity, has caused an extraordinary pleasure among the well-disposed, and has won a general applause. In particular, the precaution of a few interventions by name of the Westphalian peace treaty has been gratefully acknowledged, and its necessity has been recognized."⁴¹

However, the Treaty of Neutrality is also said to contain agreements regarding the election of the Roman king in favor of Joseph. At the request of the Viennese court, Seilern was asked to dispel these rumours.

4. Preparations for war

On the royal Prussian side, the Viennese court was repeatedly assured that the necessary measures were only being taken against the Russian movements, but that no preparations had yet been made against the imperial hereditary lands, which made the mobilization here necessary.

In the meantime there is complete mobilization in Prussia, and in Austria it is expected that Prussian troops will invade the hereditary lands either through Silesia or through Saxony. The Viennese court therefore continued its preparations for war, as Prussia's words were not trusted.

5. The Seven Years' War 1756-63

On 1 October, war broke out with an attack by the Prussian army, which was under the command of its king. The Austrian one is under the command of Field Marshal von Broune.⁴²In the first battle, the Austrians had the advantage at first, but then they retreated to the starting positions.

⁴¹ Seilern's relation of 16.6.1756, Fasz. 21. (F.A.)

⁴² Count Maximilian Ulysses von Broune, also spelled Brown or Browne, was an Austro-Hungarian general and Knight of the Golden Fleece. He was born in Basel on 23.10.1705 and died of injuries sustained in the Schlag near Prague. Wurzbach, Part 2.

Marie Theresa was dismayed by the outbreak of war, because she had hoped until the end that it would not come to a military conflict. "Everything that is sacred, the fundamental constitution of the German Reich, of our fatherland, the freedom of Europe, and both the independence and the security of all its powers, are threatened in the most annoying and dangerous manner by the Prussian action, and his irreconcilability has led him not even to conceal in his manifesto published at Berlin under the title "Causes" and directed against Us, not even that ardent desire to with which he even wished to open the Ottoman gate against Christendom."⁴³

She herself is now ready to take the lead among the defenders of common freedom, but especially to defend the freedom of the fatherland. It is quite certain that other powers will also adhere to the maintenance of the imperial cohesion and to the bond of loyalty and faith. It also reminds Seilern of the Peace of Dresden concluded between the King of Prussia and Austria on 25 December 1745, which states:

"We⁴⁴ declare by virtue of the Reich that the person who comes into possession of the hereditary kingdoms or hereditary lands by virtue of the succession must defend them as an inseparable possession against invaders. The Peace of Dresden guarantees us the defence of our hereditary lands."

⁴³ Letter from Maria Theresa to Seilern, dated 12.10.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

⁴⁴ Cf. Maria Theresa's letter to Seilern dated 12.10.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

The War Movements in the Autumn of 1756

The King of Prussia had marched against the King of Poland right at the beginning of the war and the Austrian Field Marshal von Browne immediately took action to support the King of Poland. These actions could not be carried out, because according to the reports, the King of Poland had retreated to the fortress of Königstein, leaving the commanding general in command. The Saxon army had to surrender to the enemy under the harshest conditions.

Kaunitz now asked Seilern to hire Mr. Baron von .. onickau, to inform the Prussian envoy confidentially not to allow himself to be led astray by any news of any kind.⁴⁵ He should also pay special attention to the statements made by the Electorate of Palatinate to the Electorate of Mainz that the cause of Bohemia would have to go before an Imperial Assembly anyway. The King of Prussia will appear in this matter as a sovereign king against a sovereign queen, and not as an elector, in order to prevent the division of the empire.

Paris is now also getting involved in the disputes. The French ambassador in Saxony demands access to the camp near ... King of Poland, and as this was refused on the part of the Prussians, he informed the ambassador accredited in Berlin, the Marquis de Valori, and instructed him to return to France without delay. At the same time, the French minister Rouillé urges the Prussian ambassador, Freiherr von Krippenhausen, who is accredited to France, to leave the country.

In the meantime, news comes from Russia that the Imperial Russian Army had entered Courland for the most part, and also the Russian Field Marshal Apraxim⁴⁶ was about to leave Petersburg.

In the meantime, the Electorate of Saxony had become a prey to Frederick, and he had not abandoned his demand that Saxony should provide him with 9,000 men. Although he had been assured by the Saxons that this was impossible, Friedrich explained that he would then take Saxon officials and district commissioners in their place.

⁴⁵ for the following, see: Letter from Kaunitz to Seilern, dated 29.10.1756, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

⁴⁶ Since there is only one Russian biography in Russian and I do not know it, I cannot give any information about his life.

a) Theatres of war in 1757

In March 1757, Frederick had advanced in Bohemia to the Hungarian outposts at the towns of Grottau and Grafenstein. The Austrians thought it best to abandon the positions and waited for an attack by the enemy. The Prussian troops, however, retreated to their old position. A column of troops marched to Reichenau with the intention of cutting off the Austrian troops at Friedland.⁴⁷

General Lacy⁴⁸, however, immediately responded by ordering the Austrian troops to be returned to the main army, thus thwarting Frederick's plan. The enemy evacuated Bohemian territory and on 17 March the withdrawal was completed.

Now the King of England intervened. He had declared in a speech in parliament that France and the Allies had the most dangerous intentions, not only against Europe, but especially against the Hanoverian lands and Prussia. Parliament should therefore instruct its king to send an army of observation to the countries mentioned. The parliament complied with the request.

In Vienna, it was believed that the war should not be extended and that the Hanoverian lands should be kept out of the conflict.

The King of England, as Elector of Hanover, had been offered an act of neutrality without hesitation, and for this purpose a memorandum had been handed over to Baron von Steinberg – as the King's representative – by Chancellor Kaunitz.

In Vienna it was planned to postpone the hostilities as far as possible, but Schwerin had⁴⁹ already set in motion with the Prussian troops. However, the Austrian troops, gathered in a hurry, were unable to resist the enemy. It was not until August or September that the troops were ready to fight.

According to his own statement, Chancellor Kaunitz was supposed to⁵⁰ inspect the troops in Prague, but the situation seemed very confused, since the Battle of Prague was already underway. The reports were contradictory and it seemed that Frederick wanted to go for a main battle. Part of Daun's army had retreated to Kolin, and the situation of the army trapped in Prague was not bad either. In July, the Prussian army was preparing to leave Bohemia, and from its movement the Austrian General Staff concluded that Frederick's intention was to prevent the imperial army from entering Saxony.

⁴⁷ Cf. Maria Theresa's letter of 23.3.1757, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

⁴⁸ Franz Moritz Graf von Lacy was born on 24.10.1725 in St. Petersburg and died on 2.6.1792 in Hungary. He joined the Imperial Army at the age of 18 and distinguished himself in the Seven Years' War. He became a Field Marshal, a Knight of the Golden Fleece and a recipient of the Order of the Grand Cross. Wurzbach, Part 13.

⁴⁹ Otto Magnus Schwerin was born on 21.6.1701. He had already taken part in the Battle of Mollwitz and had been promoted to lieutenant general in the Seven Years' War. In 1757 he asked for his resignation. Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 33rd vol., Leipzig 1891.

⁵⁰ Cf. letter from Kaunitz of 13.5.1757, Fasz. 18. (F.A.)

In August, the two Dutch ports of Ostend and Nieuwport were occupied by French troops. The answer was the occupation of Austrian Flanders by English troops, despite fierce protests from the Viennese court. Colloredo was recalled from London. English frigates had surrounded both ports, and the Empress had no choice but to withdraw her troops.

In September, the Russians managed to achieve a victory over the Prussian army.

The news that Cardinal Richelieu⁵¹ had concluded an armistice with the Duke of Cumberland was gratifying for Vienna, as the troops in support of Austria were now free.

The news of the withdrawal of the Russian army, which took place in October, was unrelated to the news that secret peace negotiations were underway. The Russian court expressed outrage at this in its statement, and the consequences were drawn by replacing Apraxim with General Fermer⁵².

b) Course of the war in 1758 and 1759

In January, the new Russian commander succeeded in invading Prussia and occupying the capital Königsberg. Frederick, for his part, set about reconquering the lost territories, but the winter made fighting more difficult.

The Austrian army had plenty of time to prepare for battle, and Generals Daun and Laudon⁵³ did not arrive at the troops until May. The Austrians were content to scan the enemy and constantly changed their positions. The Prussians did not dare to stay in Bohemia any longer and retreated back to Silesia. This led to a change in the theatre of war and the Austrian operational plans.

⁵¹ William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, was born on April 15, 1721, the third son of King George II. He was a military commander of the British Army and in this capacity took part in the Seven Years' War. Dictionary of National Biography, London 1900.

⁵² Again, there is only one biography in Russian.

⁵³ Gedeon Ernst Freiherr von Laudon was born on 10.3.1716 in Liefland and died in Nový Jičín on 17.7.1790. He came from a Scottish aristocratic family and did not enter the Austrian service until 1742. In 1766 he became a court war councillor and in 1769 commanding general of Moravia. Wurzbach, Part 16.

In Vienna, they wanted a division of the Russian armies. An army of 40,000 to 50,000 men was to leave for the Silesian border, the rest for Brandenburg and Pomerania. For this purpose Major General Baron von Tillier had been ⁵⁴ sent to Petersburg. Prince Esterhazy was sent as a second representative. ⁵⁵ They were to obtain at least a transfer of 30,000 men, and to present General Fermer with a present of 6,000 ducats. Esterhazy didn't think much of the bribery attempt, and he was right. Tillier and Esterhazy had been summoned to a conference before Fermer's arrival in St. Petersburg, at which the Russian Chancellor Vorontsov⁵⁶ was present. The Russians read a memorandum from which it was clear that they were not thinking of dividing the army and would march against Frederick with all their might. ⁵⁷

In the spring of 1759, the Austrian army was so well prepared that it could appear on the battlefield at any time.

It was not until mid-June that the army's inactivity seemed to have come to an end, when the news of the invasion of Russian troops in Poznań reached the army.

On 12 August, the Battle of Kunersdorf took place, in which Austrian and Russian troops sealed a defeat of the Prussian squadrons. ⁵⁸

Maria Theresa would have liked to see the complete annihilation of Frederick, but she bowed to Daun's view that the Austrian and Russian troops should remain in Frankfurt until the fall of Dresden. The Russians did not abide by the agreements and moved to Silesia to take up winter quarters.

On 4 September the conquest of Dresden took place and now Maria Theresa Daun developed in opposition to her plans:

⁵⁴ Johann Anton Freiherr von Tillier was promoted to Field Marshal in 1760. Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 38th vol., Leipzig, 1894.

⁵⁵ Emmerich Graf Esterhazy von Golantha was born on 2.6.1792. He embarked on a military career and showed a prudent attitude in the conquest of Berlin. Wurzbach, Part 4.

⁵⁶ Again, there is only one biography in Russian.

⁵⁷ Arneth, Alfred von: Geschichte Maria Theresias, 10 vols., Vienna 1863-79, vol. 6, Maria Theresa and the Seven Years' War 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 7 f.

