ARTICLE FIFTH

[The People's Paper, No. 81, November 19, 1853]

The contents of the treaty of Unk iar-Sk elessi were published by The Morning Herald, on Aug. 21, 1833. On August 24, Sir Robert Inglis asked Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons,

"whether there really had been concluded a treaty, offensive and defensive, between Russia and Turkey? [...] He hoped that the noble lord would be prepared, before the prorogation of parliament to lay before the house, not only the treaties that had been made, but all communications connected with the formation of those treaties between Turkey and Russia."

Lord Palmerston answered that

"when they were sure that such a treaty as that alluded to really did exist; and when they were in possession of that treaty, it would then be for them to determine what was the course of policy they ought to pursue.... It could be no blame to him if the newspapers were sometimes beforehand with the government." (House of Commons, August 24, 1833.)

Seven months afterwards he assures that

"it was perfectly impossible that the treaty of Unk iar-Skelessi, not to be ratified at Constantinople until the month of September, should have been officially known to him in August." (H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

He did know the treaty, but not officially."

"The British government was surprised to find that when the Russian troops quitted the Bosphorus, they carried that treaty [...] with them." (Speech of Lord Palmerston, H. of C., March 1, 1848).

Yea, the noble lord was in possession of the treaty before it had been concluded.

"No sooner had the Porte received it" (viz., the draft of the treaty of Unk iar-Skelessi), "than the treaty was communicated by them to the British Embassy at Constantinople, with the prayer for our protection against Ibrahim Pasha, and [...] against Nicholas. [...] The application was rejected,—but that was not all. With an atrocious perfidiousness, the fact was made known to the Russian Minister. Next day the very copy of the treaty which the Porte had lodged with the British Embassy, was returned to the Porte by the Russian Ambassador, who ironically

---

a Instead of "by The Morning Herald" the New-York Daily Tribune of November 21, 1853, has: "by the journals of London".—Ed.

b The New-York Daily Tribune has: "Now, was the noble lord really not sure in August that such a treaty 'really' existed? Was he at that time not yet in possession of that treaty? At a later epoch, in March, 1850 [there is a mistake in the date: it should be 1848.—Ed.], he himself stated that..."—Ed.

c K. Lieven.—Ed.
advised the Porte—'to choose better another time its confidents.'” (H. of C., Feb. 8, 1848.)

But the noble viscount had obtained all he cared for. He was interrogated with respect to the treaty of Unk iar-Skelessi, of whose existence he was not sure on August 24, 1833. On August 29 parliament was prorogued, receiving from the throne the consolatory assertion that

“the hostilities which had disturbed the peace of Turkey had been terminated, and they might be assured that the king's attention would be carefully directed to any events which might affect the present state or the future independence of that empire.”

Here we have the key to the famous Russian treaties of July. In July they are concluded; in August, something about them is transpiring through the public press. Lord Palmerston is interrogated in the Commons. He, of course, is aware of nothing. Parliament is prorogued—and, when it reassembles, the treaty has grown old, or, in 1841, has already been executed, in spite of public opinion.

Parliament was prorogued on August 29, 1833, and it reassembled on Feb. 5, 1834. The interval between the prorogation and its reassembling was marked by two incidents intimately interwoven with each other. On the one hand, the united French and English fleets proceeded to the Dardanelles, displayed there the tricoloured, and the national flag of England, sailed their way to Smyrna, and returned from thence to Malta. On the other hand, a new treaty was concluded between the Porte and Russia, on January 29, 1834, the treaty of St. Petersburg. This treaty was hardly signed when the united fleet was withdrawn.

This combined manoeuvre was intended to stultify the British people and Europe into the belief that the hostile demonstration on the Turkish seas and coasts, directed against the Porte, for having concluded the treaty of Unk iar-Skelessi, had enforced upon Russia the new treaty of St. Petersburg. This treaty, by promising the evacuation of the Principalities, and reducing the Turkish payments to one-third of the stipulated amount, appar-

---

a From the speech of M.P. Th. Ch. Anstey.—Ed.
b William IV.—Ed.
d The New-York Daily Tribune has after that: “with the exception of Silistra”.—Ed.
ently relieved the Porte from some engagements enforced on her by the treaty of Adrianople. In all other instances it was a ratification of the treaty of Adrianople, not at all relating to the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, nor dropping a word about the passage of the Dardanelles. On the contrary, the alleviations it granted to Turkey, were the purchase-money for the exclusion of Europe, by the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, from the Dardanelles.

"The very day on which the demonstration" (of the British fleet) "was being made, an assurance was given by the noble lord to the Russian Ambassador at this court, that this combined movement of the [...] squadrons was not intended in any sense hostile to Russia, nor to be taken as a hostile demonstration against her; but, that, in fact, it meant nothing at all. I say this on the authority of Lord Ponsonby, the noble lord's own colleague, the Ambassador at Constantinople."—(Speech of Mr. Anstey, H. of C., Feb. 23, 1848.)

After the treaty of St. Petersburgh had been ratified, the noble lord expressed his satisfaction with the moderation of the terms imposed by Russia.

When Parliament had reassembled, there appeared in The Globe, the organ of the Foreign Office, a paragraph stating that

"The treaty of St. Petersburgh was a proof either of the moderation or good sense of Russia, or of the influence which the union of England and France, and the firm and concerted language of those two powers had acquired in the councils of St. Petersburgh."—(Globe, Feb. 24, 1834.)

Thus public attention was to be diverted from the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, and the animosity it had aroused in Europe against Russia, to be soothed down.

Artful as the dodging was, it would not do. On March 17, 1834, Mr. Sheil brought in a motion for

"the copies of the treaties between Turkey and Russia, [...] and of any correspondence between the English, Russian, and Turkish Governments, respecting those treaties, to be laid before the house."

The noble lord resisted this resolution to his utmost, and succeeded in baffling it by assuring the house that "peace [...]

---

a K. Lieven.—Ed.
b This sentence is omitted in the New-York Daily Tribune.—Ed.
c In the pamphlet Palmerston and the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, published in 1854, this paragraph was given as follows: "Thus, on the one hand, the Treaty of Adrianople, protested against by Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Wellington, was surreptitiously to be recognised on the part of England by Lord Palmerston officially expressing his satisfaction with the convention of St. Petersburgh, which was but a ratification of that Treaty. On the other hand, public attention was to be diverted from the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, and the animosity it had aroused in Europe against Russia, to be soothed down."—Ed.
could be preserved only by the house reposing confidence in the government,” and refusing to accede to the motion. So grossly inapt were the reasons he stated to prevent him from producing the papers, that Sir Robert Peel called him, in his parliamentary language “a very unconvincing reasoner,” and his own Colonel Evans could not help exclaiming:

“The speech of the noble lord appeared to him the most unsatisfactory he had ever heard from him.”

Lord Palmerston strived to convince the house that, according to the assurances of Russia, the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was to be looked upon “as one of reciprocity,” that reciprocity being, that if the Dardanelles should be closed against England in the event of war they should be closed against Russia also. The statement was altogether false, but if true, this certainly would have been Irish reciprocity, for it was all on one side. To cross the Dardanelles is for Russia not the means to get at the Black Sea, but on the contrary, to leave it.

So far from refuting Mr. Sheil’s statement, “the consequence of the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was [...] the same as if the Porte surrendered to Russia the possession of the Dardanelles,” Lord Palmerston owned that the treaty closed the Dardanelles to British men-of-war, and that “under its provisions even merchant vessels might, [...] in effect, be practically excluded from the Black Sea,” in the case of a war between England and Russia. But if the government acted with a “temper,” if it “showed no unnecessary distrust,” that is to say, if it quietly submitted to all further encroachments of Russia, he was

“inclined to think that the case might not arise in which that treaty would be called into operation; and that therefore it would, in practice, remain a dead letter.”—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

Besides, “the assurance and explanations” which the British government had received from the contradictory parties to that treaty greatly tended to remove its objections to it. Thus then it was not the articles of the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, but the assurances Russia gave with respect to them, not the acts of Russia,

---

[a] In the New-York Daily Tribune this phrase was given as follows: “He enjoined the House not to press upon him, as 'peace could be preserved only by the House reposing confidence in the Government,' which, if left alone, would certainly protect the interests of England from encroachment.”—Ed.

[b] The New-York Daily Tribune has: “In order to mystify the House, he dropped some words to the effect....” —Ed.
but her language, he had in his opinion to look upon. Yet, as on
the same day his attention was called to the protest of the French
chargé d’affaires, M. Lagrené, against the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi,
and the offensive and contumacious language of Count Nessel-
rode, answering in the *St. Petersburg Gazette* that “the Emperor of
Russia would act as if the declaration contained in the note of M.
Lagrené had no existence,” then the noble lord, eating up his own
words, propounded the opposite doctrine that

“it was on all occasions the duty of the English government to look rather to the
acts of foreign power, than to the language which the power might hold on any
particular subject on any occasion.”

One moment he appealed from the acts of Russia to her
language, and the other from her language to her act.

Still in 1837 he assured that

“the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was a treaty between two independent
powers.”—(H. of C., December 14, 1837.)

Ten years later, the treaty having long since elapsed, and the
noble lord being just about acting the play of the Truly English
Minister and the “*civis Romanus sum*,” he told the house plainly,

“the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi [...] was no doubt to a certain degree forced
upon Turkey by Count Orloff, the Russian Envoy, under circumstances”—created
by the noble lord himself—“which rendered it difficult for Turkey to refuse
acceding to it.... It gave practically to the Russian government a power of
interference and dictation in Turkey, not consistent with the independence of that
state.”—(H., of C., March 1, 1848.)

During the whole course of the debates about the treaty of
Unkiar-Skelessi, the noble lord, like the clown in the comedy, had
an answer of most monstrous size, that must fit all demands and
serve all questions—the Anglo-French alliance. When his conniv-

---

*a* This newspaper is not mentioned in the *New-York Daily Tribune.*—*Ed.*

*b* Quoted from Palmerston's speech in the House of Commons on March 17, 1834.—*Ed.*

*c* In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence was given as follows: “Three
years later [in 1837.—*Ed.], in a thin House, composed almost entirely of his
retainers, he came roundly out and told Mr. Thomas Attwood very coolly that 'the
treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was a matter which had gone by,' and that it had never
been 'the intention of the Government to have recourse to hostile measures to
compel Russia and Turkey—two independent powers—to cancel the treaty made
between them.' This sentence was given in a different place.—*Ed.*
ance with Russia was pointed at, in sneers, he gravely retorted:\(^3\):

“If the present relations established between this country and France, were pointed at in these sneers, he would only say, that he should look [...] with feelings of pride and satisfaction at the part he had acted in bringing about that good understanding.”—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

When the production of the papers relating to the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was demanded, he answered that

“England and France had now cemented a friendship [...] which had only grown stronger.”—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

“He could but remark,” exclaimed Sir Robert Peel, “that whenever the noble lord was thrown into a difficulty as to any part of our European policy, he at once found a ready means of escape, by congratulating the House upon the close alliance [...] between this country and France,” simultaneously the noble lord was strengthening the suspicions of his Tory opponents that “England was compelled to connive [...] at an aggression upon Turkey, which France had directly encouraged.”\(^b\)

At that time, then, the ostensible alliance with France was to cover the secret infeoffment to Russia, as, in 1840, the clamorous rupture with France was to cover the official alliance with Russia.

While the noble lord fatigued the world with ponderous folios of printed negotiations on the affairs of the constitutional empire of Belgium and with ample explanations, verbal and documentary, with regard to the “substantive power” of Portugal, to this moment it has proved quite impossible to wrest out of him any document whatever relating to the first Syro-Turkish war, and to the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi. When the production of the papers was first demanded, on July 11th, 1833, “The motion was premature, the transactions incomplete, and the results not yet known.” On August 24th, 1833, “the treaty was not officially signed, and he was not in possession of it.” On March 17th, 1834, “Communications were still carrying on ... the discussions, if he might so call them, were not yet completed.” Still, in 1848, when Mr. Anstey told him that, in asking for the papers, he did ask for the

---

\(^a\) In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this passage reads as follows: “The great triumphant argument which, during the whole transactions with respect to the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, the noble lord had ready to oppose to all the attacks upon his connivance with Russia, was that of his intimate alliance with France. Like the clown in the comedy, he had an answer of most monstrous size, that must meet all demands and serve all questions, namely: The Anglo-French Alliance. When he was pointed at with sneers because he had allowed the Russian occupation of Constantinople, he retorted that...” — *Ed.*

\(^b\) Quoted from Peel’s speech in the House of Commons on March 17, 1834.— *Ed.*
proof of the noble lord's collusion with the Czar, the chivalrous minister preferred killing time by a five hours' speech to killing suspicion by self-speaking documents. Notwithstanding all this, he had the cynic impudence to assure Mr. T. Attwood, on December 14th, 1837, that "the papers connected with that treaty, viz., the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, were laid before the house three years ago," that is to say in 1834, when "peace could be preserved only" by withholding the papers from the house. On the same day he told Mr. Attwood that

"this treaty was a matter which had gone by, that it was entered into for a limited period, [...] and that period having expired, [...] its introduction by the honourable member was wholly unnecessary and uncalled for."

According to the original stipulation, the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was to expire on July 8th, 1841. Lord Palmerston tells Mr. Attwood that it had already expired on December 14th, 1837.  

"What trick, what devise, what starting hole, can'st thou now find to hide thee from this open and apparent shame? Come let's hear. Jack—what trick hast thou now?"

ARTICLE SIXTH

[The People's Paper, No. 84, December 10, 1853]

There is no such word in the Russian vocabulary as "honour." As to the thing itself, it is considered to be a French delusion.

---

[a] In the New-York Daily Tribune this sentence begins as follows: "His system of fictions, pretexts, contradictions, traps and incredible statements reached its climax, when, on December 14, 1837, he objected to a resolution of Mr. T. Attwood for the production of the papers connected with the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, on the ground that...."—Ed.

[b] The New-York Daily Tribune has: "The noble Viscount knew as well that the papers were not laid before the House in 1834, or at any other period, as that the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, far from having expired on December 14, 1837, continued to remain in full vigor till July 8, 1841."—Ed.


In the New-York Daily Tribune the article ends as follows: "Such a gross system of fraud formed the last refuge of an English Minister, who had opened Constantinople to a Russian army, and closed the Dardanelles to the English navy, and who had helped the Czar to get possession of Constantinople for months and the control of Turkey for years. How absurd then to suppose that he is now likely to turn about and oppose a friend he has so long and so faithfully served."—Ed.
“Schto takoi honneur? Eto Fransusski chimere,” is a Russian proverb. For the invention of Russian honour the world is exclusively indebted to my Lord Palmerston, who, during a quarter of a century, used, at every critical moment, to pledge himself, in the most emphatical manner, for the “honour” of the Czar. So he did at the close of the Session of 1853, as at the close of the Session of 1833.

Now it happens that the noble lord, while he expressed “his most implicit confidence in the honour and good faith” of the Czar, had just got into possession of documents, concealed from the rest of the world, and leaving no doubt, if any existed, about the nature of Russian honour and good faith. He had not even to scratch the Muscovite in order to find the Tartar. He had caught the Tartar in his naked hideousness. He found himself possessed of the self-confessions of the leading Russian ministers and diplomatists, throwing off their cloaks, opening out their most secret thoughts, unfolding, without constraint, their plans of conquest and subjugation, scornfully railing at the imbecile credulity of European Courts and Ministers, mocking the Villèles, the Metternichs, the Aberdeens, the Cannings, and the Wellingtons; and devising, in common, with the savage cynicism of the barbarian, mitigated by the cruel irony of the courtier, how to sow distrust against England at Paris, and against Austria at London, and against London at Vienna, how to set them all by the ears, and how to make all of them the mere tools of Russia.

At the time of the insurrection of Warsaw, the vice-royal archives kept in the palace of Prince Constantine, and containing the secret correspondence of Russian ministers and ambassadors from the beginning of the century down to 1830, fell into the hands of the victorious Poles. Polish Refugees brought these papers over first to France, and, at a later period, Count Zamoyski, the nephew of Prince Czartoryski, placed them in the hands of Lord Palmerston, who buried them in Christian oblivion. With these papers in his pockets, the noble viscount was the more eager to proclaim in the British Senate and to the world “his most implicit confidence in the honour and good faith of the Emperor of Russia.”

Not the fault of the noble viscount, that those startling papers were at length published at the end of 1835, through the famous

---

a Nicholas I.— Ed.
b Quoted from Palmerston’s speech in the House of Commons on August 20, 1853.— Ed.
**Portfolio.** King William IV, whatever he was in other respects, was a most decided enemy of Russia. His private secretary, Sir Herbert Taylor, was intimately connected with David Urquhart, introducing this gentleman to the King himself, and from that moment royalty was conspiring with those two friends against the policy of the “truly English” minister.