⁵⁸ Cf. report Kaunitz an Seilern, dated 15.8.1759, Rescripta Volume 72, Fasz. 19. (F.A.): *"Monsieur, un crier dépêché par son Excellence Mr. Le Maal Comte de Daun vient de nous apporter la grande et superbe Nouvelle, que l'Armée Russe commandée par Mr. de Laudon avient emporté le 12 une victoire complète sur l'Armée Prussienne près de Franfort sur l'Oder. Le Roi attaquera l'Armée Russe entre onze heures et midi, le combat fut de plus vive, l'ennemi peya enfin vers le 6 heures du soir, le dirigea sa retraite avec la plus grande précipitation sur lustrin, le Général Laudon se chargea de la poursuite avec légères de l'Armée Russe, le perte en hommes a été considérable de part d'autre, L'Armée victorieuse a pris grand nombre de canons et de trophées, et fait beaucoup prisonnières. Le Lieutenant Colonel de Caroff a dépêché par M. de Laudon le 12 à 9 heures au soir de son camp a la poursuite de l'ennemi a deux heures de distance du champ de bataille a apporté cette magnifique Nouvelle un officier avec le détail qui entrera ici pré Cédé de Mains Postillon. »*

Saxony must be maintained and Frederick of Prussia must be prevented. Daun's operations in Silesia. The Russian army should not be separated from the Austrian one, and both should take up their winter quarters in Silesia. The Russians should once again take on the active role. Daun, who had correctly understood the situation, informed the Russians that he himself would go against the King of Prussia. The Russians were not deterred from retreating, and this resulted in a separation of the two armies. Frederick, who had nothing to fear from the Russians, now set about the reconquest of Saxony, and even wanted to advance as far as Bohemia. The onset of winter brought all hostilities to a standstill. They just wanted to survive the winter well.

c) The attacks of 1760 and 1761

In Vienna it had become clear that it was necessary to move from a defensive war to a war of aggression.⁵⁹ Laudon took over the offensive of 1760. He marched with his corps through the county of Glatz and occupied the Silberberg and Vartha passes, having previously deceived the enemy and the latter expected an attack near Landshut.⁶⁰

After some deception on both sides, Frederick began the bombardment of Dresden. Daun, who had rushed to help, could not make up his mind to fight, and so again no decision was reached.

In the meantime, the theatre of war was moved to Liegnitz, where an unfortunate battle for the Austrian army took place. When Laudon, the great loser of this battle, finally declared himself ready for a decisive attack, Frederick eluded it.

In October, the march to Berlin was announced, after the Russian side had also decided to do so.⁶¹

On 13 October, Berlin surrendered to Austrian and Russian troops. This situation was very unfavorable for the Austrian army leadership, as its main purpose was to disrupt Prussia's conduct of the war and it was feared that the Russians would spare it.⁶²

⁵⁹ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, Vienna 1875, p. 94 f.

⁶⁰ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, pp. 115 f. Laudon's passage through the county of Glatz had caused great consternation in the fortress there, which was only lightly garrisoned. Laudon had proposed to bribe the commander of the fortress, Colonel d'O, who was known to be greedy for money, to surrender the fortress without resistance. Colonel Caramelli, who was entrusted with this task, was unable to get in touch with the colonel, and so Laudon had to take the necessary military steps.

⁶¹ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 165.

⁶² Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 167.

In November, the Battle of Liegnitz and Torgau took place between Friedrich and Daun, in which a certain victory was expected. At the last moment there was a turn of events that dashed all hopes.⁶³ The time had now come to decide whether the continuation of the war was worth it at all. The French Duke Choiseul, ⁶⁴who directed the policy of France, spoke out either for or against the continuation, depending on the situation.⁶⁵ His particular anger was directed at Daun, whose removal from the command he demanded. In St. Petersburg, too, these wishes were accepted. In Vienna, people were not averse to these wishes, only Maria Theresa did not seem to want to comply with this wish. Choiseul had written a memorandum by which he aroused the indignation of Maria Theresa and Kaunitz. The response of the Viennese court expressed that although Austria had the desire for peace, it could only be negotiated at a peace congress. France replied that efforts should be made to bring about a congress before the end of the winter.

It was decided to convene the Peace Congress in Augsburg between 1 and 15 July 1761. At the same time, the commanding generals were ordered to vigorously open and continue operations.

⁶³ Letter from Kaunitz to Seilern dated 6.11.1760, Rescripta Volume 72, Fasz. 19.

⁶⁴ Etienne François Duc de Choiseul née 28 juin 1719, mort en mai 1785. Il rentrait d'une autre donnée par ce dernier, ie le remplaça au ministère des affaires étrangères. A la mort due maréchal de Belle Isle (1761) en remettant celui des affaires étrangères a son cousin, depuis Duc de Praslin, et y réunit la même année de ministère de la marin. Nouvelle Biographie Générale, Paris 1856.

⁶⁵ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, pp. 266f.

III. Seilern as Plenipotentiary at the Augsburg Peace Congress

1761-63 During the war negotiations, there was very little talk of ropemakers. In the family archives there are mainly records of the reports that went from Vienna to the envoy Seilern. Reports on the war were clearly preferred. Seilern himself was concerned with the petty quarrels between the German courts, but these were of little importance. In addition, he almost never acted independently, but always waited for instructions from Vienna.

It must have come as a surprise to him that his name was mentioned as a representative at the Augsburg Peace Congress. When the date was finally fixed for 15 July, Kaunitz wrote to Seilern: " On the part of the local court, Count Starhemberg, who was in Paris as ambassador, had already been chosen in advance for this purpose, but because afterwards it was considered more advisable for the highest service to remain with the French court during the peace negotiations, so it was of my own accord that I came up with the idea of proposing to your Excellency this message of peace. And since it has also become known from the French court, after a sounding, that his person and appointment are in order, Her Majesty's resolution is really to appoint your Excellency as your ambassador at this peace congress."⁶⁶

Kaunitz issued instructions for Seilern⁶⁷ in the opinion that this congress would actually take place. Despite the great commitment to the Congress, it was already doomed to failure because the interests of the great powers were too much influenced by the other events.⁶⁸

a) Reasons for the non-establishment of the congress

One of the main reasons for the failure to do so is to be found in the behaviour of France. Choiseul brought to the fore an effort to discuss the general peace only with England. They went so far as to exchange plenipotentiaries, although there was still a war going on between the two countries. He also commented on the difficulties that Maria Theresa was causing the King of France.

He let it be known to Starhemberg that he did not attach much importance to the connection with England.

⁶⁶ Letter from Kaunitz to Seilern, 18.4.1761, Rescripta 72, Fasz. 19. (F.A.)

⁶⁷ The content of the instructions is not mentioned in Seilern's notes.

⁶⁸ Cf. Hantsch, Hugo: Geschichte Österreichs, vol. 2, 2nd ed. Vienna-Graz 1947, p. 186 f.

The negotiations between England and France, however, progressed so far that Starhemberg already saw in them individual conditions for a separate peace.⁶⁹ According to some provisions of the treaty of 1758, this was not permitted, but Kaunitz said that the strict observance of these articles would be an advantage for France, since Choiseul had said that the fate of France depended on the Viennese court. There would be no opposition to peace with England, but some conditions would have to be met.

Spain's stance on the matter brought Austria another ally.⁷⁰ Charles III, a ruler close to the House of France, wished to ally with France against England. England was presumptuous enough to declare that she hoped that France would not place herself in the matter between her and Spain. Nevertheless, the family contract between Spain and France was signed. Choiseul now spoke only of the continuation of the war and no longer of the Augsburg Peace Congress.

The Viennese court longed for a peace treaty and therefore Starhemberg should do everything in his power to work towards the convocation of the congress. By this time, however, the management of foreign affairs was no longer in Choiseul's hands. His cousin, Count Choiseul-Praslin,⁷¹ had taken over this office.

Another reason for the non-occurrence was the imminent change of throne in Russia. The state of health of the Russian Empress was critical, and it was well known that the inclinations of the heir to the throne were directed towards the King of Prussia, and not towards the allies France and Austria. In January 1762, the Tsarina died, and Peter succeeded to the Russian throne. He sought to implement the changes in policy as quickly as possible. The close friendship with the English envoy Keith⁷² was intended to prepare Russia's transition to the alliance of England with Prussia.

After Pitt's resignation, the new government willy-nilly had to continue the steps he had taken. So she also had to declare war on Spain. On the other hand, the English government tried to get closer to Austria again.

The intermediary was Duke Ludwig of Wolfenbüttel-Brunswick, who declared that England would continue the war for another year, but had not renewed the treaty with Prussia.

⁶⁹ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 269.

⁷⁰ Cf. For the following: Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia and the Seven Years' War 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 290.

⁷¹ César Gabriel de Choiseul-Praslin, comte de Choiseul, né le 14 août 1712, mort le 15 novembre 1783. En 1758 il eeaplaca de duc de Choiseul Stainville, son cousin et ami, dans les fonctions d'ambassadeur extraordinaire à Vienne. En 1760 il revient à Paris, fus admis dans le conseil, et accepta le département des affaires étrangères, don't le duc de Choiseul, titulaires de deux autres ministères se démit en sa faveur. Nouvelle Biographie Générale, Paris 1865.

⁷² George Keith, 10th Earl of Marischal 1693-1778. In 1740 he was sent to Madrid, and in 1744, when France was thinking of attacking Britain, he was to be given command. He spent a short time in Vienna, but then moved to his brother in Prussia. Dictionary of National Biography.

Austria's response was negative, and England also sent an inquiry to the Russian court to receive an answer from there. The Tsar declared that he very much desired peace, and for this purpose would renounce all the conquests made during the war. He expressed the hope that the other allies would do the same. Austria now insisted that Russian troops be withdrawn from Silesia. On May 5, 1762, a peace treaty was signed between Prussia and Russia.

George III of England was in a certain predicament, for his ancestral land of Hanover had suffered greatly from the hostilities, and since the Duke of Newcastle no⁷³ longer remained in office after Pitt, it was now up to Lord Bute⁷⁴, who had taken over the affairs of government, to proceed against Prussia. He tried to come to a peace without Prussia.

b) Continuation of hostilities

While Seilern waited in Augsburg for the start of peace negotiations, the war continued after Russia's departure. The Russian troops even allied themselves with Frederick at the request of Tsar Peter. After several defeats, Frederick thought the time was ripe to lay siege to Świdnica, which had fallen to Austria at the beginning of the war.⁷⁵

Frederick's plans, however, were thwarted by Russia. Tsar Peter had made himself an enemy of everyone through an idolatrous love for all things Prussian, the worst enemy being his wife Catherine, who had him deposed. After his violent death, she ascended the throne on July 17. It kept its promise to evacuate the Prussian territories, and by mid-September they were free of Russians.

c) Peace-building negotiations

Catherine of Russia wished to act as a peace mediator between Austria and Russia. Frederick did not refuse this, since the Russian Empress had already done him a great service with the withdrawal of the troops. The Tsarina also approached the Viennese court with such an offer. Since Russia's departure, Vienna has only focused on peace as a goal. The role of mediator was not insignificant, but France and England, both of whom had already offered themselves, could not be offended.

⁷³ Pelham Thomas, Duke of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and of Newcastle-under-Tyne lived from 1693-1768. He was educated at Westminster School and Cambridge. In the 1750s, his political goal was to promote the division between France and Austria. In 1754 he became Chancellor of the Exchequer, but resigned in 1756. He ended his political career in the Rockingham government in 1766. Dictionary of National Biography.

⁷⁴ John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute lived from 1713-1792. He was a Scottish nobleman, and on 27 October 1760 he was appointed to the Council of State. His aim was to make peace with France. In 1762 he succeeded Newcastle as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Dictionary of National Biography.

⁷⁵ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, pp. 321 ff.

One point of the negotiations concerned the demand made by England that France should in future renounce any assistance from Austria. England itself would do the same with Prussia.

Finally, on November 6, a convention was signed between France and England, containing four articles.⁷⁶

In the first article, France promised to pay Austria the subsidies that were still due.

Secondly, France promised that the artillery captured in the Prussian territories would be loaned to the Austrians.

The third article extended the above provisions to war and provisions provisions. It was also promised that precautions would be taken to secure the places promised to the Austrians after the departure of the French troops.

Fourthly, the Empress was granted a share of the revenues of the territories.

d) The Peace of Hubertusburg

Frederick had regained almost all the territories except the County of Glatz, and it was not worth while for Austria to continue the war. The financial situation was so bad that no further funds would have been raised for a new campaign.

In order to finally come to a peace with Prussia, Augustus II, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, was used, now that there was no other option.

Kaunitz was clever in declaring that Saxony had a great desire for peace, and that Austria was unable to continue the war. The Saxon envoy had a memorandum written in the spirit of Austria and sent it to the King of Poland. The king, for his part, now sent a trustworthy man to the king of Prussia. Frederick declared himself ready for peace. The principle of negotiation was that neither state should suffer significant losses. On the Austrian side, the negotiations were conducted by Collenbach,⁷⁷ who was sent to Dresden. Since Frederick was staying in Leipzig, the Saxon commissioner persuaded him to go to Leipzig. Collenbach, realizing that his step was wrong, remained in the castle of Hubertusburg, while the Saxon envoy hurried to Frederick.

In December 1762, negotiations began, with Collenbach representing Austria, Freiherr von Fritsch representing⁷⁸ Saxony and von Hertzberg representing⁷⁹ Prussia.

On February 15, 1763, a peace treaty was finally ready, and the document was hurriedly sent to Vienna.

⁷⁶ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, p. 376.

⁷⁷ Reichsfreiherr Heinrich Gabriel von Collenbach was born in 1706. In 1762 he was appointed plenipotentiary of Austria in the negotiations with Prussia. General German Biography, Vol. 4.

⁷⁸ Thomas Freiherr von Fritsch was born on 26.9.1700. In 1762 he was appointed president of the commission that was supposed to prepare for peace. He attended as a plenipotentiary and had to solve the unfavourable position of Saxony to his advantage. Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Bd. 8.

⁷⁹ Ewald Friedrich Graf von Hertzberg was born on 2.9.1725 and died in Berlin in 1795. He was entrusted by Frederick with the leadership of the peace negotiations. Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Bd. 12.

The treaty contained the following:⁸⁰ a general amnesty and the deferral of all confiscated property was stipulated. Maria Theresa renounced all claims and lands of the king. It had to evacuate all areas, including Glatz, within three weeks. The king did the same with the Austrian territories. It also promised to intensify trade between the two countries. Frederick agreed to support Archduke Joseph in the election of a Roman king or emperor.

On 1 March 1763, the Hubertusburg Peace Treaty was ratified and replaced.

IV. Seilern as ambassador to England from 1763-69

1. The relationship between England and Austria until Seilern took office

Relations between England and Austria had been abruptly interrupted by the conclusion of the Western Minority Convention of 1756, which united England and Prussia in a pact of mutual assistance.⁸¹ The government of Pitt, which was not friendly to Austria, was replaced in 1761 by the Bute cabinet, who again tried to bring about a rapprochement with Austria. He did not renew the subsidy treaty with Prussia, thus leaving a new avenue open for negotiations with Austria.

Bute's attempt at rapprochement was received with astonishment and suspicion in Vienna. Kaunitz, suspecting a trap, recalled that England sought an alliance with Austria only if it was to her advantage. "It was suggested that England, through Russia's mediation and the pretence of very great advantages which they hoped to gain from the House of Bourbon, would induce Austria not only to abandon the alliance with France, but even to take an active part in the war against it."⁸²

In foreign policy, the prestige and admiration which England had acquired in the Seven Years' War was destroyed by the badly conducted war in the colonies. Britain was without allies and therefore urgently needed to find one.

The answer of the Viennese court to Bute's inquiries was refusal, which hurt England greatly. So the first attempts ended in a big failure.⁸³

⁸⁰ Cf. Arneth, Alfred von: Maria Theresia und der siebenjahreskrieg 1756-63, vol. 2, Vienna 1875, pp. 415 ff.

⁸¹ For the following, see: Schnaubelt, Ingeborg: The Relations between Austria and England from 1756-1780, Vienna 1965, pp. 108 ff.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay: History of England, 2nd vol. 1603-1918, 3rd ed. Munich 1947, p. 620 f.

Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, p. 23 ff.

Keith, Feiling: A History of England, London 1948, p. 701 ff.

⁸² Arneth, Alfred von: Geschichte Maria Theresias, vol. 6, Vienna 1875, p. 291.

⁸³ Cf. Schnaubelt, Ingeborg: The Relations between Austria and England from 1756-1780, Vienna 1965, p. 110.

After the conclusion of the Peace of Hubertusburg in 1763, England made another attempt to resume relations. George III appointed the former British representative in Dresden, Lord Stormond, as his "Minister Plenipotentiare" with the character of an embassy for the Viennese court.⁸⁴ He should have waited first for the appointment of a minister of Austria, since the dismissal of the Austrian representative in 1757 had also taken place first. But in order to prove the British friendship, George had

III. determined to take the first step. Vienna was satisfied with the choice of Stormond's person and appointed Christian August Graf Seilern as Austria's representative. George III agreed to Seilern's appointment. After his work at the Augsburg Peace Congress, Seilern now went to the English court. On September 2, he received his credentials and instructions from the Emperor and Empress. He was also appointed Minister Plenipotentiary for Hanover. King George III issued Seilern with a passport dated 22 July 1763, St. James.⁸⁵ It is difficult to say whether Seilern was suitable for this post, but Count Starhemberg did not consider him to be the best.⁸⁶ He probably owed his appointment only to the lack of a better man for the post.

2. Seilern's inauguration in London

Seilern travelled via Strasbourg and Paris to London, where he arrived at 10 o'clock in the evening on 24 October.⁸⁷

Seilern's first conversations in London were about the status that he himself and Lord Stormond, who was accredited in Vienna, were to have. Secretary of State Lord Sandwich⁸⁸ agreed with Seilers that they should wait for a response from Vienna.⁸⁹ For there was as yet no news of Lord Stormond from Vienna, but it was hoped that he would soon learn from him in what capacity he had been received. Seilern was given the rank of ambassador and also made his inaugural visit to the king in this capacity.

⁸⁴ Cf. Schnaubelt, Ingeborg: *The Relations between Austria and England from 1756-1780*, Vienna 1965, p. 113.

⁸⁵ Original, F.A. Fasz. 17.

⁸⁶ Cf. letter from Starhemberg to Maria Theresa, 24.4.1766, State Chancellery France, Fasz. 131, fol. 6, (H.H.St.A.W.)

⁸⁷ Seilern and Vice-Chancellor Colloredo, London, 31.10.1763, England Correspondence, Fasz. 110, fol. 29 (H.H.St.A.W.)

⁸⁸ John Montague, 4th Earl of Sandwich (1718-92) received his seat in Parliament in 1739 and was not represented in the cabinet until 1755. In February 1763 he was appointed ambassador extraordinary in Madrid. Before his departure, he became 1st Lord of the Admiralty and Secretary of State in August. He remained in this office until 1765, *Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁸⁹ Seilern's letter to Kaunitz, 8.11.1763, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 11.

Soon after his arrival, Seilern reported to Vienna that both the king and the government had expressed a desire to return to the old alliance.⁹⁰ After the presentation of his credentials, the statements of the English Government in this regard became more and more explicit. Lord Sandwich informed him that the English government was working towards only one goal, namely, a closer connection with Austria.⁹¹ Seilern replied that Austria would only change its treaty with France for compelling reasons. As long as the House of Brandenburg had not yet been powerful, the Anglo-Austrian alliance was most useful. This is no longer the case. The defensive alliance with France does not preclude good relations with England. In addition, Austria had not entered into an offensive alliance with any other power. This will not happen in the future either.⁹²

Sandwich thanked Seilern for his openness and stated that he accepted these motives. He also declared that the British government was no longer thinking of supporting Prussia.⁹³

Recognizing the futility of their efforts, the English ministers did not return to the subject.

3. The domestic political situation in England at Seilern's time

Seilern experienced four different cabinets in the relatively short time of his stay. In Trevelyan's opinion, George III ruled from 1760-82 without parties, the cabinet had become an instrument of his will and parliament the recipient of his charitable gifts.⁹⁴

(a) The Grenville ministry⁹⁵

A few months before Seilern's arrival, Bute had to resign because his personal unpopularity had grown too much. He also failed to gain support in parliament.

His first successor was George Grenville. He was assisted by Lord Sandwich and Lord Halifax as Secretaries of State⁹⁶. Sandwich "had good ability and long experience, but his bad private character damaged the government."⁹⁷

⁹⁰ Seilern's letter to Kaunitz, 8.11.1763, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 11.

⁹¹ Cf. Seilern to Kaunitz, 27.12.1763, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 26.

⁹² Cf. Seilern to Kaunitz, 3.1.1764, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 3.

⁹³ Cf. Seilern to Kaunitz, 3.1.1764, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 1-4.

⁹⁴ Trevelyan, George Macaulay: History of England, vol. 2 1603-1918, 3rd ed. Munich 1947, p. 620.

⁹⁵ George Grenville (1712-70) began his political career in 1742. Under the influence of Lord Bute, his views differed from those of Pitt. In 1761 he was appointed to the cabinet and dismissed as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1765. Dictionary of National Biography.

⁹⁶ George Montagu Dunk, 2nd Earl of Halifax (1716-71) was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1757 he was appointed to the cabinet. In 1762 he became Secretary of State in the Bute government, and remained in that office in the Grenville government. He was dismissed in 1765. Dictionary of National Biography.

⁹⁷ Keith, Feiling: A History of England, London 1948, p. 702.

The Grenville government fell over the prosecution of Wilkes ordered by the king,⁹⁸ which was the main cause of controversy with the public. There was an increasing lack of support in parliament. Confidence in the ministers was declining, and people wondered how long this government would be able to last.⁹⁹

The opposition grew. After a respite in parliament, the ministers hoped to have survived the worst, but Seilern was of a different opinion: " Nevertheless, the opposing party is so strong, both in number and weight, that it would be difficult to resist it in length."¹⁰⁰

The Regency Bill brought about the long-awaited break between the government and the king. As the king's health was not excellent in March 1765, the government tried to persuade George III that he had to settle the question of guardianship of his son. He was urged to explicitly prevent his mother's regency because Parliament would not approve it. The bill introduced in parliament had the following wording in German translation: "... as the King's Majesty, Her Majesty, the Queen, or any one of the royal household is known to have demanded to be appointed guardian and government, the same shall be at liberty, either to the Queen's Majesty or to any other member of the King's Majesty. d e r o H. H. G r o s s v a t e r a b s t a m m e n d e c o n i g l. P e r s o n e n."¹⁰¹ The Princess of Valais, the king's mother, who knew nothing of this arrangement, made an indignation in the House of Commons in her favour. Under the influence of the opposition, the "Regency Bill" became an embarrassment for the king.

A few days after these events, the King received his uncle, the Duke of ¹⁰² Cumberland , and this fact seemed to indicate that Cumberland had asked the King to be allowed to negotiate with Pitt. However, Pitt refused, and since there was no other candidate, the ministry remained in office. Seilern was very happy about this, because he appreciated the government because of its pro-Austrian attitudes. He feared a return to a pro-Prussian policy. He went even further in his apprehension "whether the change in the ministerii would not even change this personal disposition of the king."¹⁰³

b) The Rockingham Cabinet¹⁰⁴

⁹⁸ Wilkes is the subject of a detailed chapter.

⁹⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 21.2.1764, , H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 24.

¹⁰⁰ Seilern an Kaunitz, 20.3.1763, , H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 36

¹⁰¹ Cf. Seilern to Kaunitz, 26.4.1765, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 9-12, 3.5.175, Fasz. 111, fol. 2-3, 7.5.1765, Fasz. 111, fol. 11, 20.5.1765, Fasz. 111, fol. 16, 17.5.1765, Fasz. 111, fol. 21-28.