“William IV [...] ordered the above-mentioned papers to be given up by the noble lord. They were given up and examined at the time at Windsor Castle, and it was found desirable to print and publish them. [...] In spite of the great opposition of the noble lord, the king compelled him to lend the authority of the Foreign Office to their publication, [...] so [...] that the editor, who took the charge of revising them for the press, published not a single word which had not the signature or initials attached. I, myself, have seen the noble lord’s initial attached to one of those documents, although the noble lord has denied these facts. Lord Palmerston was compelled to place the documents in the hands of Mr. Urquhart for publication. Mr. Urquhart was the real editor of *The Portfolio.*” (Speech of Mr. Anstey, House of Commons, February 23rd, 1848.)

After the death of the king, Lord Palmerston refused to pay the printer of *The Portfolio,* and disclaimed, publicly and solemnly, all connexion on the part of the Foreign Office, and induced, in what manner is not known, Mr. Backhouse, his under-secretary, to set his name to those denials. We read in *The Times* of January 26th, 1839:

“It is not for us to understand how Lord Palmerston may feel, but we are sure there is no misapprehending how *any other person* in the station of a gentleman, and in the position of a minister, *would feel,* after the notoriety given to the correspondence between Mr. Urquhart, whom Lord Palmerston dismissed from office, and Mr. Backhouse, whom the noble viscount has retained in office, by *The Times* of yesterday. There never was a fact apparently better established through this correspondence than that the series of official documents contained in the well-known publication, called *The Portfolio,* were printed and circulated by Lord Palmerston’s authority, and that his lordship is responsible for the publication of them, both as a statesman to the political world here and abroad, and as an employer of the printers and publishers, for the pecuniary charge accompanying it.”

In consequence of her financial distress, resulting from the exhaustion of the treasury by the unfortunate war of 1828-29, and the debt to Russia stipulated by the treaty of Adrianople, Turkey found herself compelled to extend that obnoxious system of monopolies by which the sale of almost all articles was granted only to those who had paid government licenses. Thus a few

---

*a* Published in *The Times,* No. 16948, January 25, 1839.—Ed.

*b* Marx apparently quotes from *The Portfolio,* 1843, Vol. II, No. VI.—Ed.
usurers were enabled to seize upon the entire commerce of the
country. Mr. Urquhart proposed to King William IV, a com-
mercial treaty to be concluded with the Sultan,\(^a\) which treaty, while
guaranteeing great advantages to British commerce, intended at
the same time to develop the productive resources of Turkey, to
restore her Exchequer to health, and thus to emancipate her from
the Russian yoke. The curious history of this treaty cannot be
better related than in the words of Mr. Anstey:

"The whole of the contest between Lord Palmerston on the one hand, and Mr.
Urquhart on the other, was directed to this treaty of commerce. On the third of
October, 1835, Mr. Urquhart obtained his commission as Secretary of Legation at
Constantinople, given him for the one purpose of securing the adoption there of
the Turkish commercial treaty. He delayed his departure however till June or July,
1836. Lord Palmerston pressed him to go. The applications to him urging his
departure were numerous, but his answer invariably was: I will not go until I have
this commercial treaty settled with the Board of Trade and the Foreign Office; and
then I will accompany it, and procure its acceptance at the Porte.... Finally, Lord
Palmerston gave his approbation to the treaty, and it was forwarded to Lord
Ponsonby, the Ambassador at Constantinople." (In the meantime the latter had
been instructed by Lord Palmerston to take the negotiations entirely out of the
hands of Mr. Urquhart into his own, contrary to the engagement entered into with
Mr. Urquhart.) "As soon as the removal of Mr. Urquhart from Constantinople had
been effected through the intrigues of the noble lord, the treaty was immediately
thrown overboard. Two years later the noble lord resumed it, giving Mr. Urquhart
before Parliament the compliment of being the author of it, and disclaiming for
himself all merits in it. But the noble lord had destroyed the treaty, falsified it in
every part, and converted it to the ruin of commerce. The original treaty of Mr.
Urquhart placed the subjects of Great Britain in Turkey, upon the footing of the
most favoured nation"—viz., the Russians. "As altered by Lord Palmerston, it
placed the subjects of Great Britain upon the footing of the taxed and oppressed
subjects of the Porte. Mr. Urquhart's treaty stipulated for the removal of all transit
duties, monopolies, taxes, and duties of whatever character, others than those
stipulated by the treaty itself. As falsified by Lord Palmerston, it contained a clause,
declaring the perfect right of the Sublime Porte to impose whatever regulations
and restrictions it pleased, with regard to commerce. Mr. Urquhart's treaty left
importation subject only to the old duty of three shillings; that of the noble lord
raised the duty from three shillings to five shillings. Mr. Urquhart's treaty
stipulated for an \textit{ad valorem} duty in this manner, that if any article of commerce
was so exclusively the production of Turkey, as to insure it a ready sale, at the
prices usually received under the monopoly in foreign ports, then the export duty
to be assessed by two commissioners appointed on the part of England and Turkey,
might be a high one, so as to be remunerative and productive of revenue, but that,
in the case of commodities produced elsewhere than in Turkey, and not being of
sufficient value in foreign ports to bear a high duty, a lower duty should be
assessed. Lord Palmerston's treaty stipulated a fixed duty of twelve shillings \textit{ad
valorem} upon every article whether it would bear the duty or not. [...] The original
treaty extended the benefit of Free Trade to Turkish ships and produce; [...] the

\(^{a}\) Mahmud II.—\textit{Ed.}
substituted treaty contained no stipulation whatever on the subject.... I charge these falsifications, I charge also the concealment of them, upon the noble lord, and further—I charge the noble lord with having falsely stated to the house that his treaty was that which had been arranged by Mr. Urquhart.”—(Speech of Mr. Anstey, H. of C., February 23rd, 1848.)

So favourable to Russia, and so obnoxious to Great Britain, was the treaty as altered by the noble lord, that some English merchants in the Levant resolved to trade henceforth under the protection of Russian firms, and others, as Mr. Urquhart states, were only prevented from so doing by a sort of national pride.

With regard to the secret relations between the noble lord and William IV, Mr. Anstey stated to the house,

“...The king forced the question of the progress of Russian encroachment in Turkey, upon the attention of the noble lord.... I can [...] prove that the noble lord was obliged to take the directions in this matter from the late King’s private secretary, and that his existence in office depended upon his compliance with the wishes of the monarch.... The noble lord did on one or two occasions, as far as he dared, resist, but his resistance was [...] invariably followed by abject expressions of contrition and compliance. I will not take upon myself to assert that, on one occasion, the noble lord was actually out of office for a day or two, [...] but I am able to say that the noble lord was [...] in danger of a most unceremonious expulsion from office on that occasion. I refer to the discovery which the late king had made, that the noble lord consulted the feelings of the Russian government as to the choice of an English ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, and that Sir Stratford Canning, originally destined for the embassy, was set aside to make room for the late Earl of Durham, an ambassador more agreeable to the Czar.”—(H. of C., Feb. 23, 1848.)

It is one of the most astonishing facts that, while the king was vainly struggling against the Russian policy of the noble lord—the noble lord and his Whig-allies succeeded in keeping alive the public suspicion that the king—who was known as a Tory—was paralysing the anti-Russian efforts of the “truly English” minister. The pretended Tory predilection of the monarch for the despotic principles of the Russian Court, was of course made to explain the otherwise inexplicable policy of Lord Palmerston. The Whig Oligarchs smiled mysteriously when H. L. Bulwer informed the house, that

“...no longer ago than last Christmas Count Apponyi, the Austrian ambassador of Paris, stated, in speaking of the affairs of the East, that this Court had a greater apprehension of French principles than of Russian ambition.”—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

They smiled again, when Mr. T. Attwood interrogated the noble lord
"what reception Count Orloff, having been sent over to England after the treaty of Unkiaer-Skelessi, had met with at his Majesty’s Court."—(H. of C., August 28, 1833.)

The papers entrusted by the dying king and his Secretary, the late Sir Herbert Taylor, to Mr. Urquhart "for the purpose of vindicating, upon the fitting opportunity, the memory of William IV"—will, when published, throw a new light upon the past career of the noble lord and the Whig Oligarchy, of which the public generally know little more than the history of their pretensions, their phrases, and their so-called principles—in a word, the theatrical and fictitious part,—the mask.

This is a fitting occasion to give his due to Mr. David Urquhart, the indefatigable antagonist for twenty years of Lord Palmerston, who has proved his only adversary—one not to be intimidated into silence, bribed into connivance, charmed into suitiorship, while, what with cajoleries, what with seductions, Alcina Palmerston contrived to change all other foes into fools. We have just heard the fierce denunciation of his lordship by Mr. Anstey.

"A circumstance most significant is that the accused minister sought the member"—viz., Mr. Anstey—"[... and was content to accept his [...] co-operation and private friendship without the forms of recantation or apology. [...] Mr. Anstey's recent legal appointment by the present government speaks for itself." (D. Urquhart's Progress of Russia.)

On February 8, 1848, the same Mr. Anstey had compared the noble viscount with

"the infamous Marquis of Carmarthen, Secretary of State to William III. [...] whom, during his visit to his court, the Czar, Peter I, found means to corrupt to his interests with the gold of British merchants."—(H. of C., February 8, 1848.)

Who defended Lord Palmerston on that occasion against the accusations of Mr. Anstey? Mr. Sheil; the same Mr. Sheil which had, on the conclusion of the treaty of Unkiaer-Skelessi, in 1833, acted the same part of accuser against his lordship as Mr. Anstey in 1848. Mr. Roebuck, once his strong antagonist, procured him the vote of confidence in 1850. Sir Stratford Canning, having denounced during a decennium the noble lord's connivance with the Czar, was content to be got rid of as Ambassador at Constantinople. The noble lord's own dear Dudley Stuart was intrigued out of Parliament for some years for having opposed the noble lord. When returned back to it, he had become the âme damnée of the truly English minister. Kossuth, who might have
known from the Blue Books\(^a\) that Hungary had been betrayed by the noble viscount, called him "the dear friend of his bosom" when landing at Southampton.

**SEVENTH ARTICLE**\(^2\)**

*[The People's Paper, No. 85, December 17, 1853]*

One glance at the map of Europe will show you on the Western littoral of the Black Sea the outlets of the Danube, the only river which, springing up in the very heart of Europe, may be said to form a natural highway to Asia. Strictly opposite, on the Eastern side, to the south of the river Kuban, begins the mountain-range of the Caucasus, stretching from the Black Sea to the Caspian in a south-easterly direction for some seven hundred miles and separating Europe from Asia.

If you hold the outlets of the Danube, you hold the Danube, and with it the highway to Asia, and a great part of the commerce of Switzerland, Germany, Hungary, Turkey, and above all of Moldo-Wallachia. If you hold the Caucasus too, the Black Sea becomes your property,\(^b\) and to shut up its door, you only want Constantinople and the Dardanelles. The possession of the Caucasus mountains makes you at once master of Trebizond, and through their domineering the Caspian Sea, of the northern seaboard of Persia.

The greedy eyes of Russia embraced at once the outlets of the Danube and the mountain-range of the Caucasus. There, the business in hand was to conquer supremacy, here to maintain it. The chain of the Caucasus separates Southern Russia from the luxurious provinces of Georgia, Mingrelia, Imeretia, and Guria, wrested by the Muscovite from the Mussulman. Thus the foot of the monster empire is cut off from its main body. The only military road deserving to be called such winds from Mozdok to Tiflis, through the Engpass of Dariel, fortified by a continuous line of entrenched places, but exposed on both sides to the never-ceasing attacks from the Caucasian tribes. The union of those

---

\(^a\) "Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of Hungary. 1847-1849. *Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. August 15, 1850.*" — *Ed.*

\(^b\) In the *New-York Daily Tribune* of January 11, 1854, this sentence begins as follows: "But give the same power the Caucasus in addition, and the Black Sea will exclusively belong to it as a *mare clausum* [closed sea]...." — *Ed.*
tribes under one military chief might even endanger the bordering country of the Cossacks. "The thought of the dreadful consequences which a union of the hostile Circassians under one head would produce in the south of Russia fills one with terror"—exclaims M. Kupffer, a German, who presided over the scientific commission, which, in 1829, accompanied the expedition of General Emmanuel to Elbruz.\(^a\)

At this very moment our attention is directed with equal anxiety to the banks of the Danube, where Russia has seized the two corn-magazines of Europe, and to the Caucasus, whence she is menaced in the possession of Georgia.\(^b\) It was the treaty of Adrianople, that prepared Russia's usurpation of Moldo-Wallachia, and recognised her claims to the Caucasus.

Article IV of that treaty stipulates,

"All the countries situated north and east of the line of demarcation between the two empires" (Russia and Turkey), "towards Georgia, Imeretia, and the Guria, as well as all the littoral of the Black Sea, from the mouth of the Kuban, as far as the port of St. Nicholas inclusively, shall remain under the domination of Russia."

With regard to the Danube the same treaty stipulates,

"The frontier line will follow the course of the Danube to the mouth of St. George, leaving all the islands formed by the different branches in the possession of Russia. The right bank will remain as formerly in the possession of the Ottoman Porte. It is however agreed that that right bank from the point where the arm of St. George departs from that of Sulina, still remain uninhabited to a distance of two hours" (six miles) "from the river, and that no kind of structure shall be raised there, and in like manner, on the islands which still remain in the possession of the Court of Russia. With the exception of quarantines which will be there established, it will not be permitted to make any other establishment or fortification."

Both these paragraphs, inasmuch as they secure to Russia an "extension of territory and exclusive commercial advantages," openly infringed upon the protocol of April 4, 1826, drawn up by the Duke of Wellington at St. Petersburg, and on the treaty of July 6, 1827, concluded between Russia and the other Great Powers at London.\(^288\) The English Government, therefore, refused to recognise the treaty of Adrianople. The Duke of Wellington protested against it. (Speech of Lord Dudley Stuart, H. of C., March 17, 1837.)

Lord Aberdeen protested.

\(^a\) Kupffer, *Voyage dans les environs du Mont Elbrouz dans le Caucase, entrepris par ordre de la sa Majesté l'Empereur en 1829*, p. 4.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence is followed by: "Her movements in both these regions have a common origin."—*Ed.*
"In a dispatch to Lord Heytesbury dated October 31st, 1829, he commented with no small dissatisfaction on many parts of the Treaty of Adrianople, and especially noticed [...] the stipulations respecting the islands of the Danube. He denies that that peace" (the Treaty of Adrianople), "has respected the territorial rights of the Sovereignty of the Porte, and the condition and the interests of all maritime states in the Mediterranean."—(Speech of Lord Mahon, H. of C., April 20, 1836.)

He declared that

"the independence of the Porte would be sacrificed, and the peace of Europe endangered by this treaty being agreed to."—(Speech of Earl Grey, H. of L., Feb. 4th, 1834.)

Lord Palmerston himself informs us,

"As far as the extension of the Russian frontier is concerned [...] in the South of the Caucasus, and the shores of the Black Sea, it is certainly not consistent with the solemn declaration made by Russia in the face of Europe, previous to the commencement of the Turkish war." (H. of C., March 17th, 1837.)

The Eastern littoral of the Black Sea, by blockading of which and cutting off supplies of arms and gunpowder to the north-western districts of the Caucasus, Russia could alone hope to realise her nominal claim to those countries—this littoral of the Black Sea and the outlets of the Danube are certainly no places "where an English action could possibly take place," as was lamented by the noble lord in the case of Cracow. By what mysterious contrivance, then, has the Muscovite succeeded in blockading the Danube, in blocking up the littoral of the Euxine, and in forcing Great Britain to submit, not only to the Treaty of Adrianople, but at the same [time] to the violation by Russia herself of that identical treaty?

These questions were put to the noble viscount in the House of Commons, on April 20th, 1836, numerous petitions having poured in from the merchants of London, of Glasgow, and other commercial towns, against the fiscal regulations of Russia in the Black Sea, and her enactments and restrictions tending to intercept English commerce on the Danube. There had appeared, on February 7th, 1836, a Russian ukase, which, by virtue of the Treaty of Adrianople, established a quarantine on one of the islands formed by the mouths of the Danube. In order to execute that quarantine, Russia claimed a right of boarding and search, of levying fees, and seizing and marching off to Odessa refractory ships, proceeding on their voyage up the Danube. Before the quarantine was established, or rather before a custom-house and

---

a Marx quotes from Palmerston's speech in the House of Commons on July 13, 1840.—Ed.
fort were erected, under the false pretence of a quarantine, the Russian authorities threw out their feelers, to ascertain the risk they might run with the British government. Lord Durham, acting upon instructions received from England, remonstrated with the Russian Cabinet, for the hindrance which had been given to British trade.

“He was referred to Count Nesselrode, Count Nesselrode [...] referred him to the Governor of South Russia, and the Governor of South Russia again referred him to the Consul at Galatz, who communicated with the British Consul at Brăila, who was instructed to send down the captains from whom toll had been exacted, to [...] the Danube, the scene of their injuries, in order that inquiry might be made on the subject, it being well known that the captains thus referred to were then in England.” —(H. of C., April 20, 1836 [Speech of Mr. Patrick Stewart].)

The formal ukase of the 7th Feb., 1836, aroused, however, the general attention of British commerce.

“Many ships had sailed, and others were going out, to whose captains strict orders had been given, not to submit to the right of boarding and search, which Russia [...] claimed. [...] The fate of these ships must be inevitable, unless some expression of opinion were made on the part of that house. [...] Unless that were done, British shipping, to the amount of not less than 5,000 tons, would [...] be seized and marched off to Odessa, until the insolent commands of Russia were complied with.” (Speech of Mr. Patrick M. Stewart, H. of C., April 20, 1836.)

Russia required the marshy islands of the Danube, by virtue of a clause of the Treaty of Adrianople, which clause itself was a violation of the treaty she had previously contracted with England and the other powers in 1827. The bristling [of] the gates of the Danube with fortifications, and these fortifications with guns, was a violation of the Treaty of Adrianople itself, which expressly prohibits any fortification to be erected within six miles of the river. The exaction of tolls, and the obstruction of the navigation, was a violation of the Treaty of Vienna, declaring that the navigation of rivers along their whole course, from the point where each of them becomes navigable to its mouth, shall be entirely free, that “the amount of the duties shall in no case exceed those now” (1815) “paid;” and that “no increase shall take place, except with the common consent of the states bordering on the river.” Thus, then, all the argument on which Russia could plead not guilty was the treaty of 1827, violated by the Treaty of Adrianople, the Treaty of Adrianople violated by herself, the whole backed by a violation of the Treaty of Vienna.

It proved quite impossible to wring out of the noble lord any declaration, whether he did or did not recognise the treaty of Adrianople. As to the violation of the Treaty of Vienna, he had
"received no official information that anything has occurred which is not warranted by the treaty. [...] When such a statement is made by the parties concerned, it shall be dealt with [...] in such manner as the law-advisers of the Crown shall deem consistent with the rights of the subjects of this country." (Speech of Lord Palmerston, H. of C., April 20, 1836.)

By the treaty of Adrianople, Art. 5, Russia guarantees the “prosperity” of the Danubian Principalities and full “liberty of trade” for them. Now, Mr. Stewart proved that the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were objects of deadly jealousy to Russia, as their trade had taken a sudden development since 1834, as they vied with Russia’s own stable production, as Galatz was becoming the great depot of all the grain of the Danube, and driving Odessa out of the market. If, answered the noble lord,

“If my honourable friend had been able to show that whereas some years ago we had had a large and important commerce with Turkey, [...] and that that commerce had, by the aggression of other countries, or by the neglect of the government of this, dwindled down to an inconsiderable trade, then there might have been ground to call upon parliament.” In lieu of such an occurrence, “my honourable friend has shown that during the last few years the trade” with Turkey “has risen from next to nothing to a very considerable amount.”

Russia obstructs the Danube navigation, because the trade of the Principalities is growing important, says Mr. Stewart. But she did not so when that trade was next to nothing, retorts Lord Palmerston. You neglect to oppose the recent encroachments of Russia on the Danube, says Mr. Stewart. We did not so at the epoch these encroachments were not yet ventured upon, replies the noble lord. What “circumstances” have, therefore, “occurred against which the Government [...] are [...] not likely to guard, unless driven thereto by the direct interference of this House?”

He prevented the Commons from passing a resolution by assuring them that,

“there is no disposition of his Majesty’s government to submit to aggressions on the part of any power, be that power what it may, and be it more or less strong,” and by warning them that, “we should also cautiously abstain from anything which might be construed by other powers, and reasonably so, as being a provocation on our part.”

A week after these debates had taken place in the House of Commons, a British merchant addressed a letter to the Foreign Office with regard to the Russian Ukase.

---

a This sentence is omitted in the New-York Daily Tribune.—Ed.
b William IV.— Ed.
c James Bell.— Ed.
"I am directed by Viscount Palmerston," answered the Under-Secretary\(^a\) at the Foreign Office, "to acquaint you that his lordship has called upon the law-adviser for the Crown for his opinion as to the regulations promulgated by the Russian Ukase of Feb. 7, 1836; but in the meantime Lord Palmerston directs me to acquaint you, with respect to the latter part of your letter, that it is the opinion of his Majesty's government, that no toll is justly demanded by the Russian authorities at the mouth of the Danube, and that you have acted properly in directing your agents to refuse to pay it.\(^b\)

The merchant acted according to this letter. He is abandoned to Russia by the noble lord; a Russian toll is, as Mr. Urquhart states, now exacted in London and Liverpool by Russian Consuls on every English ship sailing for the Turkish ports of the Danube; and "the quarantine still stands on the Island of Leti."

Russia did not limit her invasion on the Danube to a quarantine established, to fortifications erected, and to tolls exacted. The only mouth of the Danube remaining still navigable, the Sulina mouth, was acquired by her through the treaty of Adrianople. As long as possessed by the Turks, there was kept a depth of water in the channel of from fourteen to sixteen feet. Since, in the possession of Russia, the water became reduced to eight feet, a depth wholly inadequate to the conveyance of the vessels employed in the corn trade. Now Russia is a party to the treaty of Vienna, and that treaty stipulates in Art. 113, that

"each state shall be at the expense of keeping in good repair the Towing Paths, and shall maintain the necessary work in order that no obstruction shall be experienced by the navigation."

For keeping the channel in a navigable state, Russia found no better means than gradually reducing the depth of the water,\(^c\) paving it with wrecks, and choking up its bar with an accumulation of sand and mud. To this systematic and protracted infraction of the treaty of Vienna she added another violation of the treaty of Adrianople, which forbids any establishment at the mouth of the Sulina, except for quarantine and light-house purposes, while, at her dictation, a small Russian fort has there sprung up, living from the extortions upon the vessels, the occasion for which is afforded by the delays and expenses for lighterage, consequent upon the obstruction of the channel.

\(^a\) John Backhouse.—Ed.

\(^b\) This quotation and those following, including passages from the Vienna Treaty of 1815, are given according to D. Urquhart, Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South.—Ed.

\(^c\) The phrase "gradually reducing the depth of the water" is omitted in the New-York Daily Tribune.—Ed.
**Cum principia negante non est disputandum,** a of what use is it to dwell upon abstract principles with despotitc governments, who are accused of measuring right by power, and of ruling their conduct by expediency, and not by justice.—(Speech of Lord Palmerston, April 30, 1823.)

According to his own maxim the noble viscount was contented to dwell upon abstract principles with the despotic government of Russia; but he went farther. While he assured the house on July 6, 1840, that the freedom of the Danube navigation was "guaranteed by the treaty of Vienna"—while he lamented on July 13, 1840, that the occupation of Cracow being a violation of the treaty of Vienna, "there were no means of enforcing the opinions of England, because Cracow was evidently a place where no English action could possibly take place;" two days later he concluded a Russian treaty, closing the Dardanelles to Englandb "during times of peace with Turkey," and thus depriving England of the only means of "enforcing" the treaty of Vienna, and transforming the Euxine into a place where no English action could possibly take place.

This point once obtained, he contrived to give a sham satisfaction to public opinion by firing off a whole battery of papers, reminding the "despotic government, which measures right by power, and rules its conduct by expediency, and not by justice," in a sententious and sentimental manner, that

"Russia, when she compelled Turkey to cede to her the outlet of a great European river, which forms the commercial highway for the mutual intercourse of many nations, undertook duties and responsibilities to other states which she should take a pride in making good."

To this dwelling upon abstract principles Count Nesselrode was giving the inevitable answer that, "the subject should be carefully examined," and expressing from time to time "a feeling of soreness on the part of the imperial government at the mistrust manifested as to their intentions."

Thus, through the management of the noble lord, in 1853 things arrived at the point where the navigation of the Danube was declared impossible, and corn rotting at the mouth of the Sulina, while famine threatened to invade England, France, and the South of Europe. Thus Russia was not only adding, as The Times says, "to her other important possessions, that of an iron

\[a\] There can be no dispute with him who denies principles. This phrase is omitted in the New-York Daily Tribune.—Ed.

\[b\] The New-York Daily Tribune has: "to English men-of-war".—Ed.
gate between the Danube and the Euxine,” a she possessed herself of the key to the Danube, of a bread-screw, which she can put on, whenever the policy of Western Europe becomes obnoxious to punishment. b

EIGHTH ARTICLE

[The People's Paper, No. 86, December 24, 1853]

The petitions presented to the House of Commons, on April 20th, 1836, and the resolution moved by Mr. Patrick M’Stewart in reference to them, did not only refer to the Danube, but to Circassia too, the rumour having spread through the commercial world that the Russian government, on the plea of blockading the coast of Circassia, pretended to exclude English ships from landing goods and merchandise in certain ports of the Eastern littoral of the Black Sea. On that occasion Lord Palmerston solemnly declared:

“If parliament will place their confidence in us—if they will leave it to us to manage the foreign relations of the country [...] we shall be able to protect the interests, and to uphold the honour of the country, without being obliged to have recourse to war.”—(House of Commons, April 20th, 1836.)

Some months afterwards, on October 29th, 1836, the Vixen, a trading vessel belonging to Mr. George Bell, and laden with a cargo of salt, set out from London on a direct voyage for Circassia. On November 25th, she was seized in the Circassian Bay of Soudjouk-Kale by a Russian man-of-war, for “having been employed on a blockaded coast.” (Letter of the Russian Admiral Lazareff to the English Captain, Mr. Childs, December 24th, 1836.) The vessel, her cargo, and her crew were sent to the port

---

a This statement from The Times, No. 16062, March 28, 1836, is quoted according to D. Urquhart, Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South.—Ed.

b In the New-York Daily Tribune the article ends as follows: “The mystery, however, of Lord Palmerston’s transactions with Russia as to her schemes on the Danube was not revealed till during the course of the debates on Circassia. Then it was proved by Mr. Anstey on February 23, 1848, that ’the noble Viscount’s first act on coming into office’” (as the Minister of Foreign Affairs) “’was to accept the treaty of Adrianople,’—the same treaty against which the Duke of Wellington and Lord Aberdeen had protested.

“How this was done and how Circassia was delivered by Lord Palmerston to Russia, as far as he had the power to deliver it, may perhaps, form the subject of another article.”—Ed.

c D. Urquhart, Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South, p. 320.—Ed.
of Sebastopol, where the condemned decision of the Russians was received on January 27th, 1837. This time, however, no mention was made of a "blockade," but the Vixen was simply declared a lawful prize, because "it was guilty of smuggling;" the importation of salt being prohibited, and the Bay of Soudjouk-Kale, a Russian port, not provided with a custom-house. The condemnation was executed in an exquisitely ignominious and insulting manner. The Russians, who effected the seizure, were publicly rewarded with decorations. The British flag was hoisted, then hauled down, and the Russian flag hoisted in its stead. The master and crew, put as captives on board the Ajax—the captor—were despatched from Sebastopol to Odessa, and from Odessa to Constantinople, whence they were allowed to return to England. As to the vessel itself, a German traveller, who visited Sebastopol a few years after this event, wrote, in a letter addressed to the Augsburg Gazette:

"After all the Russian ships-of-the-line which I visited, no vessel excited my curiosity more than the Soudjouk-Kale, formerly the Vixen, [...] under Russian colours, she has now quite changed her appearance. [...] This little vessel is now the best sailer in the Russian fleet, and is generally employed as transport between Sebastopol and the coast of Circassia."a

The capture of the Vixen certainly afforded Lord Palmerston a great occasion for fulfilling his promise "to protect the interests, and to uphold the honour of the country." Besides the honour of the British flag and the interests of British commerce there was another question at stake—the independence of Circassia. At first Russia justified the seizure of the Vixen on the plea of an infraction of the blockade proclaimed by her; but the ship was condemned on the opposite plea of a contravention against her custom-house regulations. By proclaiming a blockade, Russia declared Circassia a hostile foreign country, and the question was whether the British government had ever recognised that blockade? By the establishment of custom-house regulations, Circassia was, on the contrary, treated as a Russian dependency, and the question was whether the British government had ever recognised the Russian claims to Circassia?

Before proceeding, let it be remembered that Russia was at that epoch yet far from having completed her fortifications of Sebastopol.

Any Russian claim to the possession of Circassia could only be derived from the treaty of Adrianople, as explained in a previous

---

a Quoted from The Portfolio, 1844, Vol. II, No. VIII, p. 533.—Ed.
article. But the treaty of July 6th, 1827, bound Russia to not attempting any territorial aggrandisement, nor securing any exclusive commercial advantage from her war with Turkey. Any extension, therefore, of the Russian frontier, attendant on the treaty of Adrianople, openly infringed the treaty of 1827, and was, as shown by the protest of Wellington and Aberdeen, not to be recognised on the part of Great Britain. Russia, then, had no right to receive Circassia from Turkey. On the other hand, Turkey could not cede to Russia what she never possessed, and Circassia had always remained so independent of the Porte that, at the time when a Turkish Pasha yet resided at Anapa, Russia herself had concluded several conventions with the Circassian chieftains as to the coast-trade, the Turkish trade being exclusively and legally restricted to the port of Anapa. Circassia being an independent country, the municipal, sanitary, or customs' regulations with which the Muscovite might think fit to provide her were as binding as his regulations for the port of Tampico.

On the other hand, if Circassia was a foreign country hostile to Russia, the latter had only a right to blockade, if that blockade was no paper blockade—if Russia had the naval squadron present to enforce it, and really domineered the coast. Now, on a coast extending 200 miles, Russia possessed but three isolated forts, all the rest of Circassia remaining in the hands of the Circassian tribes. There existed no Russian fort in the bay of Soudjouk-Kale. There was in fact no blockade, because no maritime force was employed. There was the offer of the distinct testimony of the crew of two British vessels who had visited the bay—the one in September, 1834—the other, that of the *Vixen* itself—confirmed subsequently by the public statements of two British travellers who visited the harbour in the years 1837 and 1838, that there was no Russian occupation whatever of the coast.—(*Portfolio*, VIII, March 1, 1844.)

When the *Vixen* entered the harbour of Soudjouk-Kale,

"there were no Russian ships of war in sight nor in the offing.... A Russian vessel of war came into the harbour 36 hours after the *Vixen* had cast anchor, and at the moment when the owner and some of the officers were on shore [...] in fixing the dues demanded by the Circassian authorities, and payable on the value of the goods.... The man-of-war came not coastwise, but from the open sea."—(Speech of Mr. Anstey, H. of C., Feb. 23, 1848.)

But need we give further proofs than the St. Petersburg Cabinet itself seizing the *Vixen en pretext* of blockade, and confiscating it *en pretext* of custom-house regulations?
The Circassians thus appeared the more favoured by accident, as the question of their independence coincided with the question of the free navigation of the Black Sea—the protection of British commerce, and an insolent act of piracy committed by Russia on a British merchant ship. Their chance of obtaining protection from the mistress of the seas seemed less doubtful as

"the Circassian declaration of independence had a short time ago been published after mature deliberation and several weeks' correspondence with different branches of the government, in a periodical" (The Portfolio) "connected with the foreign department, and as Circassia was marked out as an independent country in a map revised by Lord Palmerston himself."—(Speech of Lord Stanley, H. of C., June 21, 1838.)

Will it then be believed that the noble and chivalrous Viscount knew how to handle the case so masterly, that the very act of piracy committed by Russia against British property afforded him the long sought-for occasion of formally recognising the treaty of Adrianople, and the extinction of Circassian independence?

On March 17, 1837, Mr. Roebuck moved, with reference to the confiscation of the Vixen, for

"a copy of all correspondence between the government of this country and the governments of Russia and Turkey [...] relating to the treaty of Adrianople, as well as [...] all transactions or negotiations connected with the ports and territories on the shores of the Black Sea by Russia since the Treaty of Adrianople."

Mr. Roebuck, from fear of being suspected of humanitarian tendencies, and of defending Circassia on the ground of abstract principles, plainly declared:

"Russia may endeavour to obtain possession of all the world, and I regard her efforts with indifference; but the moment she interferes with our commerce, I call upon the government of this country" (which country exists in appearance somewhere beyond the limits of all the world), "to punish the aggression."

Accordingly he wanted to know "if the British government had acknowledged the treaty of Adrianople?"