¹⁰² See footnote 51

¹⁰³ Seilern an Kaunitz, 25.6.1765 , H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 18.

¹⁰⁴ Charles Watson-Wentworth, 2nd Marquess of Rockingham (1730-82) was educated at Westminster and Cambridge. His interests were more in the field of sport than politics. Dictionary of National Biography.

At the beginning of July, the expected changes in the government occurred. The government of the Marquis of Rockingham, with the Secretaries of State, the Duke of Grafton¹⁰⁵ and General Conway¹⁰⁶, took office on 16 July. Seilern remarked to the Viennese court that the two gentlemen had little experience in politics, as the general was trained only in war, and the other was scarcely 30 years old.

In addition, it appeals more to horses and hunting.¹⁰⁷ This government had been formed out of embarrassment, and it was clear that it would be short-lived. Seilern commented: All serious candidates had declined, no one wanted to become a member of a "summer ministry".¹⁰⁸

Under the Rockingham government, the stamp file was withdrawn. (England's large debts had led to the introduction of a stamp duty for the American colonies. The money was supposed to pay for the upkeep of the troops stationed there. These measures led to storms of indignation in the planting towns.)¹⁰⁹ Under Pitt's influence, it was decided to withdraw these measures. Some of the ministers were on his side, while he was opposed by the rest.

The Rockingham government was so weak that its resignation was only a matter of time. Pitt attacked the ministry in parliament for being "led by the Duke of Newcastle, who would be stupid because of his age."¹¹⁰ Grafton resigned at the end of April, and no successor could be found. In July 1766 the whole ministry finally resigned.¹¹¹

c) The Chatham Cabinet

After Pitt had finally agreed to re-enter the government, he now took over the office of Lord Privy Seal, having meanwhile advanced to Lord Chatham. He appointed Grafton as First Lord of the Treasury, and Conway and the Earl of Shelburne were appointed Secretaries of State.¹¹² Much to Seilern's chagrin, Pitt was now back in government. "The great prejudice, however, if one cherishes of him, makes all his words and steps blindly admired."¹¹³

In a conversation with Seiler, the two secretaries of state openly admitted that they were completely dependent on Chatham.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁵ Henry August Fitzroy, 3, Duke of Grafton (1735-1811) became Lord Lieutenant of Suffolk in 1757. In 1763 he was dismissed by Lord Bute. He was appointed to the government under the Marquis of Rockingham, and in 1767 formed the cabinet himself. Dictionary of National Biography.

¹⁰⁶ Henry Seymour Conway (1721-95), a general by profession, was appointed Secretary of State in the Rockingham government. Dictionary of National Biography.

¹⁰⁷ Seilern an Kaunitz, 12.7.1765, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 30.

¹⁰⁸ Seilern an Kaunitz, 24.8.1765, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 30.

¹⁰⁹ Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, pp. 362-74.

¹¹⁰ Seilern an Kaunitz, 18.4.1766, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 120.

¹¹¹ Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, p. 374.

¹¹² William Petty, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne, known as Lored Shelburne (1737-1805), was accepted as a member of the privy council in 1763. In the 2nd Pitt government, he was appointed Secretary of State. Dictionary of National Biography.

¹¹³ Seilern an Kaunitz, 29.4.1766, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 139.

¹¹⁴ Seilern an Kaunitz, 5.8.1766, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 309.

Chatham sought an ally on the continent, aware that France and Spain were eager to regain their lost possessions. They had no opponents on the continent and so they were able to turn their attention to England.

Lord Chatham tried to achieve a connection with Russia, but Catherine II pushed her demands too high, calling for the Turkish war to be included in an alliance. An inquiry to Peaceful II of Prussia was also answered negatively.

At the beginning of December 1766, Lord Chatham hardly took part in government business, for severe attacks of gout prevented him from doing so.¹¹⁵ The confusion increased, "as Lord Chatham, on whom everything depends, has for many months, on account of either his true or pretended ill health, has hardly been at all absent from business."¹¹⁶

Charles Townshend, the Minister of Finance, sought to improve the financial situation by introducing new taxes in the colonies. A law to this effect was proposed in June 1767, and when it came into force in November, the colonies fiercely resisted, questioning the authority of Parliament. The government was no longer able to cope with this situation and the Chatham government failed.¹¹⁷

d) The Crafton Cabinet

Crafton was the only one from the Chatham government to escape. His political unreliability allowed the king to get his hands on the ministers entirely. Lord Weymouth¹¹⁸ and Lord Shelburne were named as new secretaries of state.

The situation in America came to a head. In order to appease the colonies, it was decided to withdraw all taxes except the tea tax on 1 May 1769, but the colonies refused to compromise.

The new elections of 1768 brought the Wilkes affair to a new outburst. He stood for election to the House of Commons and this led to a revolt.

4) The Wilkes case

¹¹⁵ Seilern an Kaunitz, 14.4.1767, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 557.

¹¹⁶ Seilern an Kaunitz, 14.4.1767, H.H.St.A.W., England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 557.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, pp. 384-87.

¹¹⁸ Thomas Taynne, 3rd Viscount of Weymouth and Marquis of Bath (1734-96) leaned towards the Bedford party. In 1768 he became Secretary of State for the Northern Department and then for the South. He remained in office until the end of 1770. Dictionary of National Biography.

In its issue of April 23, 1763, the newspaper "North Briton" attacked the Peace of Hubertusburg, which had just been concluded, and the speech of George III, in which he called the peace honorable.¹¹⁹ George III, feeling personally attacked, demanded the arrest of Wilkes. When the affair was debated in parliament on 15 November, neither Greenfield, who was then head of government, nor the king were prepared to drop the matter. Egged on by the king, Wilkes, along with 49 other newspapermen, was captured by a general warrant¹²⁰ and thrown into the Tower.

With the help of Lord Temple, Wilkes demanded a habeas corpus. In order to issue this, Lord Temple secured the person of Chief Justice Pratt, who declared the capture illegal because one of the privileges of the Parliament was that a general warrant was not legal. Wilkes was released and he received compensation for the damage caused by the search of the house.

After the opening of the autumn session of Parliament, they immediately convened to make new accusations against Wilkes. The Whig party was divided into two camps: on the one side were Lord Wardwicke and his son Charles Yorke, the Attorney General, who defended the arrest, and on the other, Pitt, who greatly regretted the incident.¹²¹

The further attacks against Wilkes were based on two unpublished essays, one, a parody of Pope's "Essay on Man," titled "Essay on Woman," the other a paraphrase of "Veni creator." Since they were Wilkes' private property and therefore nobody's business, the parliament sought pretexts to enforce a new arrest of Wilkes. This, however, only drew the ire of the public.

On 15 November, the House of Commons voted for the burning of No. 45 North Briton by the executioner, which took place on 3 December. Parliament also decided that "editions libels" were not protected by Parliament's privileges.¹²²

Wilkes himself was ordered to appear before the House of Commons, but an injury sustained in a duel prevented him from obeying the order. As he had still not appeared before Parliament by 23 December, it was decided to examine the matter in his absence.

On 19 January, his expulsion from parliament was enforced, as Wilkes had fled to France in the meantime. Since his conviction was pronounced in the King's Bench and he was declared outlawed, the matter was considered closed.

Seilern, who observed and reported this matter very closely, was completely incomprehensible to her. He had no sympathy for the English freedom of the press, which went so far as to attack the king, nor for the fact that the author of such pamphlets was even discussed. This lack of understanding, however, was not only characteristic of Seilers, but also of the other envoys of the continental powers, since there was no law of freedom of the press on the continent.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, pp. 348-59 and 391 ff.

¹²⁰ A general warrant is issued by the Secretary of State, without mentioning a name. Keith, Feiling: A History of England, London 1948, p. 703.

¹²¹ Cf. Keith, Feiling: A History of England, London, 1948, p. 703.

¹²² Marshall, Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans 1962, p. 354 f.

On 25 November, Seilern was pleased to announce Wilke's capture.¹²³ He was also astonished by the riots of the mob, as he put it, which took place at the burning of the North Briton, and he said that they were not decent citizens, for they would not be capable of such excesses.¹²⁴

Seilern was mistaken, for Wilkes' followers were recruited from all strata of the people.

After Wilkes' escape, Seilern thought the matter was settled, but he was mistaken.

In the general election of 1768, Wilkes suddenly reappeared and was enthusiastically welcomed by the London mob. The conditions were very bad, as the seafarers and coal carriers went on strike because of too high prices. So all it took was one spark to ignite the powder keg, and that spark was Wilkes. He terrorized the population, demanded that all houses be illuminated, and those who disobeyed his orders had to reckon with damage to their homes.¹²⁵

In a by-election in Middlesex, Wilkes' lawyer was elected. The King demanded Wilkes' arrest and on 26 April 1768 he was sent to King's Bench Prison. At the opening of Parliament on May 10, 1768, the crowd went wild and demanded Wilkes' release. Troops provided for security intervened in the commotion and the first deaths were reported.

On 8 June, Judge Mansfield sentenced Wilkes to 22 months' imprisonment and a fine of £1,000 on the 1764 charge. Wilkes then published a letter from Lord Weymouth in which he asked the Lambeth magistrate to call the military as soon as possible in case of emergency. So he accused Lord Weymouth of being responsible for the "Massacre of St. George's Field".¹²⁶

In 1769 there were new district elections, but they were only a farce, as there was no opposing candidate for Wilkes. He was re-elected with a large majority. As an antidote, the election was annulled. The court then finally found a man to run against Wilkes: Colonel Luttrell, who, despite losing the election, was given the seat in Parliament. The king triumphed over the electorate, and from then on only the king's bought puppets sat in parliament.

Wilkes, whose popularity was steadily increasing, was elected Alderman of London while still a prisoner.

¹²³ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 25.11.1763, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 110, fol. 38.

¹²⁴ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 9.12.1763, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 110, fol. 13.

¹²⁵ . Keith, Feiling: A History of England, London 1948, p. 707.

¹²⁶ Hunt, Willian-Poole, Reginald: The Political History of England, vol. 9, 10, London 1909, pp. 95 f.

Seilern returned to the Wilkes case. On 15 May 1768 he announced his candidacy for a seat in London.¹²⁷ For Seilern, it was unbelievable that a man like Wilkes was allowed to run at all. "As strange as it may seem that one who, in addition to the protection of the law, is thus outlawed by the crime he has committed, should be granted such a dignity, one would still want to assert that the aforementioned circumstances could not prevent the eventual election."¹²⁸ He was relieved to find out a few days later that Wilkes had no chance and was running for a seat in Middlesex.¹²⁹

The successful election was celebrated accordingly. When riots broke out, the ambassadors did not escape the anger of the people. Seilern reported that his windows had been smashed and his equipage had also been stopped. Wilkes stated that he would face the court himself, and Seilern hoped that he would not be treated too leniently.¹³⁰

On April 8, he sent an excerpt from the "Public Advertiser" to Vienna dealing with John Wilkes. "After some years spent abroad this man returns to England with a little fear of the laws, which he had violated."¹³¹ He dared to run in Middlesex, even though he doesn't own a piece of land there. To make matters worse, the man in debt, an outlaw, reappears in the country to run for parliament as a "Knight of a Shire". He sought to impose his victory with terror, and every other candidate was forcibly prevented by Wilkes and his friends. The consequence of the violent election victory was renewed riots, in which even the royal family was not safe from the riots. The government was blamed for this, and one could only hope that George III would finally dismiss these ministers.