The noble lord, although pressed very hard, had ingenuity enough to make a long speech, and

"to sit down without telling the house [...] who was in actual possession of the Circassian coast at the present moment [...] whether it really belonged to Russia, and whether it was by right of a violation of fiscal regulations, or in consequence of an existing blockade, that the Vixen had been seized, and whether or not he recognised the Treaty of Adrianople." (Speech of Mr. Hume, H. of C., March 17th, 1837.)
Mr. Roebuck stated that, before allowing the *Vixen* to proceed to Circassia, Mr. Bell had applied to the noble lord, in order to ascertain whether there was any impropriety or danger to be apprehended of a vessel landing goods in any part of Circassia, and that the Foreign Office answered in the negative. Thus, Lord Palmerston found himself obliged to read to the house the correspondence exchanged between himself and Mr. Bell. Reading these letters, one would fancy he was reading a Spanish comedy of the cloak and the sword, rather than an official correspondence between a minister and a merchant. When he heard the noble lord read the letters respecting the seizure of the *Vixen*, Daniel O'Connell exclaimed, “He could not help calling to his mind the expression of Talleyrand that language had been invented to conceal thoughts.”

For instance, Mr. Bell asks, “whether there were any restrictions on [...] trade recognised by His Majesty's government—as, if not, he intended to send thither a vessel with a cargo of salt?” “You ask me,” answers Lord Palmerston, “whether it would be for your advantage to engage in a speculation in salt,” and informs him “that it is for commercial firms to judge for themselves whether they shall enter or decline a speculation.” “By no means,” replies Mr. Bell. “All I want to know is, whether or not His Majesty's government recognise the Russian blockade on [...] the Black Sea to the South of the river Kuban?” “You must look at the London Gazette,” retorts the noble lord, “in which all the notifications, such as those alluded to by you, are made.” The London Gazette was, indeed, the quarter to which a British merchant had to refer for such information, instead of the ukases of the Emperor of Russia. Mr. Bell, finding no indication whatever in the Gazette of the acknowledgement of the blockade or of other restrictions, despatched his vessel. The result was, that some time after he was himself placed in the Gazette.

“I referred Mr. Bell,” says Lord Palmerston, “to the Gazette, where he would find that no blockade had been [...] communicated or declared to this country by the Russian government—consequently, none was acknowledged.”

By referring Mr. Bell to the *Gazette*, Lord Palmerston did not only deny the acknowledgement on the part of Great Britain of the Russian blockade, but simultaneously affirmed that, in his opinion, the coast of Circassia formed *no part* of the Russian territory, because blockades of their own territories by foreign states—as for instance against revolted subjects—are *not* to be notified in the *Gazette*. Circassia forming no part of the Russian
territory could not, of course, be included in Russian custom-house regulations. Thus, according to his own statement, Lord Palmerston denied, in his letters to Mr. Bell, Russia's right to blockade the Circassian coast, or to subject it to commercial restrictions. It is true that, through his speech, transpired the desire to induce the house to infer that Russia had possession of Circassia. But, on the other hand, he stated plainly,

"As far as the extension of the Russian frontier is concerned [...], on the South of the Caucasus and the shores of the Black Sea, [...] it is certainly not consistent with the solemn declaration made by Russia in the face of Europe, previous to the commencement of the Turkish war."

When he sat down, pledging himself ever "to protect the interests and to uphold the honour of the country," he seemed to labour beneath the accumulated miseries of his past policy, rather than hatching treacherous designs for the future. On that day he met with the following cruel apostrophe:

"The want of vigour and alacrity to defend the honour of the country which the noble lord had displayed was most culpable; [...] the conduct of no former minister had ever been so vacillating, so hesitating, so uncertain, so cowardly, when insult had been offered to British subjects. [...] How much longer [...] did the noble lord propose to allow Russia thus to insult Great Britain, and thus to injure British commerce? [...] The noble lord was degrading England by holding her out in the character of a bully—haughty and tyrannical to the weak, humble and abject to the strong."

Who was it that thus mercilessly branded the truly English Minister? Nobody else than Lord Dudley Stuart.

On November 25th, 1836, the Vixen was confiscated. The stormy debates of the House of Commons, just quoted, took place on March 17th, 1837. It was not till April 19th, 1837, that the noble lord requested the Russian government

"to state the reasons on account of which it had thought itself warranted to seize, [...] in time of peace, a merchant vessel belonging to British subjects."

On May 17th, 1837, the noble lord received the following despatch from the Earl of Durham, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg:

"My Lord.—With respect to the military de facto occupation of Soudjouk-Kale, I have to state to your lordship that there is a fortress in the bay which bears the

---

a Passages from Palmerston's correspondence with Durham, the English Ambassador to Russia, are quoted from "Letters from the Black Sea and the Caucasus.—The Vixen again", The Portfolio, 1844, Vol. II, No. VIII.—Ed.
name of the Empress (Alexandrina), and that it has always been occupied by a Russian garrison.

“I have &c.

“Durham.”

It need hardly be remarked that the fort Alexandrina had not even the reality of the pasteboard towns exhibited by Potemkin, before the Empress Catherine II, on her visit to the Crimea.²⁹⁰ Five days after the receipt of this despatch, Lord Palmerston returns the following answer to St. Petersburg:

“His Majesty's government, considering in the first place that Soudjouk-Kale which was acknowledged by Russia in the Treaty of 1783 as a Turkish possession, now belongs to Russia, as stated by Lord Nesselrode, by virtue of the Treaty of Adrianople, [...] see no sufficient reason to question the right of Russia to seize and confiscate the Vixen.”

There are some very curious circumstances connected with the negotiation. Lord Palmerston requires six months of premeditation for opening, and hardly one to close it. His last despatch, of May 23d, 1837, suddenly and abruptly cuts off any further transactions. It quotes the date before the Treaty of Kutshuk-Kainardji, not after the Gregorian, but after the Greek chronology. Besides, “between April 19th, and May 23d,” as Sir Robert Peel said,

“a remarkable change from official declaration to satisfaction, occurred [...] apparently induced by the assurance received from Count Nesselrode, that Turkey had ceded the coast in question to Russia by the Treaty of Adrianople. [...] Why did he not protest against this ukase?” (H. of C., June 21st, 1838.)

Why all this? The reason is very simple. King William IV had secretly instigated Mr. Bell to despatch the Vixen to the coast of Circassia. When the noble lord delayed negotiation, the King was still in full health. When he suddenly closed the negotiations, William IV was in the agonies of death, and Lord Palmerston disposed as absolutely of the Foreign Office, as if he was himself the Autocrat of Great Britain. Was it not a master-stroke on the part of his jocose lordship to formally acknowledge by one dash of the pen the Treaty of Adrianople, Russia’s possession of Circassia, and the confiscation of the Vixen, in the name of the dying king, who had despatched that saucy Vixen, with the express view to mortify the Czar, to disregard the Treaty of Adrianople, and to affirm the independence of Circassia?

---

a Quoted from D. Urquhart, Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South, p. 320.— Ed.

b Nicholas 1.— Ed.
Mr. Bell, as we stated, went into the *Cazette*, and Mr. Urquhart, then the first secretary of the Embassy at Constantinople, was recalled, because of “having persuaded Mr. Bell to carry his *Vixen* expedition into execution.”

As long as King William IV was alive, Lord Palmerston dared not openly countermand the *Vixen* expedition, as is proved by the Circassian declaration of independence, published in *The Portfolio*, by the Circassian map—revised by his lordship—by his uncertain correspondence with Mr. Bell, by his vague declarations in the house, by the supercargo of the *Vixen*, Mr. Bell’s brother receiving, when setting out, despatches from the Foreign Office, for the Embassy at Constantinople, and direct encouragement from Lord Ponsonby, the British Ambassador to the Sublime Porte.

In the earlier times of Queen Victoria, the Whig ascendancy seemed to be safer than ever, and accordingly the language of the chivalrous viscount suddenly changed. From deference and cajolery, it became at once haughty and contemptuous. Interrogated by Mr. T. Attwood, on December 14, 1837, with regard to the *Vixen* and Circassia—

“As to the *Vixen*, Russia had given such explanations of her conduct as ought to satisfy the government of this country. That ship was not taken during a blockade. It was captured because those who had the management of it contravened the municipal and customs’ regulations of Russia.”

As to Mr. Attwood’s apprehension of Russian encroachment—

“I say that Russia gives to the world quite as much security for the preservation of peace as England.” (Speech of Lord Palmerston, H. of C., Dec. 14, 1837.)

At the close of the session the noble lord laid before the house the correspondence with the Russian government, the two most important parts of which we have already quoted.

In 1838 party aspects had again changed, and the Tories recovered an influence. On June 21st they gave Lord Palmerston a round charge, Sir Stratford Canning, the present Ambassador at Constantinople, moving for a Select Committee to inquire into the allegations made by Mr. George Bell against the noble lord, and into his claims of indemnification. At first his lordship was highly astonished that Sir Stratford’s motion should be of “so trifling a character.”

“You,” exclaimed Sir Robert Peel, “are the first English minister who dares to call trifles the protection of the British property and commerce.”

“No individual merchant,” said Lord Palmerston, “was entitled to ask Her Majesty’s government to give an opinion on questions of that sort, as the right of
Russia to the sovereignty of Circassia, [...] or to establish those customs and sanitary regulations she was enforcing by the power of her arms."

"If that be not your duty, what is the use of the Foreign Office at all?" asked Mr. Peel.

"It is said," resumed the noble lord, "that Mr. Bell, this innocent Mr. Bell, was led into a trap by me by the answers I gave him. [...] The trap, if there was one, was laid not for Mr. Bell, but by Mr. Bell," namely, by the questions he put to innocent Lord Palmerston.

In the course of these debates (June 21st, 1838), out came at length the great secret. Had he been willing to resist in 1836 the claims of Russia, the noble lord had been unable to do so from the very simple reason that, already in 1831 his first act on coming into office was to acknowledge the Russian usurpation of the Caucasus, and thus, in a surreptitious way, the treaty of Adrianople. Lord Stanley (now Lord Derby) stated that, on August 8th, 1831, the Russian Cabinet informed its representative at Constantinople of its intention

"to subject to sanitary regulations the communications which freely exist between the inhabitants of the Caucasus and the neighbouring Turkish provinces," and that he was "to communicate the above-mentioned regulations to the foreign missions at Constantinople as well as to the Ottoman Government."

By allowing Russia the establishment of so-called sanitary and custom-house regulations on the coast of Circassia, although existing nowhere except in the above letter, Russian claims to the Caucasus were acknowledged, and consequently the treaty of Adrianople, on which they were grounded.

"Those instructions," said Lord Stanley, "had been communicated in the most formal manner to Mr. Mandeville" (Secretary to the Embassy), "at Constantinople, expressly for the information of the British merchants, and transmitted to the noble Lord Palmerston."

Neither did he, nor dared he, "according to the practice of former governments, communicate to the committee at Lloyd's the fact of such a notification having been received." The noble lord made himself guilty of "a six years' concealment," exclaimed Sir Robert Peel.

On that day his jocose lordship escaped from condemnation by a majority of sixteen; 184 votes being against, and 200 for him. Those sixteen votes will neither out-voice history nor silence the mountaineers, the clashing of whose arms proves to the world that the Caucasus does not "now belong to Russia, as stated by Count Nesselrode," and as echoed by Lord Palmerston!
On Friday last, The Morning Chronicle, in its fourth edition, communicated a telegraphic despatch, according to which the Sultan\(^a\) had declared war against Russia. The Paris Patrie of yesterday evening announces, in a semi-official note, that the intelligence received from the East, does not confirm the statement of The Morning Chronicle. According to another Ministerial paper, the Constitutionnel, it was on the reiterated representations of Mr. de Bruck, the Austrian Internuncio, that the Divan assembled on the 25th, with the view to deliberate on the Vienna note, when it declared it would abide by the last note of Reshid Pasha.\(^294\) A Grand Council was convoked on the following day. This Council consisting of 120 of the principal Ministers, Councillors, Pashas and religious dignitaries, resolved that

"it would be contrary to the dignity, and subversive of the sovereign authority of the Sultan to sign the Vienna note without the modifications suggested by the Divan, and that, inasmuch as the Czar\(^b\) had declared those modifications to be totally inadmissible, and refused to abandon his demand for an engagement destructive of the independence of the Ottoman Empire, it only remained for the Council to advise the Sultan to proceed at once to adopt the measures necessary for the preservation of his Empire, and to free his dominions from the presence of the invader."\(^c\)

As to the formal declaration of war, it has not yet been confirmed by any authentic dispatch. This time, at least, the Porte

---

\(^a\) Abdul Mejid.—Ed.
\(^b\) Nicholas I.—Ed.
\(^c\) Quoted according to the article published in The Morning Post, October 5, 1853 and reprinted in Le Constitutionnel, No. 279, October 6, 1853.—Ed.
has caught the Western diplomats. The English and French Governments, not daring to call their fleets home, unable to hold any longer their ridiculous position at Besika Bay, unwilling to pass the straits in open defiance to the Czar, wanted the Porte to send for ships from Besika Bay on the pretext that danger to the Christians at Constantinople was to be apprehended during the fêtes of the Bairam. The Porte refused, observing that there was no danger; that if there was, it would protect the Christians without foreign aid, and that it did not wish to summon the ships until after the fêtes. But the vanguard of the united fleets had hardly crossed the straits, when the Porte, having now put its vacillating and treacherous allies into a fix, declared for war. As to the war itself, it commenced three months ago, when the Russian forces crossed the Pruth. The first campaign was even brought to a close when the Russian legions reached the banks of the Danube. The only change that can now take place will be that the war will cease to be a one-sided one.

Not only the Bey of Tunis, but the Shah of Persia, notwithstanding the intrigues of Russia, has placed at the disposal of the Sultan a corps of 60,000 of his best troops. The Turkish army, then, may truly be said to be a mustering of all the available forces of Mohammedanism in Europe, Africa, and Western Asia. The hosts of the two religions which have long struggled for supremacy in the East, the Russo-Greek and the Mohammedan are now fronting each other, the one summoned by the arbitrary will of a single man—the other by the fatal force of circumstances, according to their mutual creeds, as the Russo-Greek Church rejects the dogma of predestination, while Mohammedanism centers upon fatalism.

To-day two meetings are to be held, the one in Downing-st.—the other at the London Tavern; the one by the Ministers—the other against them; the one in favor of the Czar—the other in favor of the Sultan.

From the leaders of The Times and Morning Chronicle, we might infer, if there could exist any doubt about the intention of the Coalition, that it will try to the utmost to prevent war, to resume negotiations, to kill time, to paralyze the Sultan's army, and to support the Czar in the Principalities.

"The Czar has declared for peace," The Times is happy to
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state, upon undoubted authority. The Czar has expressed "pacific sentiments at Olmütz" by his own lips. He will not accept the modifications the Porte has proposed; he will abide by the original Vienna note, but he will allow the Vienna conference to interpret the note in a preternatural sense, contradictory to his own Nesselrode's interpretation. He will allow them to occupy themselves with conferences, provided they allow him, meanwhile, to occupy the Principalities.

The Times, in its peace paroxysm, compares the two Emperors of Russia and Austria to a couple of savage chiefs in the interior of Africa, in order to arrive at the conclusion:

"After all, what does the world care for the Emperor of Russia, that it should go to war out of deference to his political mistakes?"

The banks of Turin, Paris, Berlin and Warsaw have raised their rate of discount. In the bank returns of last week, the bullion reserve of the Bank of England was stated to have again decreased by £181,615, its total amount now being only £15,680,783. The active circulation of notes has decreased to the extent of nearly £500,000, while the discount of bills has increased by £400,000, a coincidence which confirms the statement I made in my letter on the Peel Act, that the amount of bank notes in circulation does not rise and fall in proportion to the amount of banking business which is done.

Mr. Dornbush concludes his monthly commercial circular as follows:

"Political events during the last week have greatly added to the agitation in the Corn trade, caused by the increasing reports of a deficient wheat crop, the spreading of the potato disease and the scarcity of ship-room. Town flour has advanced to 70 shillings per 280 pounds, new wheat to 80 shillings, with a rising discount approaching 5 per ct. A great excitement now pervades the corn trade—the probability of a war in the East, the prohibition of exporting grain from Egypt, the confirmed deficiency in the wheat crop in England, the spreading of the potato disease, the falling off in the foreign arrivals (especially from the South of Europe), the continued demand for France, Belgium and Holland—these were the principal exciting causes that again drove up prices of wheat variously from one shilling to six shillings per quarter in the leading provincial markets held last week.... Generally, immediately after harvest, the tendency of prices is and remains

---

[a] Here and below Marx quotes from the leaders in The Times, No. 21552, October 6, 1853.—Ed.