Despite these attacks on the government, nothing happened. Although the ministry was uncomfortable with the matter regarding foreign diplomats, nothing was done. Wilkes actually turned himself in voluntarily, even though riots had been expected the day before, and many people had left London. He confessed to his article in North Briton and testified that all the allegations were true. He also confessed his dislike of the king. However, he denied the accusations made about the defamatory poems, saying that the court had only obtained them by bribing his servant. Lord Mansfield renders no verdict and Wilkes has been released.¹³²

Wilkes, anxious to settle his affairs as soon as possible, turned himself in to the sheriff. On the way to the prison, his car was attacked by the crowd, but he succeeded. To convince them that they were only harming him. In prison, he then applied for an investigation into whether his trial, freedom from the outlaw, and his banishment had been justified at all. That request was granted.¹³³

As the verdict was delayed for some time, there were continual riots, which reminded rope makers of the time of the Stuart kings.¹³⁴

¹²⁷ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 15.3.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 76.

¹²⁸ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 15.3.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 76.

¹²⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 22.3.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 82.

¹³⁰ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 5.4.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 96-99.

¹³¹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 8.4.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, Pub. Advertiser, fol. 102.

¹³² Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 26.4.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 110-111.

¹³³ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 29.4.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 115-116.

¹³⁴ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 10.5.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 126 and

The "North Briton", which continued to appear, defended its hero and songs were written among the people in honour of Wilkes. The Chief Justice Lord Mansfield was attacked and asked to support Wilkes.¹³⁵

When, after his expulsion from Parliament, Wilkes stood for election three times in Middlesex, Seilern could only report with horror what was said of George III: "that a vicious prince, who administers the state well, was unequally preferable to a virtuous but weak and negligent one."¹³⁶

Wilke's trial, which had begun in 1763, finally came to an end only in 1769. Wilkes was awarded £4,000, which the king had to pay.¹³⁷

Parliament ended the matter by maintaining the expulsion from Parliament in accordance with the customs of the commons.¹³⁸

The Wilkes affair was not so important for Seilern's official business, but he himself took a lively interest in it, probably because this was impossible in Austria. He also expressed his opinion clearly in this regard. To him, who knew no freedom of the press, it must have seemed almost outrageous that anyone should dare to attack the king, the government and parliament. However, he was not the only one who took offence at this, his counterparts also agreed with him.

1. English foreign policy, its relationship with the continental states from Seilern's point of view

a) The Gravier Case, an Anglo-Austrian conflict

In February 1764, Earl Sandwich reported an incident in Livorno to Seilern.¹³⁹ Gravier, a merchant's widow living under English protection, had already placed two of her daughters who had converted to the Catholic faith in convents and now wanted to send the third to one as well. This daughter remained with her mother only on one condition: that she would not be taken abroad until she was 13 years old. The widow then complained, and the other inhabitants of Livorno also joined her. They demanded the free withdrawal of all persons under English sovereignty. If this was not the case, the merchants were threatened with leaving. Seilern promised to get in touch with Vienna immediately, adding that, in his opinion, the girls had voluntarily changed their faith. Since the British insisted on a speedy settlement, and Lord Stormond also presented a memoir, Seilern could only wish for a speedy settlement.

Seilern, 17.5.1768, Fasz. 114, fol. 129, 135, 138.

¹³⁵ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 10.6.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 159, 160.

¹³⁶ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 31.3.1769, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 444.

¹³⁷ Cf. Raigersfeld to Kaunitz 14.11.1769, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 114, fol. 705 and 706.

¹³⁸ Cf. Raigersfeld an Kaunitz, 28.2.1770, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 116, fol. 43.

¹³⁹ For the following, cf. Seilern an Kaunitz 17.2.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 10.

The king had already received a petition from the merchants of Livorno in December, in which it was reported that Anne Gravier, who was only eleven years old, had entered the convent on June 23. Before her, her two older sisters had entered a convent in Pisa. The interventions of the British consul in Florence had no effect. In its privileges it was said: "qu'aucun Sujet de l'Empereur ne recevra un Enfant qui aura quitté la Maison paternelle avant l'age de treize ans, enfin changer Religion d'ambassadeur le Catholique Religion."¹⁴⁰

But instead of demanding the necessary obedience from the girls, they were incited in their disobedience by the convention at Pisa against the protection they received from the consulate in Florence.¹⁴¹

The merchants urged the king to intervene through Lord Stormond. The daughter was to be returned to her mother, and the other two were to be reminded of their obedience, for the family wanted to return to England.

In Vienna, the Vice-Chancellor of the Empire, Count Colloredo, agreed to present the matter to the Emperor, even though it was a Tuscan matter. Stormond claimed the surrender of the youngest daughter on the basis of a British-Tuscan declaration, Article 26 of which said: "Religions may only be changed when the age of majority has been reached. Since the Tuscan government had refused to hand it over, they had been forced to turn to the emperor as well."¹⁴²

The latter replied in two mémoires: " Sa Majesté Impériale s'essaient fait rendre compte des dites instances a lieu voulu ordonner que cette Demoiselle fut d'abord rendue à sa mère s'engageât de ne pas commencer sa fille hors de la Toscane avant quelle eut atteint l'age de treize ans, et qu'il aussitôt qu'elle seroit parvenue à cet age ou lui demandant si elle persistait dans la résolution de changer de religion."¹⁴³

In the second, the Emperor explained in detail his reasons for refusal.

Lord Stormond was very much dismayed at the letters he had received, and did not seem to have expected a refusal. In his reply, he shared his dismay and disappointment.¹⁴⁴ On the orders of his court, he wrote a new promemoria in which he demanded the new extradition of Anne Gravier.¹⁴⁵ No one could deny mother and daughter the return journey. The girl is still much too young to decide on her future.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 2.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 111, fol. 10-11.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 2.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 111, fol. 11.

¹⁴² Cf. an Seilern, Vienna, 7.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 112, fol. 48.

¹⁴³ An Seilern, Vienna 7.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 112, fol. 50.

¹⁴⁴ Seilern an Kaunitz, 2.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 9.

¹⁴⁵ Seilern an Kaunitz, 2.3.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 9.

Since the imperial court was not prepared to give in, Sandwich repeatedly asked Seilern for an intervention. The ministers threatened unpleasant consequences if they refused to give in to the request. "To all appearances, this is now to the effect that, otherwise, all English merchants would move away from Livorno and go to Genoa, or other Italian seaports."¹⁴⁶ As the Viennese court did not make any noise, Seilern consoled Lord Sandwich, who claimed that a refusal could be heard in the persistent silence.

There was a further exchange of promemorias and notes, which were unsuccessful, as both sides did not deviate from their original point of view. The British government repeatedly pointed out that the girl was a minor.¹⁴⁷

The Emperor took a step of concession with his declaration: "Sa Majesté ordonna à son Conseil de Regence de prendre les mesures les plus efficaces pour empêcher déformais que sous quel prétexte ce puisse entre les enfants de tous les négociants étrangers établis à Livourne fussent admis avant l'âge de treize ans accomplis et contre la volonté de leurs parents, Dans aucune autre maison pour y professer une religion différente de Celle dans laquelle ils seraient nés que même en ce cas ils fussent renvoyés sans aucun examen. »¹⁴⁸ The Emperor declared that there was no way he could go any further, because the girl had been born in Livorno and her father had immigrated from Switzerland.

Stormond was not satisfied with the success, and London did not agree with it either, although it seemed that they wanted to let the matter rest. There was another exchange of notes.

Finally, Sandwich declares that they are satisfied with the above imperial decree, which, owing to the negligence of the Consulate, had only now come to the knowledge of the English Ministry. If the handing over of the girl to the critical consul up to the age of thirteen was also envisaged, they agreed.¹⁴⁹

As a result, Emperor Francis I .dem also decided to accommodate the English king. The governor of Livorno was instructed to hand the girl over to the English consul, with whom she was to remain until she reached the age of thirteen. The consul took over the girl, but refused to meet the conditions. The British citizens were satisfied with the outcome, except for Mrs. Gravier, who wanted to keep her daughter for herself. She was unsuccessful in her renewed appeal for help to the English court, because the emperor maintained his demand that the girl should not be allowed to leave Livorno. The decision was now up to the British government.

¹⁴⁶ Seilern an Kaunitz, 17.4.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 9.

¹⁴⁷ Seilern an Kaunitz, 14.7.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 87-117, 122-124..

¹⁴⁸ Seilern an Kaunitz, 7.8.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 4.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 14.7.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 118.

In London, they demanded Anne's extradition on the grounds that the surrender had only been proposed to protect the child from possible punishment. Any other interpretation could only be a misunderstanding. Seilern pointed out in vain that the girl would no longer receive protection after leaving the country. The news that Anne's birthplace was in Switzerland caused nothing but astonishment.¹⁵⁰

Stormond again and vehemently demanded the return of the girl and threatened that the matter would be brought before Parliament. This step could easily lead to a break between England and Tuscany.

In Vienna, this statement was immediately seen as a threat of war. The Emperor declared that he had done the utmost in this matter, and that the fact that the matter was still not settled was due to the obstinacy of the mother. The Viennese decision had left the paths open to the girl to any religion, but the mother obviously wanted to convert her to Protestantism. Let the king appoint someone to whom the girl could be delivered, but the other two would not be released under any circumstances.¹⁵¹

The emperor's suggestion was that the girl should be given to her mother, but that the mother should be brought before her at the age of thirteen, either in Tuscany or in London, in order to decide on his religion. The king should guarantee the free decision.¹⁵²

In London this proposal was accepted, and Sandwich summoned the widow Gravier to speak to her about it. She refused, and she also demanded her two older daughters. Seilern immediately refused. When asked not to go too far with her wishes, she agreed.¹⁵³

Both sides were now satisfied with the result, and the king himself expressed his approval.¹⁵⁴

This somewhat strange affair became a matter of prestige for the two states, in which a compromise was reached. Neither the Emperor nor the King of England had to abandon their principles, and this fact calmed the minds again.

b) The insult of the Austrian consul in Tripoli

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 19.10.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 9-12.

¹⁵¹ Cf. An Seilern, 15.12.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 112, fol 156, 167-175.

¹⁵² Cf. An Seilern, 16.12.1764, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 112, fol 192, 193, 198 and 199.

¹⁵³ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 7.1.1765, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 111, fol. 29, 32-34.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 11.1.1765, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 111, fol 39, and 8.2.1765, fol. 17.

After the death of the Emperor in 1765, the Viennese court learned of an insult to the Austrian consul in Tripoli by an English colleague. "It is incomprehensible how a consul, who ought rather to have helped to defend than to violate the dignity and privileges of this office, could have allowed himself to be carried away by a sort of rage, the first of all consuls in his own house, which is respected by the barbarians themselves as a sanctuary even sanctified for deadly evil-doers. at a time when the Emperor's banner, which has just been stretched out, reminds us of the due deference in an almost predatory manner, to ill-treat in an almost predatory manner on account of a mere free man who had fled, but who was neither a native Englishman, but a Emperor-Tuscan subject, nor in English service or pay, and whom, even if he had had some right in the same, he should nevertheless have demanded repayment in the usual manner among civilized peoples."¹⁵⁵ Satisfaction must be demanded for this insult in front of a people who measure the gravity of a crime "according to the degree of public punishment".¹⁵⁶ England owes this honour to the imperial house.

Seilern, who, like everyone else in London, was ignorant of this incident, immediately turned to the Tripolitan envoy, who had not yet taken any steps to await confirmation of the news from Vienna. He told Seilern that his master wished to get rid of the English consul. The English Secretary of State, General Conway, declared that he would demand an explanation from his consul, Mr. Fraser. If this is consistent with the Austrian accusations, the required satisfaction will be paid.¹⁵⁷ He denied his transgression and even denied the rank of the Austrian consul Conti. Kaunitz therefore expressed the hope that they would not be deceived by the bogus reasons.¹⁵⁸

In the meantime the Tripolitan envoy had brought the matter to Conway. He handed over a letter from Bei with a report of the incidents. Seilern demanded that a sentence be imposed on Fraser, which would only be waived if he could provide compelling evidence of his innocence. The poor postal connection could delay an answer for months.