[b] Based on an account of September 24, 1853 in The Economist, No. 527, October 1, 1853.—Ed.

[c] See this volume, pp. 295-300.—Ed.
downward till Christmas. This year the movement has been the reverse.... Prices have been rising for some months past. At this moment there is no actual want of corn in any part of this quarter of the globe; many granaries, barns and rick-yards are full to repletion, and in some sea ports store-room is wanting. The late rise in price, therefore, has not been caused by a present, but by a prospective scarcity of corn, founded on the presumption of a deficiency in the crops, the effects of which are expected to be felt as the season advances. The coming winter is likely to prove one of great hardship and privation.... The prevailing opinion is still in favor of a further advance in prices; and while the bulk of speculators continue 'buying and storing,' the tendency is likely to remain upward, probably till next spring.... The presumed high range of prices during the next winter is likely to become, in the following spring, a great attraction to the importation of corn from distant regions, which, in ordinary seasons, cannot be reached on account of the distance and high cost of carriage; next spring an accumulation of arrivals from all accessible parts of the world is not improbable; and the very cause which now contributes to raise the price by the withdrawal of stocks from sale, will, with the setting in of the downward tide of prices, tend to depress the value of corn with a force commensurate to the then eagerness of holders to dispose of their stocks. Now the rule is to buy; then the watchword will be to sell. *Next year may prove as dangerous and disastrous as 1847."

The general depression in the Manchester market continues. In proportion as the news from Australia and China, as well as that regarding the Eastern complication, are taking a more gloomy character; the minds of cotton-spinners, manufacturers and merchants, become more unsettled. The fall in prices may now be considered in ordinary qualities and Nos. of yarn to be from 7/8 to 1d. per lb., from the highest point two months ago, which is very near twice as much as the fall in the corresponding quality of cotton, amounting to no more than 1/2 to 7/8 d. And even at the extreme reduction of 1d., people find it difficult to sell, and stocks, the bugbears of our sympathetic school of political economists, go on accumulating. Of course it must not be expected that this accumulation of stocks will increase very rapidly; at the present moment both merchants and manufacturers, on finding several markets overstocked, have yet the outlet of sending their goods, on consignment, to other markets, and this faculty they *very largely use just now. But to throw the entire exportable produce of British industry, large enough to swamp, at regular intervals, the whole world, upon a few more or less confined markets, will necessarily excite the same state of plethora, and the revulsions consequent upon it, in those very markets which are as yet stated to be healthy. Thus it is that the slightly improved news from India, according to which there still is no chance of profitable exportation to that country, but merely a chance of diminishing loss upon fresh exports, has induced a rather considerable business to that
country, partly on account of the regular India houses, partly on account of the Manchester spinners and manufacturers themselves, who, rather than submit to the loss incumbent upon sales in a declining market, prefer taking whatever slight chance of a better sale there may result from a speculative export to India. And here I may add, that it has been ever since 1847 a regular practice with the Manchester spinners and manufacturers to send out for their own account large shipments to India, etc., and to have the returns in Colonial produce, sold equally for their own account either in British North America or Continental harbors. These speculations do not, certainly, belong to the legitimate trading sphere of the manufacturer, who is necessarily not half as well informed of the state of the markets as the sea-port merchant, but they please the British cotton-spinner who, while directing such distant operations, believes that favorite illusion realized, in which he imagines himself the supreme director, the ruling mind, as it were, of the world's trade and commercial destinies. And if it were not for these speculations which hold fast for a year or eighteen months a considerable portion of the industrial surplus capital, there is no doubt that the extension of manufactures in England would for the last five years have gone on at a still more rapid rate.

In the dry goods market, domestics are the articles suffering under the greatest depression; stocks continue to accumulate although a great number of looms have been stopped. Yet it cannot be said that there is anything doing in other sorts of goods.

A similar stagnation prevails at Leeds and Bradford, at Leicester and Nottingham. At the latter place the hours of work have been reduced to ten and even eight in the lace trade; hosiery has been depressed ever since June last, when the production was at once reduced in Nottingham by one-third of its amount. The only trade that appears to go on in uninterrupted prosperity for the present, is the hardware trade of Birmingham and its vicinity.

At London, bankruptcy begins to spread among the small shop-keepers.

In my letter of August 12, I stated that the master spinners and manufacturers were getting up "An Association for the purpose of aiding the trade in regulating the excitement among the operatives in the Manchester District," that that Association was to consist of local Associations, with a Central Committee, and that it intended "resisting all demands made by associated bodies of mill-hands,
fortifying the monopoly of capital by the monopoly of combination, and dictating terms as an Associated body."\(^a\)

Now, is it not a very curious fact, that this scheme, of which I informed you about two months ago, has, to this very moment, never been alluded to by the London papers, although silently carried out in the meantime, and already doing its work at Preston, Bolton and Manchester? The London press, it appears, was anxious to withhold the fact from the eyes of the world, that the Factory Lords were systematically arraying their class against the class of Labor, and that the successive steps taken by them, instead of being the spontaneous result of circumstances, are the premeditated effects of a deep-laid conspiracy of an organized Anti-Labor League! This English Capitalist League of the nineteenth century is yet to find its historian, as the French Catholic League did in the authors of the *Satyre Menippée*, at the end of the sixteenth century.\(^{296}\)

The work-people, in order to succeed in their demands, must naturally try to keep the one party in till the strike of the others has proved victorious. Where this plan is acted upon, the millowners combine to close *all* their mills, and, thus, to drive their hands to extremities. The Preston manufacturers,\(^{297}\) as you know,\(^b\) were to begin the game. Thirteen mills are already closed, and, at the expiration of another week, every mill is to be shut up, throwing out of work more than 24,000 men. The weavers have addressed a memorial to the masters, soliciting an interview, or offering to refer the matters in dispute to arbitration, but their request was rejected. As the Preston weavers are assisted by penny collections from the operatives of the surrounding districts, from Stalybridge, Oldham, Stockport, Bury, Withnell, Blackburn, Church-Parish, Acton, Irwell-Vale, Enfield, Burnley, Colne, Bacup, &c.; the men having discovered that the only means of resisting the undue influence of capital, was by union among themselves; the Preston factory-lords, on their part, have sent out secret emissaries to undermine the means of succor for the men on strike, and to induce the millowners of Burnley, Colne, Bacup, &c., to close their establishments, and to cause a general cessation of labor. In certain places, as at Enfield, the overlookers have been induced to inform their masters, who had taken a part in forwarding the movement, and accordingly a number of penny collectors have been discharged. While the Preston men are

---

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 250. — *Ed.*

\(^b\) See this volume, p. 316. — *Ed.*
exhorted by the work-people of the surrounding districts to remain firm and united, the Preston masters meet with an immense applause from the other manufacturers, being extolled as the true heroes of the age.

At Bury, matters are taking a similar turn as at Preston. At Bolton, the bedquilt makers having lots cast to decide which of them were to begin striking, the masters of the whole trade at once closed their mills.

Besides the simultaneous closing of mills, other means of combination are resorted to. At Keighley, for instance, the weavers of Mr. Lund struck for an advance of wages, the principal cause of their turn-out being his giving less than was received by the weavers of Mr. Anderton, at Bingley. A deputation of the weavers having asked for an interview with Mr. Lund, and proceeded to his lodgings, they had the door politely shut in their faces. But, a week afterward, Mr. Anderton's work-people were informed by notice that a reduction would be made in the wages of his weavers of 3d. per piece, and of his woolcombers of one farthing per pound, Mr. Lund and Mr. Anderton having, in the meantime, concluded an alliance offensive and defensive, with a view to fight the weavers of the one by pulling down the wages of the other. Thus, it is supposed, Mr. Lund's weavers will be driven to submission or Mr. Anderton's weavers to a turn-out, and the additional weight of another turn-out doing away with all chance of support, both sets will bend to a general reduction.

In other instances the masters try to enlist the shop-keepers against the working men. Thus Mr. Horsfall, the coal king of Derby main pit, when, in consequence of a reduction of wages, his hands struck, went to all the butchers, bakers and provision dealers of the neighborhood the colliers trade with, to prevail on them not to let his men have anything on credit.

In all localities where the Association for "regulating the excitement among the operatives" exists, the associated masters have pledged themselves to heavy fines, in case of any individual member violating the status of their League, or yielding to the demands of the "hands." At Manchester these fines amount to £5,000, at Preston to £3,000, at Bolton to £2,000, etc.

There is one feature which, above all, distinguishes the present conflict from past ones. At former periods—as in 1832, 1839, 1840, 1842—a general holiday, as it was called, viz.: a general and simultaneous stopping of labor throughout the whole kingdom, was a favorite idea with the operatives, and the great object they
aimed at. This time, it is capital which threatens a general withdrawal. It is the masters who endeavor to bring about a general closing of mills. Do you not think that, if successful, it may prove a very dangerous experiment? Is it their intention to drive the English people to an insurrection of June, in order to break their rising spirit, and to lay them prostrate for a series of years to come?

At all events, we cannot too closely watch the symptoms of the civil war preparing in England, especially as the London press intentionally shuts its eyes to great facts, while it diverts its readers with descriptions of such trifles as the banquet given by Mr. Titus Salt, one of the factory princes of Yorkshire, at the opening of his palace-mill, where not only the local aristocracy were regaled, but his hands, too. "Prosperity, health, and happiness to the working class," was the toast proposed by him, as the public is told by the Metropolitan press, but it is not told, that, some days afterwards, his moreen weavers received notice of another reduction in their wages from 2/3 to 2/1. "If this means either health or prosperity to the moreen weavers," writes one of his victims to The People's Paper, "I, for one, do not want it."a

You will perhaps have seen from The Times that a Mrs. MacDonnell, of Knoydart, Glengarry, has, in imitation of the Duchess of Sutherland, undertaken to clear her estates, in order to replace men by sheep.b The People's Paper, informed by a correspondent on the spot, gives the following graphic description of this Malthusian operation!

"This lady had a number of cottagers on her domains, many of whom were unable to pay their rents—some being considerably in arrears, as we are told. She, therefore, ordered them all off, and drove them to take refuge in the woods and caves, where they have since been lurking, or rather dying, while Mrs. MacDonnell's horses have been warmly bedded in secure and comfortable dwellings. She at the same time offered them a free passage to Canada, passage money being cheaper than poor rolls, and permission to sell 'their little stocks,' they having no stock whatever to sell, except the clothes they stand in, a broken table, or a rheumatic cat. Finally, she forgave them the arrears—she could not get. This is called 'noble generosity.'"

---

a Quoted from the postscript to the article of Ernest Jones "The Highland Lady.—The Yorkshire Factory Prince" in The People's Paper, No. 74, October 1, 1853. The quotation below is from the same article.—Ed.
b See K. Marx, "Elections.—Financial Clouds.—The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery" (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 486-94).—Ed.
Such ejections appear to be again the order of the day, throughout the Highlands. Thus, at least, we are informed by Sir Charles Forbes, a Highland laird, writing to The Times,

"that sheep-farms are now becoming so valuable, that it will pay our English sheep-farmers to hire sheep at any time, and to pay for the removal of all who stand in their way."^{2}

Written on October 7, 1853
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3904, October 21, 1853; reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 878, October 25; published simultaneously in abridged form in German in Die Reform, Nos. 64 and 65, October 24 and 25, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

^{2} The Times, No. 21544, September 27, 1853.—Ed.
Karl Marx

[THE TURKISH MANIFESTO.—
FRANCE'S ECONOMIC POSITION] 299

London, Tuesday, October 18, 1853

The Turkish manifesto addressed on the 4th of October to the four Great Powers as a justification of the Sultan's3 declaration of war against the Czar, b is, in every respect, superior to the huge mass of state papers, which Europe has been inundated with since May, 1853.

The Sultan, it states, has given no motive for quarrel. There remained not even a pretext for it, after the question of the Holy Shrines had been settled. On the part of Russia all treaties were infringed; on the part of Turkey all means of conciliation exhausted. According to the Powers themselves, the Sultan was not to subscribe to Prince Menchikoff's note. How, then, could he be expected to adopt the Vienna note, which, as a whole, was not different from that of Prince Menchikoff's? The explanatory epistle of the Vienna conference could not change the condition of affairs. The clear and precise paragraph of the treaty of Kainardji being misconstrued by Russia, what would not be the risk of "placing in her hands vague and obscure paragraphs affording her a solid pretext for her pretentions to a religious Protectorate?" Moreover, the modifications proposed by the Sultan have been fully justified by the subsequent explanations published by Nesselrode. The occupation of the Principalities had, at first sight, constituted a casus belli, and the Porte is now decided to proclaim it a casus belli. Prince Gorchakoff has, accordingly, been summoned to evacuate the Danubian provinces. If fifteen days after

---

a Abdul Mejid.— Ed.
b Nicholas I.—Ed.
the arrival of that notification he should answer in the negative, Omer Pasha is to commence hostilities, the Russian agents are to quit the Ottoman states, and the commercial relations of the two countries to be broken off. No embargo, however, will be laid upon Russian merchant vessels, but they will receive orders to leave the Turkish ports. The straits will remain open to the mercantile navy of friendly Powers.

Such is the substance of the Sultan’s manifesto.

The Turkish ultimatum was intimated to Prince Gorchakoff on the 9th inst. Accordingly, the term for evacuating the Principalities expires on the 25th inst. The threat, however, of commencing hostilities cannot be understood in a literal sense, as Omer Pasha is certain not to abandon his strong positions, with a view to attacking the Russians.

In The Morning Herald of yesterday you will find confirmed my observations on the westward movement of the Russian army, and the secret understanding with Austria which this movement indicates.³

Russia, true to the old Asiatic system of cheating and petty tricks, now plays upon the credulity of the Western World by spreading the rumor that the Czar had “just sent a courier in all haste to Vienna to declare that he accepted freely and completely the whole of the conditions proposed by the mediating powers,” when, unfortunately, “he became informed of the declaration of war on the side of the Porte.” Then, of course, the God of the Russians retracted at once all the concessions he had ever made, and exclaimed that “nothing remained but war, and war to the knife,” (guerre à l’outrance). Thus the Czar, it appears, has been forced into war by the Sultan.

Mr. de Bruck, the Austrian Internuncio, is said to have interrogated the Porte whether it intended to appeal to the political refugees in order to form a foreign legion. Reshid Pasha replied that, notwithstanding the propositions incessantly made to the Porte, he had not yet come to any decision; but that in the case of Turkey being abandoned by her allies, she would believe herself perfectly justified in making use of all means for her proper defense, and in employing the services of the political refugees disseminated throughout the several countries of Europe.

We read in the Constitutionnel⁴:

---

² See this volume, pp. 339-40.—Ed.
³ Of October 15, 1853.—Ed.
"We have reason to believe that there has arrived at this moment at Paris and London an official demand for the succor of France and England on the part of the Sublime Porte."

You will read in the newspapers that the Emperor of Austria\(^a\) has reduced his army by about 100,000 men. The truth is that this number have been dismissed on furlough, but are revocable at any moment. The financial pressure on the one side, and the hope of thus catching the money-lenders on the other, have induced the Vienna Cabinet to take this step.

The following extract from a London commercial circular, concerning the corn trade of France, will, I suppose, be read with interest:

"From a very extensive correspondence [...] taking every possible trouble to ascertain the real state of the case, we believe the crop of wheat in France to be on an average fully one-third short, varying according to locality, the greatest deficiency being in the south. It is true that journals under the influence of the Government have endeavored to persuade the public that such is not the case, but the very acts of the Government are a sufficient contradiction to such assertions. It first relaxed the Navigation Laws in favor of this country; it then repealed them altogether; next it anticipated the reduction of the duty, which the sliding-scale would of itself have secured, by fixing it at the minimum (without reference to the sections into which France is divided at various rates of duty) and opened the ports to foreign vessels free of tonnage dues. Since then it has opened all the rivers and canals free to corn vessels, and invited the railways to carry the food at reduced rates; it has opened Algeria free, and allowed it to ship to France by any tonnage; it has prohibited the export of potatoes and vegetables, and has not hesitated to interfere arbitrarily in many markets between buyers and sellers. Surely all this confirms a short crop, or are very unnecessary precautions. The trade in France has, however, been in a state of suspense for some time: not that the merchants throughout the kingdom have any doubt as to the result of the harvest, but the false step which the Government adopted with regard to fixing the price of bread has so perplexed them that they have been afraid to act, and it is notorious that as soon as the decree was issued, telegraphs were sent off in all directions, canceling the orders given for corn; and it is impossible to estimate the ultimate consequence this measure may have upon prices. The average production of wheat in France is estimated at 80 millions of hectaritres (about 28 millions qrs.), the highest production during the last 25 years having been 97 millions in 1847, and the lowest 52 millions in 1830. The growth of wheat has increased very much of late years, much faster in proportion than the population; and the fact that stocks are completely exhausted at the present time, shows that the population have been much better fed and in a more prosperous condition than they used to be.