But Conway did not consider such a promise to be justifiable, since there was no one in Tripoli who could have carried out the sentence. A dismissal and condemnation in London was not enough for Seilern, because a public insult also required public satisfaction.¹⁵⁹ He was of the opinion that the Beider should be asked to inform the people that the English Government disapproved of the disappearance of its representative, and therefore dismissed him.

¹⁵⁵ An Seilern, 11.11.1765, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 322.

¹⁵⁶ An Seilern, 11.11.1765, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 322.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 3.12.1765, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 111, fol. 23-25.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. An Seilern, 16.1.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 345.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 24.1.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 22.

In February, the Tripolitan envoy delivered a letter from Bei demanding the removal of Fraser, who was "persona non grata." If he (sc. The Bei) would not have been so convinced of the attitude of the British government if he had expelled Fraser from the country long ago. Mr. Fraser was the son of Lord Lovat, and was also related to Conway. A measure would therefore stir up a lot of dust. George III assured Seilern that he would do nothing at all, least of all anything that would contribute to the displeasure of the English court.¹⁶⁰

Seilern, by his constant insistence, succeeded in getting the consul to apologize on command. On 19 February, Conway informed the Austrian ambassador, to his great satisfaction, that the king had instructed him to reprimand Fraser and to pronounce his recall.

In early July, Fraser announced that he was returning. His relatives, especially Conway, had asked Seilern to intercede for Fraser. The latter gave his consent.¹⁶¹

But also from the Austrian envoy Conti came the news that Fraser had left, but had not apologized. Seilern immediately reported to Conway and told him that if necessary, the new consul would have to apologize if Fraser had not already done so.¹⁶²

A few days later, Richmond, the second secretary of state, informed Seilern that an apology had been made by Fraser and that an insult was not in his mind. Furthermore, the government was determined to leave him to the clemency of the imperial household. The fact that no attempt was made by the English government to defend Fraser meant that the matter had been reduced to a private matter, which could not offend an imperial court.¹⁶³

At the end of July, Seilern received from Richmond all available testimony and reports that absolved Fraser of any guilt and held Conti responsible for what had happened. Seilern demanded a thorough investigation.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 24.1.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 23.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 4.7.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 279, 280.

¹⁶² Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 11.7.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 283, 284.

¹⁶³ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 18.7.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 289-91.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 26.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 349.

The testimony of Jacob Sambler, a lieutenant on the "Deal Castle", was as follows: One of the sailors hired at Messina had deserted before sailing. The next day Fraser went to see Captain Hudson, and he and three other sailors accompanied him home, as was customary there. There they learned that the deserter was with the Austrian consul, whereupon Mr. Fraser went there at once. With him went the sailors, all of whom were unarmed, to retrieve the fugitive. "That on going into the Court of the House in order to find a servant to inform the Imperial Consul of our being there, we saw the Deserter, and Mr. Fraser immediately sent a message to the Consul to acquaint him that we were to come to reclaim the said Deserter and the Sailors directly laid Hands on him to prevent his further Escape and held him in the open court till the Consul should be spoken with. That the Imperial Consul did not appear upon the Message sent him but his Wife That the Message was repeated to her and she was told at the same time that there was no Affront or Insult meant or should be offered to the Consul or to her, as no doubt he would give up the man amicably. Afterwards¹⁶⁵ the consul came down and refused to hand over the prisoner. The sailors could not take the prisoner away, for some armed Moors came up. During this time Mr. Fraser was with the consul, and he did not lay hands on the consul, nor did he strike his wife. Mr. Fraser had not uttered any disrespectful words to the Consul or the Imperial House after the testimony.

The testimony of two sailors was almost identical to the one above. The two only added that the Consul had insulted Conti and his wife Mr. Fraser.¹⁶⁶

Seilern doubted the correctness of these statements, as they were in great contradiction to those of the Swedish ambassador, who had also had them certified by the Pasha. In his opinion, these people were accomplices who tried to conceal their guilt in this way. Conway decided to withdraw the documents and the new Secretary of State, Lord Shelburne, offered Seilern submission. Then letters of justification arrived from Conway, followed by those from Shelburne and Fraser. He explained that the case had been presented to Seilern in a distorted way, because he, Fraser, had the Austrian Attorney General for the Communist Party. Consul never offended by words or deeds. The fault lies solely with the consul. He had only done his duty when he demanded the prisoner back. Anyone who works on board a British ship is considered an English seaman. The imperial consul had persuaded the deserter to flee.¹⁶⁷

At that point, Seilern had the deserter's statement, which confirmed that there had indeed been an understanding between him and Conti. No further details are reported. Seilern withholds the document and, for understandable reasons, urges the Viennese court to show leniency. Since the Tripolitan envoy had reported to his Pasha that England had asked for the mercy of the imperial court, they were also satisfied.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ Seilern and Kaunitz, 26.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 113, fol.351, 352.

¹⁶⁶ Seilern and Kaunitz, 26.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 113, fol. 353 and 354.

¹⁶⁷ Seilern and Kaunitz, 26.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 113, fol. 363 and 364.

¹⁶⁸ Seilern an Kaunitz, 26.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 113, fol. 346-348.

Maria Theresa agreed to leniency out of consideration for Fraser's relatives. However, she demanded that Fraser never be allowed to return to Tripoli. His successor should announce the reason for the dismissal and, if possible, apologize.¹⁶⁹

Seilern succeeded in preventing Fraser's return, but he was unsuccessful in apologizing. Seilern was satisfied with what had been achieved, because sticking to the demand would have ruined half the success.

c) England and Prussia

The situation after the Peace of Hubertusburg had changed. Frederick II of Prussia had angered England by occupying the English magazines in his country, believing he had unsatisfied claims. Since Frederick was asked to apologize, and he did not agree to it, the English court feared that Frederick would attack Hanover. They therefore turned to Austria, Prussia's greatest enemy, for help. Seilern assured Sandwich that the laws of the Reich would be strictly observed and that they did not wish to interrupt the ongoing peace in Vienna under any circumstances. "I have not left unrecognised how this prince's increased power certainly deserves a fair attention; but Lord Sandwich knows best by whose action and assistance it has risen so high, and has been supported up to now."¹⁷⁰ However, this affair then dissolved itself, because Friedrich released the occupied magazines.

As a result of this incident, Frederick II's actions were watched as closely from London as from Vienna.

They were not very pleased with the treaty concluded between Prussia and Russia, as London also wished to enter into a treaty with Russia. They were not prepared to enter into an alliance with Prussia again. The former enthusiasm for Friedrich now turned into aversion, which was noted with joy in Vienna.

Little attention was paid in London to the machinations that began between Prussia and Russia over the election of the Polish king.

More attention was paid to the rumours of a resumption of Franco-Prussian relations, but when it did happen, it was with the knowledge of Austria. The constellation of states in relation to each other did not change.

On the other hand, the negotiations that had begun between Frederick II and the Porte, which were directed against Austria, were considered dangerous. Seilern declared it to be fictitious.¹⁷¹ These rumours were by no means fictitious, for Frederick was actually trying to approach the Porte, hoping to carry out his own plans with Poland more easily.

¹⁶⁹ Seilern an Kaunitz, 23.10.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence, Fasz. 112, fol. 461, 462.

¹⁷⁰ Seilern an Kaunitz, 27.12.1763, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 110, fol. 28.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 17.5.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 174.

In 1765 it was decided in England with Prussia to appoint the mutual representatives as ministers. England sent Sir Andrew Mitchell, and Prussia sent Earl Malzahn. Austria was not very pleased by this and called on Seilern to prevent a possible rapprochement. But Conway allayed his misgivings when he declared that Prussia's following in England was small, and that not even Pitt was one of its loyal supporters.¹⁷²

Nevertheless, in 1766 a rapprochement with Prussia was resumed, as efforts to form an alliance with Russia were unsuccessful. It was perhaps hoped that in this way a defensive agreement with Russia would be reached.¹⁷³

With this wish, England did not harbor any hostile disposition towards Austria, but only wanted to get out of isolation at all costs.

Meanwhile, the voices of an imminent war grew louder and louder. These rumours were further strengthened by the construction of a field equipage by Austria and Prussian rearmament. In England they did not believe in it, and besides, Great Britain was far from Poland. It was far too uninteresting for England.

In response to the rumours, Austria said that it was necessary to arm itself against Prussia. It remained with the preparations.

Nevertheless, Seilern had a lot of trouble to dispel a new rumor, namely that negotiations for a Prussian-Austro-French alliance were underway.¹⁷⁴ There was no concrete basis for this. The only reason that could be considered was the meeting between Emperor Josef II and Frederick II, which had already been planned. In England, there was little interest in this meeting, and in fact everything remained the same.

d) England and France

aa) Austria's offer of neutrality

In April 1766, Kaunitz gave Seilern a difficult assignment.¹⁷⁵ He pointed out that the final peace was more like an armistice than a true peace. The sources of the fire ... Manila, and Newfoundland fisheries could create a new war at any moment. The unrest in the American colonies was also not conducive to improving the world situation. If Pitt were to come to power, a new war would be inevitable. As soon as French naval power was restored, there would be a conflict, since England owed it to herself for the sake of self-preservation.

¹⁷² Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 30.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 276.

¹⁷³ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 30.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 276.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 21.4.1769, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 462.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 22.4.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 355-69.

The alliances with the Nordic countries seem to indicate this. Austria is watching the emergence of the Nordic league with concern. The danger of such an alliance system particularly affected Austria, and therefore France had been asked to take precautions. France still wants to wait and see, but Austria is thinking of a way out. France and England had to be convinced that a war in Germany was against their national interests, and that Austria would never break the peace. Great Britain had nothing to fear for Hanover, a land war would be superfluous, and so would the League.

The first attempt was made with France, because it was Austria's ally. Count Starhemberg was also able to persuade France to recognize the danger and consider a continental war unnecessary. Now, however, it is also necessary to inform the English ministers, and this task falls to ropers. He was to inform Kaunitz and Choiseul, who knew what was going on, the British sentiments.

To this end, let him (sc. Seilern) present the disadvantages of a war on the Continent for England, for all other reasons take a back seat if her own interests do not come to the fore. If this were to be realized, all the reasons for a Nordic league would disappear and Great Britain could turn back to the sea. If Prussia had no opportunity for military conflicts, France would not be in a position to interfere in foreign affairs.

In addition, Seilern had to make unmistakably clear the impossibility of an Anglo-Prussian-Austrian alliance against France. Certainly, such a treaty would offer advantages for England, but Austria could not and would not come to an agreement with Prussia. With a state that even now tries to damage the monarchy – Frederick II had previously tried to achieve an alliance with the Turks – one should not be on friendly terms.

However, the Viennese court would not conclude an alliance with England alone. Maria Theresa wants to be able to remain neutral, with the exception of aid to France. England only had to promise that peace would be guaranteed in Germany.

Seilern, however, should only ever speak of a war in Germany and not of a land war.

England should only always believe that France expects many advantages from a land war and is not, as is the case, peace-minded.

Seilern was also to inform the French and Spanish ambassadors in this regard.

Soon the answer came from London. Seilern assured that as long as France did not think of war, there would certainly be none. The British court was to be believed, because it had little left to conquer, and it preferred to keep what it had conquered.¹⁷⁶ The uncertain world situation is a cause for concern, and national debts are so high that it is impossible to think of a new war.

Seilern promised not to lose sight of the danger of a northern war. The policy pursued by England was now taking a heavy toll, for the two continental powers now had no time for their former ally.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 17.5.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 167.

Unfortunately, Seilern was not able to address his assignment to the Secretary of State immediately, because the responsible minister, Duke of Grafton, had resigned and Seilern wanted to find out the attitude of his successor first.

In a report to Paris, Seilern expressed himself in the same way. In the meantime, Seilern had given Conway the first hints, and Conway agreed with him that a break with France would force England to avoid a war in Germany. The assurance that Austria would try to obtain from France a guarantee that war on the continent would not take place was also applauded. However, both state secretaries were of the opinion that the avoidance of war in Germany depended more on France than on Great Britain.¹⁷⁷ He was assured that nothing would be done against Austria. But if England should ever again conclude an alliance with Prussia, it would have the same character as the Franco-Austrian one. Such a measure could only be advantageous, because it would ensure the balance.¹⁷⁸

Seilern, who was very much alarmed by this, spoke a few days later to the Secretary of State, Richmond, about this statement, and wanted to know why England had changed her mind. He replied that this was not the case, but that Seilern had only misunderstood the statements. Seilern then pointed out that Vienna had clearly declared that it did not want to join the "pacte de famille" as long as it was not forced. A treaty between England and Prussia would be one such reason.

Richmond pointed out Britain's isolation and that an alliance with Prussia would only restore balance. He knows that Austria's treaty with France is only a defensive contract, but that it could very easily become an offensive contract. Seilern replied that any alliance could be transformed. England is not alone, as it also has alliances with Sweden, Denmark and Portugal.¹⁷⁹

When Seilern spoke of this interview to the French ambassador, he was completely surprised, for he had not yet received any instructions from his government. This prompted Seilern to behave cautiously towards him.

In the meantime it had been informed in Vienna that England was indeed thinking of including Austria in an alliance with Prussia. As always, Austria's interests were overlooked.

The rumour circulating in Europe that Emperor Joseph II was preparing a reconquest of Lorraine only gave new fuel to the possibility of separation from France.¹⁸⁰ Kaunitz emphasized that everyone had a wrong idea of the emperor, because Josef viewed the Prussian king objectively, but was far from being his friend.

He hoped that England would commit itself to neutrality after the failure of the meeting. He also threatened to join the "pacte de famille". The Chancellor praised Seilern's conduct very much.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 6.6.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 227, 228.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 21.6.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 252.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 21.6.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 256.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Seilern, 11.7.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 398-99.

In his reply, Seilern expressed his astonishment at the offer of Austria's inclusion in the alliance with Prussia, for the English court was of a completely different opinion. Although there was an opinion in London that Joseph had an aversion to France, he constructed this from his actions. As long as Maria Theresa was alive, the desire to break the alliance was unthinkable, because she held on to the alliance with France.

Seilern distrusted the French court, because in his opinion the agreement to the matter of neutrality was not meant honestly.¹⁸¹ He pointed out that France had won all its victories on land and would not take Austria's interests into account if necessary. He continued to persuade England, but he was not mistaken about France.

The first incident occurred when the Spanish ambassador, Prince Masserano, told Seilern that Austria was planning a treaty with England and was very upset about it. So the French ambassador had talked about the secret negotiations.¹⁸²

Kaunitz remained calm and was of the opinion that England should not be pressured under any circumstances, otherwise the impression would be created that the Austrian proposals were dictated by fear.¹⁸³

At the end of September, however, the true facts came to light. The English had learned that France had been aware of the offers of neutrality. Conway was outraged. In his eyes, an attempt had been made to put the English court to sleep in order to prevent it from making favourable connections. Nevertheless, he assured the Viennese court that defensive measures would always be taken. Now that the matter was known, Kaunitz instructed Seilern not to deny Austria's intentions under any circumstances.¹⁸⁴

Austria's attempt to bring about England's neutrality had failed, and it was no longer discussed.

bb) The conflict over Corsica

In 1768, France and Genoa agreed on the ownership of the island of Corsica. The island passed into French possession according to the treaty of May 16, 1768. France sent 10,000 men to the island, as it was now de facto master.

There was a great deal of excitement in England about this, for this step was seen as a dangerous enlargement of France. In addition, a valuable Mediterranean base had fallen into the hands of the French. Since it was believed that this had been done with the support of the Viennese court, it was not well received.¹⁸⁵

The government was very alarmed, but the French ambassador denied England any right to interfere. The opposition saw no reason for war in the matter, nor did it constitute a violation of sovereignty at sea.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸¹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 29.7.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 298 f.

¹⁸² Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz 8.8.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 113, fol. 315-318.

¹⁸³ Cf. An Seilern, 16.9.1766, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 428-432.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. An Seilern, 27.10.1766, H.H.St.a.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 112, fol. 468 and 469.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 24.5.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 145.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 3.6.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 115 and 156.

Kaunitz had told the French representative that this undertaking was very unpleasant, but the official statement only stated that it did not take any part in the French undertakings. The fact that there was no war was only due to the indecisive attitude of the British government.¹⁸⁷

England tried to persuade Austria to take action, for it could not be decided on its own. Seilern saw through the government very quickly, for he was skeptical that "the only thing that matters now is whether the previous verbal objection will be maintained by active means."¹⁸⁸

The vote in parliament was of decisive importance in the matter. They couldn't come to an agreement. In April of the next year, they still did not know what to say to France. It was not until September that a soft response to the French declaration was made: "Aussitôt que Sa Majesté Britannique de prendre Possession de l'Isle de Corse, elle n'a pas tante de faire connaître par le canal de Son Ambassadeur à Paris Ses sentîmes sur une entrepris, qui pourrait troubler le tranquillité générale en donnant atteinte aux intérêts de différents Etats d'Italie heureusement établis et confirmée par les derniers Traités de Paix.

Si la Communication de la Convention de Sa Majesté Très Chrétien avec la République de Gênes pas calmer les inquiétudes sur cette affaire la déclaration du Roi Très Chrétien doit les augmenter et démontrer, que ses Sentiments étaient bien fondées. »¹⁸⁹

France had nothing to fear from England.

a) Seilern's recall to Vienna

In July 1769 Seilern sent a letter to Kaunitz in which he asked him to recall him from London: "Since, however, my extremely strained forces no longer permit me to endure any longer the measures which I have borne for not much less than six years and which have been carried out in accordance with the ever-increasing cost of living on the one hand, and on the other hand the increasing burden, I see myself placed in the indispensable necessity of to effect on Her Majesty's summons."¹⁹⁰

After the Viennese court had decided to recall Seilern, he wrote on 2 November that he did not want to stay in London for an hour longer. On 7 November, he began his return journey, which also marked the end of his work as a diplomat. He returned to an office in the administration.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. An Seilern, 9.6.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 17 and 18.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 28.6.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 640.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 12.9.1768, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 640.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Seilern an Kaunitz, 21.7.1769, H.H.St.A.W. England Correspondence Fasz. 114, fol. 597.

If we take a closer look at the person of Count Seilern, we gain from him the impression of the dutifully devoted official, who was induced to fly high in diplomacy, but which did not at all suit the manner of this man. Seilern was provided with sufficient instructions when he took office in England and also received them continuously, He himself must have been much too anxious to make any order of his own free will, unless he was sure that the court would decide the same way, This was certainly a quality that was common to all ambassadors of Maria Theresa, doc one had the impression among Seilers that that he was particularly careful not to make a mistake.

Little is known about Seilern's attitude in his position in the administration, since the Lower Austrian Provincial Archives have no records of Seilern, and those of the administrative archive were destroyed in the fire of the Palace of Justice. Seilern, however, must have proved his worth there, because it was not only the favor of Maria Theresa, which he undoubtedly possessed, that procured him the position of president of the Supreme Court of Justice. As proof of this, it can be cited that he remained in this office even under Emperor Joseph, who fought his private war with Count Seilern. I could not fathom the real reason for the enmity of the two, and it must not have been known to Seilern himself, who himself had turned to the Emperor to obtain a reason from him.

Seilern was considered a friend and patron of Sonnenfels and this should have earned him the respect of the emperor, as he stood up for the enlightenment. However, Josef probably had no use for Sonnenfels either, because in Winter he is not exactly portrayed as an engaging personality.

The relationship with Maria Theresa must have been an intimate one, because there are numerous small notes of the empress on rope makers, in which she always speaks of the test of her trust in him. The fact that he was married to one of the Empress's chambermaids probably played no role in this. Rather, she must have remembered the services that his ancestors had rendered to the imperial house, and may have sought such qualities in him as well.

Seilern had achieved the feat of serving under three rulers, and, if he had not applied for his retirement in 1791, he might have succeeded in serving under Emperor Franz. However, his health did not allow him to do so. He lived to a ripe old age for his time and spent his last years in his house in Seilergasse. In the last years of his life, he only maintained close contact with his daughter-in-law, Princess Oettingen-Oettingen.

Pro Memoria ¹⁹¹

"Since His Majesty has decided to hold a chapter of the Order at the imminent granting of the Golden Fleece, and I have also most humbly succeeded in fulfilling the promise made to me several years ago by the Empress of the most blessed memory, and most graciously confirmed by His reigning Majesty, I consider that it is unavoidable that the Knights of the Order who are present at this consultation should be relieved of the actual The nature of the reasons with which those who apply for clemency believe they can support their request.

This caution of mine seems to me all the more necessary, as my family does not come out of the imperial royal army. It originated in the Palatinate, and it was only my grandfather who had the good fortune to move from there to the imperial kingdom. services.

Since that hour he has been appointed as Imperial Court Councillor, and therefore as Imperial Royal Councillor. Konkommissarius was employed at the perpetual Imperial Assembly, and was afterwards not only very useful in the general acts of peace and execution which took place at Nijmegen in the years 1776, 77, 78, and 79, but also, in addition to the legations carried out at the Spanish, French, and Roman courts and imperial districts, and at the embassy concluded with France at Risswigg, the Emperor Leopold had been appointed under three governments. Joseph and Charles, who held the dignity of Conference Minister and Austrian Chancellor to the end, enjoyed the confidence of these three gentlemen, dealt with the whole work of Spanish cession and succession, and also drafted the last will and testament of Emperor Leopold.

After completing the second message at the Baden Peace Congress, my father had been Court Vice-Chancellor, Chancellor, and Supreme Court Chancellor for about 50 years, and as early as the year 1715, on the death of his grandfather, he asked the Emperor Charles Majesty, who were known to be very sparing with the sharing of praise, to receive the following handwritten handwritten letter, which was so gracious in his own hand, that already he, and thus rather his descendants, had the most justified claim to an equitable, but until that hour there was no reward, the same was as follows:

¹⁹¹ Majesty petition of Christian August I. for the Golden Fleece to Emperor Leopold I., Vienna 10.5.1790, Original, F.A., Fasz. 28.

"To my Court Vice-Chancellor Count von Seilern. Dear Count Seilern: Because God has pleased the Almighty, by taking away your cousin Bl. To deprive me of a very dear and faithful servant, whom I shall never forget, and to deprive you of a dear and good cousin, I did not want to refrain from writing these lines, even in your sorrow, assuring you that these of your dear cousin's merita will never die in my memory, as then, because I have not been able to reward them enough against him, I will still show my knowledge in you, you as his successor will always feel my grace and knowledge in all this, and since I cannot replace you to your careful cousins in any other way. You will find it again in all of me, with which you will once again best assure you of my everlasting grace.

Vienna, 8th January 1715 Karl"

In order to clarify the above-mentioned non-payment, I must remark that when the riots arose in Hungary, and when considerable confiscated estates were given to the then conference ministers, Counts Starhemberg and Schönborn, among others, my grandfather was also given a dermal 100,000 fl. However, in view of the fact that the country of Hungary had been subjected to many disturbances, the same had condemned this grace with the addition that other occasions might arise where such a grace could be replaced, but which is now to be expected.