"The following table will show the progress of the population and production during the last 25 years:

\(^a\) Francis Joseph I.—Ed.
Average production of Wheat in five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Hectolitres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>32,569,223</td>
<td>from 1827 to 1831 57,821,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>33,540,910</td>
<td>from 1832 to 1836 68,684,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>34,240,178</td>
<td>from 1837 to 1841 71,512,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>35,400,486</td>
<td>from 1842 to 1846 72,015,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>35,781,821</td>
<td>from 1847 to 1851 86,121,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The increase of consumption, in proportion to the increase of population, will cause the effect of a bad harvest to be more severely felt, as there are no old stocks left to fall back upon, and of course no stocks of foreign grain in warehouse."

The sinister intentions of the governing classes of England, with regard to Turkey, may be inferred from the sermons of Messrs. Bright and Cobden at Edinburgh, from the Gladstone speeches at Manchester, and from the hint thrown out by several papers, that, in the case of a Russo-Turkish war, Lord Aberdeen will be replaced by Lord Palmerston, the chivalrous antagonist of Russia.

Jail Inquiries are now a constant feature in the reports of the press. From what has been disclosed it appears that prison discipline in Birmingham consists of collars and mural torture; in Leicestershire of cranks,\(^3\) and in Hampshire of the less artificial method of starvation. And "you call this a free country!"

I stated, in a former letter, that the so-called peace concluded with Burma, was but an armistice, and that the new acquisitions would prove an endless source of new troubles to the British conquerors.\(^b\) The last overland mail informs us, indeed, that the war party in Burma is increasing in strength; that the new territories are literally overrun by large bands of robbers, instigated by the Government of Ava and requiring a considerable increase of military force at Prome, and that

"the British troops are sick and disgusted, healthy sites for barracks having not yet been discovered."\(^c\)

The shameful neglect of all means of irrigation on the part of the Indo-British rulers, is again producing, in the district of Patna, its regular quota of cholera and famine, consequent on the long continued drouth.

---

\(^a\) Quoted from *The Economist*, No. 529, October 15, 1853.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) See this volume, pp. 201-02 and 282-83.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) *The Times*, No. 21560, October 15, 1853.—*Ed.*
From a return just issued I abstract the following statistics of wrecks of British and foreign vessels on the coasts of the United Kingdom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total wrecks</th>
<th>Sunk by leaks or collisions</th>
<th>Strand-ed</th>
<th>Lives lost</th>
<th>Total sum of wrecks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>about 1,100</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum total of wrecks during the 3 years: 2,482
And of lives lost: 2,434

Written on October 18, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

"Wreck Chart of the British Isles" (a fourth report) issued by the Department of the Admiralty.—Ed.
Among the arrests recently made at Paris, the most important is that of M. Delescluze, private Secretary to M. Ledru-Rollin. He had been sent to Paris on a secret mission, and compromising papers, as is stated, have been seized upon him. One cannot understand M. Ledru-Rollin's trusting to a man who has never cleared himself from the suspicion of having betrayed in 1848 the Belgian Legion in the famous affair of Risquons-Tout.\(^3\)

At Copenhagen the consummation of the coup d'état seems imminent, as the Ministry will not yield, and as the Folketing has pronounced against the abolition of the existing Constitution, unless the Government submit to them its own project of a Constitution for the whole Danish monarchy. The two separate projects for the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein have appeared.\(^3\) They are poor imitations of the constitutions of the old Prussian Provincial Diets, distributing the representation among the several "orders," making the right of election dependent on the holding of landed property, and limiting its exercise by the condition of "domicile" in the respective electoral districts. The most remarkable paragraphs in these constitutions are two, one of which deprives the courts of law of their ancient right of canceling administrative decrees, and the other excluding all individuals from the right of voting who compromised themselves in the revolutionary struggle from 1848-50, whether they have since been amnestied or not.

I told you in my last letter that the Austrian decree reducing the army was intended merely to entrap the money-lenders\(^a\); and now

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 418.—Ed.
that all chance of obtaining a loan has vanished—now that the Government declare they never intended to contract any loan—now that they have entered upon a fresh emission of paper, we are informed that

"no arrangements are being made for carrying into execution the Imperial decree relative to the reduction of the army, and that, on the contrary, the generals who command in Lombardy, Hungary, and Croatia, have, all of them, demanded reinforcements on account of the state of the public mind in those countries.""A

A Paris correspondent writes as follows to The Morning Post with reference to the proceedings of the Emperor of Russia during his late visits to Olmütz and Berlin:

"The Czar's b chief object was to make a new alliance between the Northern Powers.... To overcome the resistance of Prussia he used every argument—I may say every bribe; for he offered, in the event of his advancing into and holding Turkish territory, to yield the occupation of Warsaw and the military dominion of Poland to Prussia."c

As to the reported successes of the Russians over Shamyl, letters have arrived at Paris which show them to be nothing but inventions, no engagement of any description having taken place in the Caucasus since the month of May, when the victory at Mendoh was gained by Shamyl, and the Russians were driven back from their attempts upon Malka.

"We quite understand the popularity of a war with Russia on behalf of the Poles or the Hungarians, even if there was no ground of our interference except political sympathy.... We do not understand a war on behalf of the Turk."

Thus wrote The Times on Oct. 12. A week later we are told by the same paper:

"The first collision between British and Russian armies would be a signal of revolution all over the Continent, and we think it by no means unlikely, nor, indeed, altogether objectionable, that such a consideration may have occasionally passed through the minds of our aristocratic, plutocratic, [...] despotic, and anything but democratic rulers.... We are deliberately to go to war with Russia, in defense of the Turkish nominal sovereignty over certain really independent provinces, because by so doing we shall provoke a rebellion in the Austrian Empire."d

---

a Judging by Marx's notebook, this is quoted from the letter from Vienna published in the Frankfurter Journal as reprinted in The Morning Post, October 21, 1853.— Ed.
b Nicholas 1.— Ed.
c The Morning Post, October 19, 1853.— Ed.
d The Times, No. 21563, October 19, 1853.— Ed.
One day England is not to go to war with Russia, because by so doing it would defend the Turks, instead of the Poles and Hungarians; and the next day because any war in behalf of Turkey would be simultaneously a war in behalf of the Poles and the Hungarians.

The Vienna Presse states that Abd-el-Kader has been asked by the Sultan to accept a military command in the case of a war with Russia. The negotiations were managed by the Sheikh-ul-Islam, and the Emir declared his willingness to enter the service of Turkey on the condition that the advice of Bonaparte was previously asked. The command destined for him was that of the Asiatic army.

Written on October 21, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

a Arif Hikmet Bey.—_Ed._
Several important military movements have recently taken place in the seat of war in Turkey, which more clearly define the positions and plans of the respective parties. The Russians—to whom we first advert because they are the attacking party, and as such must be regarded as taking the initiative—have continued to extend their line of operations toward the West. Brigade after brigade has been sent in the direction of Widin, on the upper Danube; and now the front of the Russian army may be said to extend from Kalafat, opposite Widin, to Orasch, opposite Orsova, in a direction which equally menaces the road to Constantinople, and that to Servia and Macedonia. The first movement toward Kalafat was sufficient to establish the certainty of a Russian diversion toward the centers of the Slavonic and Greek population of Turkey. It made it probable, at the same time, that the plan of the campaign would be defensive action and mere demonstrations on the direct road to Constantinople, with energetic offensive action on the road to Sofia, in Servia and Macedonia. However, when these movements were made, the Turks had not declared war. This event has since taken place, and appears to have irritated the Czar—a to such a degree that he is likely to impart a far more energetic impulse to his troops than was previously to be expected. Not only is Prince Paskiewich called to the command of the Russian forces, but he is also said to bring with him 40,000 soldiers from the army in Poland, who next to the guards and grenadiers, are considered the best troops in the Russian pay. Such reenforcements would establish a superiority for the Russian

---

* Nicholas I.—*Ed.
arms which might justify offensive action, both on the Upper and Lower Danube, while at the same time they might be considered as a counterpoise against any French and British forces, that, according to rumor, are likely to be sent to the support of Turkey. At all events, these Russian reenforcements cannot arrive on the Danube in time for operations this season. From Warsaw to Bucharest, by way of Dubno, Chotin and Jassy, the distance is eight hundred miles across a country in which an army cannot move more than eight or ten miles a day. It will then be three months or till the beginning of January before these fresh troops can take up their positions; and considering the season of the year, it is even probable that it will take them longer. These troops, then, must remain entirely in the background until the beginning of the spring campaign.

The Russian forces, now in the Principalities, have been estimated at from 130,000 to 150,000 men. Supposing they have lost by sickness and desertion from 20,000 to 30,000, they still maintain a numerical superiority over the Turks opposed to them. For if we know but little more of the actual strength of the Russians than what may be concluded from the number of divisions and brigades marched into Turkey, and from the effective numbers they ought to show on their rolls, the numbers of the Turkish forces on the Danube are very well known through the reports of British, French and Piedmontese officers sent there by their respective Governments. Now, all these reports agree in this fact, that even after the arrival of the Egyptian contingent, the Turkish active army, under Omer Pasha, did not number more than 110,000 combatants, of whom only 80,000 were regulars. Behind them, at Adrianople, an army of reserve was being formed which was to consist of 80,000 Redifs (old soldiers called in again), but of the state of this reserve we have no positive information. The fact, then, is this, that on the day when the first shot will be fired, Omer Pasha will command an army numerically inferior to that of his opponent, and that nothing but blunders on the part of his enemy, or capital generalship on his own part, will save him from defeat.

We have equally good information as to the position and the defensive preparations of the Turks. Three lines have been fortified: first, the Danube, to prevent its being passed by the enemy; second, that from Varna to Shumla; third, that a few leagues in the rear of the second, on the river Kamčiya, where is the fort which guards the passes of the Balkan. These fortifications are described by the foreign officers as formidable, and likely
to frustrate any attempt of an enemy to carry them. Now, with all respect for the important art of field fortification, and for the judgment of the officers who give this report, we may be allowed to say that such opinions must be received with great caution. How many field-works considered to be impregnable have been carried, after a few rounds of grape-shot, on the first assault; and who does not know that the most celebrated field-works ever constructed, the lines of Torres Vedras,\textsuperscript{304} were strong, not by their passive capacity of resistance but because Wellington had 100,000 men to defend them, while Masséna could only bring 30,000 men to the attack? Single, detached field-works, as in mountain passes for instance, have often done great service; but never in modern times has a superior army, commanded by an able General, been defeated in a general action on account of the passive resistance offered by field-works. And then the manner in which field-works are defended is almost everything; but half-disciplined troops, or soldiers without any discipline, are of little avail behind breastworks when a vigorous shower of grape is directed upon them.

But let us look at the three lines of defense the Turks have fortified. The first is that of the Danube. Now, to fortify the line of the Danube can only mean to erect such works as will prevent the Russians from crossing that river. The course of the Danube, from Orsova to the sea, is nearly 600 miles long; to fortify such a line effectually and to garrison the fortifications, would require six times as many men as the Turkish General can command, and if he had them he would commit the greatest blunder should he put them to such a use. We conclude then that this first line of fortifications must be confined to works between Rustchuk and Orsova, by which the passage of the river is molested, but not effectually prevented.

The second position from Shumla to Varna is exactly the same in which the Turks were routed in 1829, and in which they are again sure to be annihilated if they there accept a decisive battle. The position appears to possess striking advantages for defense, and to be susceptible of great additional strength by art; and the position on the Kamičiya, to the rear of Varna and Shumla, appears to be still stronger, and has the advantage of forcing the enemy to leave troops behind to blockade those fortresses. But both have this disadvantage, that they have a narrow pass in their rear as the only means of retreat, which outweights, for an inferior army, all other advantages, and which would make it an egregious mistake to accept a battle unless the inferior army were as sure as
the British were at Waterloo that at the decisive moment an allied
army would fall upon the flanks of the attacking enemy. 305

As to Omer Pasha we have no means of judging to what use he
really intends turning these fortifications. We cannot doubt but he
knows very well that his part in the war will be chiefly defensive;
and he is, therefore, perfectly justified in strengthening his
defensive position by all the means which the art of fortification
places at his disposal. We do not know, whether he intends these
fortifications to frighten the Russians from passing the Danube at
those points by which Constantinople is most directly menaced or
whether he proposes to accept a decisive battle in them. It is said
that he has disposed his army in such a manner that at whatever
point toward Shumla the Russians shall cross the river, he will be
prepared to fall upon the head of their main column and beat it
before support can arrive. In that case, the second line of
fortifications would form a secure retreat if the operation should
be frustrated. But the truth is that a great defensive battle on any
of the three lines would be a mistake; for either the Russians will
concentrate all their forces for the attack, and then Omer Pasha
will stand but a poor chance; or they will divide themselves, and
then he ought to leave his fortified lines in order to fall upon one
of their columns. The best use to which he could turn these
fortifications, and the only one consistent with the modern system
of warfare, would be to use them as a provisional base for
offensive operations against detached Russian columns, on their
passing the Danube; to check the Russian advance by a more or
less obstinate defense of each line; and to hold, by means of the
third line, the most important passes of the Balkan as long as this
can be done without a general engagement. At the same time it
cannot be denied that any army, and particularly the Turkish
army, would be exceedingly demoralized by the abandonment
without a battle, of these fortifications; for if they cannot hold out
behind ditches and bulwarks, how are they to beat the Russians in
the open field? This is the way the private soldier always reasons,
especially if only half-disciplined; and therefore, if the fortifica-
tions in question actually have the importance ascribed to them,
we cannot but consider them more dangerous to the Turks
themselves than to the Russians.

But the Russians have fortified themselves, too, in Wallachia?
Certainly, and their case is different. They are the attacking party;
their fortifications merely serve to cover retreat and check pursuit
in case of disaster; and they have four lines of rivers, one behind
the other, crossing their line of retreat, and forming as many lines
of defense. These lines are, the Danube, the Arges, the Buzeu and the Sereth. Here is a fair case for precautionary fortifications; here are natural lines of defense which form, to a European army, no obstacle for retreat, while with a little artificial improvement they may become serious obstacles to pursuit; and above all, here is no intention of accepting a general battle with only one line of retreat in the rear. The Russian fortifications, as far as we can judge, belong decidedly to the European system of warfare, while the Asiatic spirit predominates in those of the Turks. This same unreflecting character is the ruling feature of the general position of the latter. They defend Constantinople by placing themselves across the nearest road which leads to it, while the Russians appear to direct their first attack, not upon that city, but upon the central parts of the peninsula, where Turkish dominion is most vulnerable, and where, after all, for a Russian army lies the shortest way to the capital.

There is, however, one thing which we must not forget. The Russian army is, and ever has been, slow and cautious in its movements. It will most probably not act during the winter season. A few skirmishes may take place in order to secure this or that island of the Danube to either party. But unless the Czar commands extraordinary activity—which command would most likely be frustrated by the passive pedantry of his generals—there is very little chance of decisive maneuvers before spring. The Danube might be passed but the Balkan cannot be traversed, and between the two, the position of the Russian army would be most dangerous.

In the meantime, the Turks have sent their fleet to Varna. Admiral Slade, an Englishman, who commands it, appears to be in high spirits. But that movement, too, is full of risk. The Russian fleet, indeed, appears inferior to the Turkish in everything but numbers; but as long as the Russians have two guns and two ships of the line to one of the Turks, the latter cannot venture an action out of the reach of their strand batteries. And in that case, the fleet would be safer and better placed in the Bosphorus, where it is not likely the Russians will blockade it. Once at Varna, the Turkish fleet is exposed to be deprived of all possibility of movement; while in the Bosphorus, it retains its freedom of action, and might be used for expeditions to Trebizond, to the Caucasian coast, or against detached positions of the Russian fleet.

In every respect, then, we are unwillingly compelled to believe the Russians to be superior to the Turks. Whether Omer Pasha, who is really an able soldier, will succeed by his personal qualities
in changing the balance, remains to be seen. Old Paskiewich, however, although a slow, is an experienced general, and will not easily be caught.

Written about October 21, 1853

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3919, November 8, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the New-York Weekly Tribune, No. 635, November 12, 1853
The war has at last opened on the Danube,—a war of religious fanaticism on both sides, of traditional ambition with the Russians, of life and death with the Turks. As was to have been expected, Omer Pasha has been the first to begin positive hostilities; it was in the line of his duty to make some demonstration toward the forcible expulsion of the invaders from the Ottoman territory; but it is by no means certain that he has thrown from thirty to fifty thousand men across the Danube, as is rumored from Vienna, and there is reason to fear that if he has done so he has committed a fatal blunder. On the shore he leaves, he has ample resources of defense and a good position; on the shore he seeks he has inferior power of attack and no retreat in case of disaster. The report of his crossing with such numbers must therefore be doubted till more positive advices.