As far as I am concerned, in the year 1751 I was appointed Imperial Councillor to the Royal Court of Justice. Sardinian court in the capacity of an imperial envoy, and since the ceremonial matters prevailing at that time with regard to the rank between the princess of Carignan and the imperial envoy's wife could not be remedied at once, Regensburg was appointed as royal envoy. Electorate of Bohemian envoy with a low salary of 6,000 fl. Employed, compelled to do so, ignoring the assurance given to me that I would soon be sent to a more important place, and remained there for nine full years with the constant consolation of the future message of the election of the Roman king.

However, I had the good fortune to receive a far more important message on the occasion of the peace congress agreed upon at Augsburg, and received a copy of the very flattering ministerial letter from the Empress Majesty, as well as from the Chancellor of the Court and State, through an express messenger sent to me.

The former consisted, inter alia, of the following expressions:

"A test of my confidence in him and his skill is the election of his person to the future congress, where the salvation of the state and the tranquillity of Europe depend on it."

The second was as follows:

"Your Excellency's expressed desire to take the place of ambassador in the future election of the Roman king has so little come from my memory, that, on the contrary, in the united consideration of all my extended stay there, I have been anxious to give the most essential proof of my constant memory, and thereby to prove that what the previous ability can do."

"It is, on the other hand, that the powers, which are the main parties involved in the present war, have alternately declared that they will arrange for a general congress to be held in the imperial city of Augsburg at the beginning of the coming month of July for the continuation of peace and retirement, and to be appointed by their respective ministers."

"On the part of the local court, Mr. Count Starhemberg, who was in Paris as ambassador, had already been chosen for this purpose, but since according to various considerations it was considered more advisable for the highest service to remain with the French court during the peace negotiations, I have come up with the idea of proposing to His Excellency for a message of peace. and since it was also perceived, after preliminary sounding out of the French court, that the same person and designation were decent, Her Majesty the Empress's most gracious resolution was really to appoint His Excellency as ambassador to such a peace congress, in order to have this selection made by Deroselben, as hereby decided, opened by me."

"This provision can be all the more agreeable and appreciable to your Excellency, because on the one hand the transport of your house furniture and equipage in the congress venue Derogleichen in Regensburg makes the transport of your house furniture and equipage noticeably easier, but on the other hand it gives you the hopefully not to come back opportunity to create an eternal memory for posterity."

Vienna, April 18, 1761

However, I had to bear a large part of the expenses required for this purpose for two whole years, and received no more than 15,000 fl. for my full compensation for the considerable expenses incurred over the following two years, since the Archbishop of Olomouc had recently received not only 70,000 fl. but also thereby the fiefs confiscated from his Prince-Bishopric were restored to him, and the authority to sell their 6 disposed of was also granted.

After the congress at Augsburg, which was not consummated, I was then entrusted with the precious message to the British court, with the no less very small annual salary of 30,000 florins, with the assurance given to me, and also received, that this burden would not last more than three years, which, however, was doubled in spite of my repeated request. and was extended into the seventh year.

Finally, my elder son has been no less for several years, even with a salary not much more than 5,000 fl. As royal. The Electorate of Bohemia was employed by the Imperial Assembly for the Imperial Assembly, which, however, in order to ensure such decency, required an expenditure of some 20,000 fl. requires.

In spite of all this, I have so far been left with the only inner consciousness and consolation, which is incomparably preferable after all other brilliant and lucrative advantages, that during the period of my many years of career, and of my business carried out both domestically and abroad, not only has not a single exhibition been made to me, but on the contrary, the most gracious satisfaction has been testified to on several occasions.

By means of these facts, which have been gathered together in haste and as briefly as possible due to lack of time, I may hope to have sufficiently proved how not only my parents and foreparents, but also the most illustrious houses, have rendered to the state, for more than 114 years, in four successive successive stables, and indeed with the gratuitous sacrifice of several hundred thousand guilders from my fortune, as fruitful as they are disinterested. and therefore neither the hard encounters which I had suffered in such an excellent manner during the previous Supreme Government, which compelled me to dismiss my office three times but did not receive it, nor the conferral of this esteemed order, which has not yet been fulfilled, deserve less because I have incurred this disgrace merely by my innate frankness, since I considered myself guilty to use a language that is unpleasant, but appropriate to my duties.

How fortunate, then, can I, like all faithful vassals, consider that the Most High has bestowed upon us dermal as regent, from whom everyone must promise himself with all confidence that he will certainly not refrain from making up for the injustice that has occurred.

Finally, in order to dispel any doubt that may be striking, that I am giving my grandfather this name, since he was called my great-uncle in the diploma of the Emperor Leopold and in the handwritten letter of the Emperor Charles, I must also remark how I have mentioned this circumstance, which is no less than to my dishonour, I have declared the most blessed memory of both the Empress Majesty and the Prince of Starhemberg, but I consider it unnecessary to spread it further, because I believe that even without this I have sufficiently proved the services rendered by my family to the most illustrious archbishopric, and the merits thus acquired.

Vienna, May 10, 1790.

References

I)

I. Unprinted Sources

1. *Family Archive of the Counts of Seilern, incorporated into the State Archives of Brno (F.A.):*

- Fasz. 17 Seilern's personal documents 1737-93
- Fasz. 18 Copies of the scripts of Maria Theresa and appendices of the law firm Uhlfeld and Kaunitz to Christian August after Regensburg 1752-61, 4 vols.
- Fasz. 18-19 Copies of the Supplements to the Rescripts 1752-61, 2 vols.
Copies of the relations of Count Seilern to Maria Theresa and to the chancellery of Uhlfeld and Kaunitz from Regensburg 1752-54, 2nd vol.
- Fasz. 20 Copies of the relations of Count Seilern to Maria Theresa and to the chancellery of Uhlfeld and Kaunitz from Regensburg 1754-56, 2nd vol.
- Fasz. 21 Copies of the relations of Count Christian August von Seilern to the chancellery of Uhlfeld and Kaunitz from Regensburg 1756-58, 3 vols.
- Fasz. 22 Copies of the relations of Count Seilern to Maria Theresa and to the chancellery of Uhlfeld and Kaunitz from Regensburg 1758-61, 2 vols.
- Fasz. 23 Copies of the Supplements to the Relations 1752-54, 2 vols.
- Fasz. 24 Copies of the Supplements to the Relations 1754-56, 2 vols.
- Fasz. 25 Copies of the Supplements to the Relations 1756-58, 2 vols.
- Fasz. 26 Copies of the appendices of Vice-Chancellor Collordo and Chancellor Kaunitz to Christian August after Augsburg and London 1763-69.
- Fasz. 27 Concepts of Christian August's relations with Chancellor Kaunitz from London 1763-69.

- Fasz. 28 Findings of intrigues against the granting of the Golden Fleece to Christian August 1790.
- Invitations to national conferences in Hungary and Austria under the Enns 1772-1802.
- Contract of sale for the Lukow manor in 1763.
- Fasz. 29 Marriage, dowry and widow contracts of Christian Augusts and Charlotte Countess Solms-Sonnenwalde and Maria Theresia von Mährental, 1741, 1783.
- Marriage contract of the daughter Maria Anna and Raimund Graf Kilan-Perlas 1761.
- Documents about the misdeeds of his son Karl August, not to be published 1786-89.
- Fasz. 30 Dispositions of Empress Maria Theresa 1770-80.
- Dispositions of Emperor Josef II 1772-88.
- Personal letters from:
 Johann Karl Fürst Dietrichstein 1765-68.
 Karl Fürst Batthyany 1753-65.
 Ludwig von Fürstenberg 1756-58.
 Friedrich Wilhelm Graf Haugwitz 1749-52.
 Friedrich Wilhelm Graf Wildesheim 1765.
 Rudolf Graf Chotek, 1764, 67.
 Wenzel Anton Graf Kaunitz 1755-61.
 Letters from Diplomats and Statesmen 1752-70.
- Fasz. 31-32 Concepts of letters to the daughter-in-law Princess Oettingen-Oettingen 1797-98.

2. ***House, Court and State Archives Vienna (H.H.St.A.W.):***

England Correspondence 1763-69

Fasz. 110 England reports from 17 Oct. 1763 to 30 Dec. 1769.

Fasz. 111 England Reports of 1764-65.

Fasz. 112 England Reports, Directives 1764-66.

Fasz. 113 England Reports 1766-67.

Fasz. 114 England Reports 1768-69.

Fasz. 115 England Reports, Directives 1767-1770.

II. Printed Sources and Writings

AignerLudwig: History of Freemasonry in Austria-Hungary, 5 vols., Budapest 1890-88.

Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 56 vols., Leipzig 1875-1912.

ArnethAlfred: Geschichte Maria Theresias, 10 vols., Vienna 1863-79, vols. 5 and 6, Maria Theresa and the Seven Years War, Vienna 1875. Bde 8 and 9, Maria Theresa's last reign 1763-80, Vienna 1877 and 79.

BrunnerSebastian: Die theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Joseph II., Vienna 1868.

BrunnerSebastian: The Mysteries of the Enlightenment in Austria 1770-1800, Mainz 1869.

De Luca: Das gelehrte Österreich, 2 vols., Vienna 1776, vol. 2.

Dictionary of National Biography, London 1885.

FeilingKeith: A History of England, London 1948.

GebhardtBruno: Handbook of German History, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1955.

CloserOswald: Der Reichshofrat, Bedeutung und Verordnung, Schicksal und Besetzung einer Reichsbehörde 1559-1806, Vienna 1942.

- Hantsch**Hugo: Die Geschichte Österreichs, 2Bde., Graz 1947.
- Hunt**William– The Political History of England, Vol. 9 and 10
PooleReginald: London 1909.
- Khevenhüller-Metsch**
and **Schlitter** Hans: Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Josef Khevenhüller-Metsch, vol. 2, Vienna 1908, vol. 3, Vienna 1910, vol. 4, Vienna 1914.
- Lorenz**Reinhold: The Government of Maria Theresa in All-German History. In Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte, Jhg. 1930, S.179-189.
- Maasburg**Friedrich: History of the Supreme Court of Justice in Vienna (1749-1848), Prague 1879.
- Marshall**Dorothy: Eighteenth Century England, Longmans London 1962.
Nouvelle Biographie Générale, Paris 1857-1866.
Österreichische Biedermannschronik, Vienna 1784.
- Snout**Ingeborg: The relations between Austria and England from 1756-1780, Vienna 1965.
- Schwoy**, Franz Joseph: Topography of Moravia, 3 vols., 1794.
Calendar of States and Estates 1752.
- Trevelyan**, George
Macaulay: History of England, 2nd vol., 1603-1918, 3rd ed. Munich 1947.
- Turba**Gustav: Reichsgraf Seilern aus Ladenburg am Neckar 1646-1715, Heidelberg 1923.
- Uhlirz**, Karl and
Mathilde: Handbook on the History of Austria and its Neighbouring Countries, Vol. 1, Graz-Leipzig-Vienna 1927-1944.
- Vehse**Eduard: History of the Austrian Court, 10 vols., Hamburg 1851-53.

Geschichte der Höfe des Haus Braunschweig in
Deutschland und England, 4 vols., Hamburg 1853.
Vienna Diarium 1770, No. 102.
Wiener Zeitung 1801, pp. 3733, 3738, 3918.

WinterEduard: The History of Austrian Reform Catholicism 1740-
1848, Berlin 1962.

WurzbachConstant: Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich,
Vienna 1877, 34th part.

Customs officersErich: Geschichte Österreichs, Munich 1961.