While the struggle in Europe is commenced under disadvantageous circumstances for the Turks, the case is otherwise in Asia. There, the frontier territories of Russia and Turkey divide themselves, in a military point of view, into two quite distinct theaters of operation. It is the high ridge, or rather concatenation of ridges, connecting the Caucasus with the table-land of Central Armenia, and dividing the waters that run toward the Black Sea from those which the Araxes leads to the Caspian Sea, or the Euphrates to the Persian Gulf; it is this ridge which formerly parted Armenia from Pontus that now forms the partition of the two distinct districts where the war is to be waged. This range of abrupt and generally barren rocks, is traversed by very few roads—the two principal of which are those from Trebizond and Batum to Erzerum. Thus for all military purposes, the hills in
The question may be considered as nearly impassable, forcing both parties to have distinct corps on either side, operating more or less independently of each other.

The country on the shore of the Black Sea is intersected by a number of rivers and mountain torrents, which form as many military positions for defense. Both the Russians and the Turks have fortified posts on important points. In this generally broken country (the valley of the river Rioni is the only one which forms anything like a plain), a defensive war might be carried on with great success against a superior army (as very few positions are liable to be turned on the land side, on account of the mountains), were it not for the cooperation of the respective fleets. By advancing, and, in case of need, landing troops upon the flank of the enemy, while the army engages him in front, a fleet might turn all these strong positions, one by one, and neutralize, if not destroy, fortifications which, on neither side of the frontier, are very respectable. Thus the possession of the Black Sea coast belongs to him who is master of the Sea; or, in other words, unless the allied fleets cooperate actively with the Turks, it will in all likelihood belong to the Russians.

The country in the interior, on the inland side of the mountains, comprises the territory in which the Euphrates, the Araxes and the Kura (Cyrus) take their rise; the Turkish province of Armenia is on the one, the Russian province of Georgia on the other side of the frontier. This country, too, is extremely mountainous and generally impassable to armies. Erzerum on the part of the Turks, Tiflis on the part of the Russians, may be said to be the two immediate bases of operations, with the loss of which the possession of the whole neighboring country would be inevitably lost. Thus the storming of Erzerum by the Russians decided the Asiatic campaign of 1829.

But what is the immediate basis of operation for one party, will be the direct object of operations to the other. Thus the roads connecting Tiflis and Erzerum will be the lines of operations for both. There are three roads; one by the upper Kura and Akhalzikh, the other by the upper Araxes and Erivan, the third in the midst between these two, across the mountains by way of Kars. All these roads are guarded on either side by fortified towns and posts, and it would be difficult to say which would be for Turks or Russians the most eligible. Suffice it to say that the road by Akhalzikh is the one which would lead a Turkish army most directly upon the insurgent districts of the Caucasus, but that very advance of the Turks would be turned by a Russian corps
advancing from Batum up the valley of the Chorokh by Olti upon Erzerum; the road from Batum joins that from Tiflis only about 15 miles from Erzerum, which would enable a Russian corps advancing in the direction alluded to, to cut off the communication of the Turks, and, if strong enough, to take possession even of Erzerum, the fortifications of which are of a merely Asiatic character and not capable of serious resistance.

The key to the theater of war in Asia, and on either side of the hills, then, is Batum, and considering this, as well as its commercial importance, we need not wonder at the efforts the Czar\(^a\) has always been making to get hold of it. And Batum is the key of the theater of war, nay, of all Turkey in Asia, because it commands the only passable road from the coast to the interior—a road which turns all the Turkish positions in advance of Erzerum. And whichever of the two fleets in the Black Sea drives the other back into its harbors, that fleet commands Batum.

The Russians are perfectly aware of the importance of this post. They have sent, by land and by water, reinforcements to the Transcaucasian coast. A short time ago it might have been believed that the Turks, if weaker in Europe, enjoyed a decided superiority in Asia. Abdi Pasha, who commands the Asiatic army, was said to have collected 60,000 or 80,000, nay 120,000 men, and swarms of Bedouins, Kurds and other warlike irregulars were reported to flock daily to his standard. Arms and ammunitions were said to be in store for the Caucasian insurgents, and as soon as war was declared, an advance was to be made into the very heart of these centres of resistances to Russia. It may, however, be as well to observe that Abdi Pasha cannot possibly have more than about 30,000 regular troops, and that before the Caucasus is reached, with these, and with these alone, he will have to encounter the stubborn resistance of Russian battalions. His Bedouins and Kurdish horsemen may be capital for mountain warfare, for forcing the Russians to detach largely and to weaken their main body; they may do a great deal of damage to the Georgian and Colonist villages in the Russian territory, and even open some sort of an underhand communication with the Caucasian mountaineers. But unless Abdi Pasha's regulars are capable of blocking up the road from Batum to Erzerum, and can defeat whatever nucleus of an active army the Russians may be enabled to bring together, the success of the irregulars will be of a very ephemeral nature. The support of a regular army is

\(^a\) Nicholas I.—Ed.
now-a-days necessary to the progress of all insurrectionary or irregular warfare against a powerful regular army. The position of the Turks on this frontier would be similar to that of Wellington in Spain, and it remains to be seen whether Abdi Pasha will know to husband his resources as well as the British general did, against an enemy decidedly his superior in regular warfare and the means of carrying it on. In 1829 the Russian forces in Asia, amounted, before Erzerum, to 18,000 men only, and considering the improvements that have since then taken place in the Turkish army (although that of Asia has least participated in them), we should say the Russians would have a fair chance of success if they could unite 30,000 men in a body before the same place now.

Whether they will be able to do so or not, who can decide at the present time, when there is even less of real facts known, and more idle rumors spread as to the Russian army in Asia than as to that in Europe? The Caucasian army is officially computed at 200,000 men, at its full complement; 21,000 Cossacks of the Black Sea have been marched toward the Turkish frontier; several divisions are said to have been embarked from Odessa for Redut Kale, on the South Caucasian coast. But everybody knows that the Caucasian army does not count half its official complement, that the reenforcement sent beyond the Caucasus cannot, from obvious causes, have the strength reported by Russian papers, and from the conflicting evidence we receive, we are absolutely at a loss to make anything like an estimate of the Russian forces on the Asiatic frontier. But that we may say, that in all probability the forces of both parties (an immediate general insurrection of the Caucasians left out of the question), the forces will be pretty nearly balanced, that the Turks may, perhaps, be a little stronger than the Russians, and therefore will be, on this theater of war, justly entitled to undertake offensive operations.

The chances for the Turks are, indeed, far more encouraging in Asia than in Europe. In Asia they have but one important post to guard, Batum; and an advance, be it from Batum, or from Erzerum toward the Caucasus, opens to them in case of success a direct communication with their allies, the mountaineers, and may at once cut off the communication, at least by land, of the Russian army south of the Caucasus with Russia; a result which may lead to the entire destruction of that army. On the other hand, if defeated, the Turks risk losing Batum, Trebizond and Erzerum; but even if that be the case, the Russians will then not be strong enough to advance any further. The advantages are far superior to
the loss to be undergone in case of defeat; and it is therefore, for sound and satisfactory reasons, that the Turks appear to have decided upon offensive warfare in those regions.

Written about October 27, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3925, November 15, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 636, November 19, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*
Karl Marx

WAR.—STRIKES.—DEARTH

London, Tuesday, Nov. 1, 1853

The news of the cannonade of Isakchea had hardly reached London, when the intelligence was telegraphed from Vienna to London and Paris, that the Porte, at the request of the representatives of the four Powers, had issued orders for the adjournment of the hostilities, if they should not have already commenced, till the 1st November. Is the exchange of cannon-shots at Isakchea to be or not to be considered as a commencement of hostilities? That is the question now stirring the Stock Exchange and the press. In my opinion it is a very indifferent one, as in any event the armistice would have elapsed to-day.

It is rumored that the Turkish army had crossed the Danube at Widin and Matchin, viz.: at the north-eastern and north-western frontiers of Bulgaria. The accuracy of this dispatch appears very doubtful. According to the Paris Presse of to-day, it was resolved by a military council held in the Seraskirat on the 15th or 16th Oct., that as soon as the refusal of Prince Gorchakoff to evacuate the Principalities would be officially known, the hostilities were to commence in Asia, on two different points: against the fortress of Poti, at the Black Sea, and on the frontier of Georgia. The same paper informs us, that Gen. Baraguay d'Hilliers, the newly appointed French Ambassador at Constantinople, has set out accompanied by a staff composed of officers of the génie and of the artillerie. Mr. Baraguay is known as a bad General and a good intriguer. I remind you of his exploits at the famous Club of the Rue de Poitiers.

---

a War Ministry of the Ottoman Empire.—Ed.
While the first cannon bullets have been exchanged in the war of the Russians against Europe, the first blood has been spilt in the war now raging in the manufacturing districts, of capital against labor. On Friday night a riot took place at Wigan, arising out of the contest between the colliers and the coal kings; on Saturday the town was stated to be perfectly quiet, but to-day we are informed by electric telegraph that at the colliery of Lord Crawford or of the Earl Balcarres, an attack was made by the colliers; that the armed force was called out; that the soldiers fired, and that one of the workmen was killed.\textsuperscript{310} As I am to receive private information from the spot, I adjourn my report on this event,\textsuperscript{a} only warning your readers against the reports of \textit{The Daily News} and \textit{The Times}, the former of these papers being in the direct pay of the Manchester School, and the latter being, as \textit{The Morning Herald} justly remarks, "the bitter, unforgiving, relentless enemy of the working classes."

In 1842, when the Manchester School, under the banner of free trade, enticed the industrial proletariat into insurrectionary movements, and, in the time of peril,\textsuperscript{311} treacherously abandoned them, as Sir Robert Peel plainly told the Cobdens in the House of Commons—at that epoch their watchword was: \textit{Cheap food and dear wages}. The Corn Laws having been abrogated and free trade, as they do understand it, realized, their battle-cry has been changed into: \textit{Cheap wages and dear food}. With the adoption of the Manchester commercial system by Government, the millocracy had imposed upon themselves a problem impossible to be resolved under their régime: the securing of an uninterrupted continuance of brisk trade and commercial prosperity. For the hour of adversity, they had cut off any position to fall back upon. There was no more deluding the masses with Parliamentary reform, as in 1831; the legislative influence, conquered by that movement for the middle classes, having been exclusively employed against the working classes; and the latter having, in the meantime, got up a political movement of their own—Chartism. There is no more charging the aristocratic protectionists with all the anomalies of the industrial system and the deadly conflicts springing up from its very bowels, as free trade has worked for about eight years under wonderfully fortunate circumstances with a California and an Australia—two worlds of gold, extemporized, as it were, by the imaginative powers of the modern \textit{demiurge}. Thus, one by one, step by step, the industrial bourgeoisie have removed, with their

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, pp. 446-47.—\textit{Ed.}
own hands, all the carefully propagated delusions that could be conjured up at the hour of danger, in order to deturn the indignation of the working classes from their real antagonist, and to direct it against the antagonists of the millocracy, against the landed aristocracy. In 1853, there have waned away the false pretenses on the part of the masters and the silly illusions on the part of the men. The war between those two classes has become unmitigated, undisguised, openly avowed and plainly understood. "The question," exclaim the masters themselves in one of their recent manifestoes—"is no longer one of wages but one of mastership."a The Manchester liberals, then, have at last thrown off the lion's skin. What they pretend at—is mastership for capital and slavery for labor.

Lock-out vs. Turn-out, is the great lawsuit now pending in the industrial districts, and bayonets are likely to give judgment in the case. A whole industrial army, more than 70,000 working-men are disbanded and cast upon the streets. To the mills closed at Preston and Wigan there have been added those of the district of Bacup, which includes the townships of Bacup, Newchurch, Rawtenstall, Sharnford, and Stanford. At Burnley the mills stopped last Friday; at Padiham on Saturday; at Accrington the masters are contemplating a lock-out; at Bury, where about 1,000 men are already out of work, the masters have given notice to their hands of a "lock-out unless they discontinued their contributions to those out of work in their own town and at Preston;" and at Kindley, three large mills were closed on Saturday afternoon, and more than a thousand additional persons thrown out of employment.

While the hypocritical, phrase-mongering, squint-eyed set of Manchester humbugs spoke peace to the Czar§12 at Edinburgh, they acted war with their own countrymen at Manchester. While they preached arbitration between Russia and Europe, they were rejecting scornfully all appeals to arbitration from their own fellow-citizens. The workmen of Preston had carried in an open air meeting the resolution

"that the delegates of the factory operatives recommend the Mayor to call a public meeting of the manufacturers and the operatives to agree to an amicable settlement of the dispute now pending."b

---

a Here and below Marx quotes from the article "As They've Made Their Bed Se They Must Lie", published in The People's Paper, No. 78, October 29, 1853.—Ed.
b The People's Paper, No. 78, October 29, 1853; The Times, No. 21568, October 25, 1853.—Ed.
But the masters do not want arbitration. What they pretend at is dictation. While, at the very moment of a European struggle, those Russian propagandists cry for reduction of the army, they are at the same time augmenting the army of civil war, the police force, in Lancashire and Yorkshire. To the workmen we can only say with The People's Paper.

“If they close all the mills of Lancashire, do you send delegates to Yorkshire and enlist the support of the gallant men of the West Riding. If the mills of the West Riding are closed, appeal to Nottingham and Derby, to Birmingham and Leicester, to Bristol and Norwich, to Glasgow and Kidderminster, to Edinburgh and Ipswich. Further and further, wider and wider, extend your appeals and rally your class through every town and trade. If the employers choose to array all their order against you, do you array your entire class against them. If they will have the vast class struggle, let them have it, and we will abide the issue of that tremendous trial.”

While, on the one hand, we have the struggle of masters and men, we have, on the other, the struggle of commerce with overstocked markets, and of human industry with the shortcomings of nature.

At a very early period of the Chinese revolution, I drew the attention of your readers to the disastrous influences it was likely to exercise on the social condition of Great Britain.a

“The Chinese insurrection,” we are now told by The Examiner, b “is rampant in the tea districts, the result of which is that teas are looking up in the market of London, and calicos are looking down in the market of Shanghai.” “At Shanghai,” we read in the circular of Messrs. Bushby & Co., a Liverpool house, “the tea market has opened at prices about 40 to 50 per cent. above last season. Stocks were light, and supplies coming [...] slowly.”c

The last advices from Canton state that the

“insurgents are [...] generally spreading themselves throughout the country to the entire ruin of trade, that manufactures, almost without exception, have given way in price; in some instances, the fall is very serious. Stocks are large and fast accumulating, and we fear the prospect of amendment is rather remote. At Amoy the trade in imports, beyond a few chests of opium, appears at an end for the present.”

The following is described as the state of the markets at Shanghai:

a See this volume, pp. 93-100.—Ed.
b Of October 29, 1853.—Ed.
c Here and below quotations from accounts of various firms are given according to The Economist, No. 531, October 29, 1853.—Ed.
War.—Strikes.—Dearth

“Both black teas and raw silks have been offering freely, but the conditions imposed by holders have been such as greatly to restrict operations; no desire appeared to take manufactures, and transactions have been chiefly effected by means of opium at very low prices, and bullion from Canton. Large amounts of treasure have been removed from that place, but the supply is rapidly being exhausted, and we must look to other quarters for silver bullion and coin, without which we shall soon be unable to purchase produce, unless a great improvement should take place in the import market. Business in the latter has been very limited, and chiefly confined to sales of damaged goods at auction.”

In the commercial circular from Messrs. Gibson & Co., dated Manchester, Oct. 21, we find noticed, as a most prominent cause of the actual depression,

“not only present bad advices from our great Chinese market, [...] but the prospect of such continuing to arrive in that absence of confidence in monetary transactions there, which must so inevitably be the result, and for a protracted period, of the complete and radical changes which appear likely to be effected in the government and institutions of that vast Empire.”

As to the Australian markets, The Melbourne Commercial Circular states, that

“where goods purchased only about a month ago [...] have been sold, if then delivered, at a profit of no less than 100 @ 150 per cent., [...] now [...] they would not realize enough to cover the expenses.”

Private letters from Port Philip, received last week, are also extremely unfavorable with regard to the state of the markets. Goods continue to pour in from all parts of the world, and the prices they could command were so low, that rather than submit to immediate sacrifices, ships were being purchased in numbers, to be used for storage.

We can then not be surprised at the commercial circulars continuing to record dullness and declining prices in the markets of the industrial districts. Thus we read in the circulars of Messrs. Fraser, Son & Co., dated Manchester, Oct. 21:

“The extent of operations, whether for the home trade, or for foreign parts, has been on an exceedingly limited scale, and prices have suffered throughout to a greater or lesser extent. The further decline in 1/8 prints and madapolams may be stated at 1 1/2d. to 3d. per piece; in 56 to 66 reed 34 in. to 36 in. shirtings 4 1/2d. to 6d. per piece; in 36-72 reed shirtings, 3d. per piece; in 39 in. shirtings, of low quality, weighing 5 1/4 to 6 lbs., about 4 1/2d. per piece; in 39 in. 60 to 64 reed shirtings 3d. per piece; in 45 to 54 in. shirtings 4 1/2d. to 7 1/2d. per piece; in low 5 to 8 jaconets 1 1/2d.,

---

*a Quoted from a letter from Australia published in The Times, No. 21568, October 25, 1853, p. 7.—Ed.*
and in 14 to 16 square jaconets 3d. per piece; in T cloths 1\(^{1}/2\)d., in long cloths 3d. per piece and in domestic of certain classes about 1-16d. per yard. In yarns, watered twist has declined the most for common and middling qualities, which may be considered as 1/4d. to 1/6d. per lb. below last month's quotations. Mule yarns have been most affected in No. 40's, which have been selling at a reduction of fully 1d. per lb. from the highest point of the year. [...] Other yarns at 20s. below 60 have been similarly affected."

As to the food market, the London *Weekly Dispatch*\(^a\) states:

"In so far as wheat is concerned, the opinions of farmers, as they proceed to thrash their grain and count their stocks, is that the crop will be shorter still than they anticipated. Indeed they call it [...] a half-crop."

The wetness of the weather since about a fortnight, highly unfavorable for wheat-sowing and seeding in the ground, evokes, too, serious apprehensions for the harvest of 1854.

From Oxfordshire it is reported as follows:

"As to the wheat crop, as a whole it is a miserable failure; farms that usually produce from 40 to 44 bushels per acre are this year yielding from 15 to 20 bushels; and some well cultivated wheat and bean lands are yielding but from 8 to 10 bushels per acre. [...] Potatoes sadly diseased, are an insignificant yield."

A Yorkshire report informs us that:

"The wet has caused a complete cessation of all active out-door operations; and the remains of the latter harvest, we are sorry to say—all the beans, the bulk of spring wheat, and some oats, are, by being exposed to the action of the weather, rendered so soft as to prevent the hope that it can ever be fit to thresh after the drying winds of spring. It is, moreover, sadly sprouted, and a sad waste of this last resource will doubtless inevitably take place. We give a faint idea of the extent of the loss to which we now refer. Commencing at the Tees, and from thence to Catterick, at Stokesley, and embracing the lowlands of Cleveland, and eastward of Thirsk to the sea, westward of Harrogate and from the Humber to the sea, [...] vast quantities of corn are abroad and spoiled by the wet, with a rainy sky overhead; a full fifty per cent. of the potatoes irrevocably diseased, and a new demand for seed has sprung up, with small stocks of old corn. It is certain that the whole of the wheat-growing districts of the country are deficient and spoiled beyond any former period within our recollection."

A Hertfordshire report states:

"It is very extraordinary at this period of the year *not to have concluded the harvest in this country*. Such, however, is the fact, as there are many fields of oats not yet carted, and a considerable portion of the spring-sown beans, with an occasional field of barley; indeed, there are some fields of lent-corn not yet cut."

\(^a\) No. 2707, October 30, 1853.—*Ed.*
The Economist of last Saturday publishes the following table, showing the quantities of wheat and grains of all kinds, and of meal and flour of all kinds imported into the United Kingdom during the period from Jan. 5 to Oct. 10, 1853:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries from which exp'ld</th>
<th>Wheat, qrs.</th>
<th>Wheat, meal, or flour, cwts.</th>
<th>Corn [..] of all kinds, qrs.</th>
<th>Agg. of meal and flour of all kinds, cwts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia, viz.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ports</td>
<td>69,101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>307,976</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports within Black Sea</td>
<td>704,406</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,029,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>220,728</td>
<td>5,291</td>
<td>733,801</td>
<td>5,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>872,170</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>899,900</td>
<td>3,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'klnbg-Schwerin</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>123,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>19,187</td>
<td></td>
<td>146,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenburg</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansatic Towns</td>
<td>176,614</td>
<td>53,037</td>
<td>231,287</td>
<td>53,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>58,094</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>132,255</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15,155</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islds. (foreign produce)</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>4,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>96,652</td>
<td>857,916</td>
<td>470,281</td>
<td>858,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,657</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azores</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,053</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>177,963</td>
<td>48,763</td>
<td>177,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, viz.: Sardinian Territories</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>48,174</td>
<td>67,598</td>
<td>45,597</td>
<td>67,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Territories</td>
<td>39,988</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples and Sicily</td>
<td>8,618</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,977</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Territories</td>
<td>44,164</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>106,796</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>28,569</td>
<td></td>
<td>56,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall'bia and Moldavia</td>
<td>209,048</td>
<td></td>
<td>601,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>21,043</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>297,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>543,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total of wheat is \( qrs. 3,770,921 \)
The equivalent of \( 3,802,743 \) cwt. of meal and flour is \( qrs. 1,086,522 \)
The total of grain, flour and meal \( \cdots \) \( qrs. 8,179,980 \)

The Economist, in order to allay the apprehensions of the city merchants, draws the following conclusions from the foregoing table:

"In 1847, notwithstanding the extraordinary stimulus of high prices, we imported of wheat and flour, in the whole year, only 4,464,000 quarters. In the first nine months of the present year we have imported, without any such stimulus, except during the last two months, 4,856,848 quarters. [...] Now, one of two things must be true with regard to these large imports as they affect our own home supply—either they have to a great extent been consumed, and have thereby saved in the same proportion our own home production, or they are warehoused, and they will be available hereafter."

Now, this dilemma is utterly inadmissible. Consequent on the prohibitions or the threatened prohibitions of the export of corn from the continent, the corn merchants thought it fit to warehouse their stores meanwhile in England, where they will be only available hereafter in case of the corn prices ranging higher in England than on the continent. Besides, in contradistinction to 1847, the supply of the countries likely to be affected by a Russo-Turkish war amounts to 2,438,139 quarters of grain and 43,727 cwt. of flour. From Egypt, too, exportation will be prohibited after 30th November next. Finally, England has this year to look only to the usual annual surplus of other nations, while, before the abrogation of the Corn Laws, it had at its
disposition, in seasons of want, the foreign stocks accumulated during the favorable seasons.

The Weekly Times, from its point of view, sums up the situation in the following terms:

"The quarter loaf is a shilling—the weather is worse than it has been for half a century at this season of the year—the operative classes are in the delirium of strikes—Asiatic cholera is raging among us once more, and we have got a war mania. We only want war taxes and famine to make up the orthodox number of the plagues of England."\(^a\)

Written on November 1, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3925, November 15, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

\(^a\) The Weekly Times, No. 355, October 30, 1853.—Ed.
Karl Marx

[PERSIAN EXPEDITION IN AFGHANISTAN
AND RUSSIAN EXPEDITION IN CENTRAL ASIA.—
DENMARK.—THE FIGHTING ON THE DANUBE
[AND IN ASIA.—WIGAN COLLIERS]313

London, Friday, Nov. 4, 1853

Shafi Khan, the Persian Ambassador at the Court of St. James, has
been suddenly recalled from England by the Shah. This recall
coincides strangely with the operations of Persia in Afghanistan,
where it was said to have taken Herat, and with the Russian
expedition upon Khiva, the capital of the Khanate of Khiva.314
The Persian expedition and the Russian one may be considered as
two movements, the one from the west, the other from the north,
centered on the Punjab, the northern outpost of the British
dominions in the East. The Russian expedition is commanded by
Gen. Perowskii, the same whose Khiva expedition in 1839-40
proved abortive. The Russians having organized, of late years, a
flotilla in the Aral Sea, are now able to ascend the river
Amu-Darya.

A large Russian fleet is cruising in the Baltic, where it recently
took an opportunity to inspect the fortifications of Slite, and the
harbor of the Swedish Island of Gothland, of which Russia is
covetous, in the manner she got possession of the Island of Aland,
close to the coast of Sweden, and strongly fortified by Russia in
1836. From Gothland the Russian fleet proceeded to the Cattegat
and the Sound, with a view to support the King of Denmark’s3
intended coup d’état in the very probable case of the Copenhagen
Diet not quietly accepting the so-called Whole-State Constitution
(Gesammt-Staats-Verfassung) octroyed by the magnanimous Czar.
The state of affairs at Copenhagen is this: the Danish Government
has succeeded in carrying the abolition of the Lex Regia,315 and
introducing the new law of royal succession, by the support they

---

a Frederick VII.—Ed.
received from the Peasant-leaguers. This party, under the leadership of Col. Tscherning, aims principally at the transformation of the Feste Gut, a sort of feudal peasant-tenure, into free property; and the introduction of municipal laws favorable to the interests and the development of the peasantry. The properly called national and liberal party—the party of the Eyderdanes, who formed the Casino Ministry in 1848, forced the Constitution of 1849 upon the King, and carried the war against Schleswig-Holstein—consisting chiefly of professional gentlemen, had neglected, like the rest of the liberal party all over the Continent, to consult the interests of the mass of the people, formed in Denmark by the peasantry. Thus their influence on the people was lost, and the Government has succeeded in excluding them almost altogether from the present Folketing, where they can hardly be said to muster more than ten men. The Government, however, having got rid of the obnoxious opposition of the Eyderdanes by the aid of the Peasant-leaguers, threw off the mask, called Mr. Oersted, who was odious to both parties, to the Ministry; and so far from any longer cajoling the peasant party, a royal veto prevented the publication of the new Municipal law, originally introduced by the Government itself in order to catch the peasants. The Peasant-leaguers, duped and abused by the Government, have entered into a coalition with the Eyderdanes, and appointed Monrad, a clergyman and one of the leaders of the Eyderdanes, as Vice-President of the Committee sitting on the Constitutional question. This coalition has baffled all hope of overthrowing the Constitution in a constitutional way, and accordingly the whole plan having been formed by and for the Muscovites, a Russian fleet appears in the Danish waters at the very moment of the crisis.

All the journals of Vienna and Berlin confirm the intelligence of the passage of the Danube by strong divisions of the Turkish army. According to the Oesterreichische Correspondenz the Turks have been repulsed by the Russians in Lesser Wallachia. A telegraphic dispatch states that a serious engagement took place on the 21st ult. between the two armies in Asia. We must wait for more ample and authentic information to account for the circumstances which may have induced the Turkish Commander-in-Chief to cross the Danube at Widin, a maneuver which, at first view, must be regarded as a gross blunder. The Kölnische Zeitung announces that Prince Gorchakoff has seized upon all the treasure-chests (it is not said whether governmental or other) of Wallachia; and, according to another German paper, the same
General has removed to the interior all deposits of corn on the Danube designed to be exported to foreign countries.

The news of advantages gained by Shamyl over Prince Woronzoff, are confirmed by the French papers of to-day. We read in the Agram Gazette, that an important letter has been received by Prince Danilo from Russia, and the Prince after having received it, gave orders to have all the corn which had been gathered in from the Montenegrin territory removed to Zabljak. Cartridges are being made and bullets cast. It is said that Russia has informed the Vladika that a collision between the Turks and Russians was imminent, and that the war had a patriotic and sacred character; and that the Montenegrins ought to watch their frontiers narrowly, in order that neighboring provinces should not furnish aid to the Porte.

The Wanderer of Vienna, of the 27th ult., says that a letter from St. Peters burg states, that the Emperor Nicholas has ordered the formation of an army of reserve, the headquarters of which are to be in Volhynia.

On last Tuesday a riot occurred at Blackburn on occasion of the election of councillors at St. Peter’s Ward, and the soldiery was forced to interfere.

With regard to the Wigan riots, Mr. Cowell, the leader of the laborers at Preston, has declared in a public meeting that—

"he very much regretted what had occurred in Wigan. He was sorry the people of Wigan had no more sense than to have recourse to a system of leveling. There was no sense in working people collecting together and destroying the property they had produced. The property itself never did them any injury—it was the men that held the property that were the tyrants. Let them respect property and life, and by proceeding in a peaceable, orderly and quiet manner, they might rely on the struggle terminating in their favor." 

Now I am far from defending the aimless acts of violence committed by the Wigan colliers, who have paid for them with the blood of seven men. But, on the other hand, I understand that there is a great difficulty, especially for the inferior elements of the working classes, to which the colliers undoubtedly belong, in proceeding “peaceably, orderly and quietly,” when they are driven to acts of frenzy by utter destitution and by the cool insolence of their masters. The riots are provoked by the latter in order to enable themselves to appeal to the armed force and to put down, as they have done in Wigan, all meetings of the workingmen by

---

a Quoted according to “The Operatives of Preston” in The People’s Paper, No. 79, November 5, 1853.—Ed.
order of the magistrates. The riot which occurred in the town of Wigan, on Friday afternoon, was occasioned by the coal kings of the district meeting in large numbers at Whiteside's Royal Hotel, in order to deliberate on the demands of the colliers, and by their coming to the resolution to repudiate all compromise with the men. The attack on the saw-mills at Haigh, near Wigan, which occurred on Monday, was directed against the foreign colliers, brought over from Wales by Mr. Peace, the Agent for the Earl of Balcarres, in order to replace the turnouts of the coal pits.

The colliers were certainly not right in preventing their fellow-laborers, by violence, from doing the work they had abandoned themselves. But when we see the masters pledging each other by heavy fines, with a view to enforce their lock-out, can we be astonished at the more rude and less hypocritical manner in which the men attempt to enforce their turn-out? Mr. Joseph Hume himself says, in a letter addressed to the operatives at Preston:

"I see on the list of advocates for arbitration to settle the disputes of nations, instead of having recourse to war, many master-manufacturers who are at this moment in strife against their men."  

The Manufacturers' Association at Preston have published a manifesto in order to justify the general lock-out. Their sincerity may be inferred from the fact, that the masters' secret league, the programme of which I communicated to your readers about two months ago, is not mentioned in a single word, thus giving the hue of a necessity, which the masters were unable to escape, to the deliberate result of conspiracy. They reproach the workingmen with asking for 10 per cent. neither more or less. They do not tell the public that, when the masters took off 10 per cent. in 1847, they promised to restore it as soon as trade had revived, and that the men have been informed again and again of the revival of trade by the glowing descriptions of Messrs. Bright, Cobden & Co., by the declamations of the whole middle-class press, and by the royal speech on the opening of Parliament. They do not tell us that bread is more than 40 per cent. dearer, coals 15 to 20 per cent., meat, candles, potatoes, and all other articles, largely entering in the consumption of the working classes, about 20 per
cent. dearer than before, and that the manufacturers vanquished their antagonists under the banner of: *Cheap bread and dear labor!* They reproach the men with continuing to enforce an equalization of wages in the same town for the mills of the same description. Why, does not the whole doctrine of their masters, of Ricardo and Malthus, proceed from supposing such an equalization to exist throughout the whole country? The men, they say, are acting under the orders of a Committee. They are instigated by "strangers," "intruders," "traders in agitation." Just the same thing was contended on the part of the protectionists reproaching, at the time of the Corn Law League, the same manufacturers with being directed by Messrs. Bright and Cobden, "two professional traders in agitation," and with blindly acting under the orders of the Revolutionary Committee at Manchester, levying taxes, commanding an army of lecturers and missionaries, inundating the country with small and large prints and forming a state in the state. The most curious fact is that while the masters accuse the men of "acting under the orders of a Committee," they call themselves the "United Manufacturers' Association," publishing their very manifesto through a Committee and plotting with the "strangers" of Manchester, Bolton, Bury, etc. The "strangers" of whom the masters' manifesto speaks, are merely the men of the neighboring industrial localities.

I am far, however, from supposing that the workmen will obtain the immediate end their strikes aim at. On the contrary, I have stated in a former letter, that at no distant period they will have to strike against a reduction instead of for an advance of wages. Already reductions of wages are growing numerous, and producing their correspondent quota of strikes. The true result of this whole movement will be, as I stated on a previous occasion, that "the activity of the working classes will soon be carried over to the political field, when the new organization of trades, gained in the strikes, will prove of immense value to them." Ernest Jones and the other Chartist leaders, are again in the field; and at the great meeting at Manchester, on last Sunday, the following resolution was passed:

"That after witnessing the united exertions of the master class against the trades of this country, by opposing a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, this meeting is of opinion that the present struggle of labor cannot be carried to a successful issue, except by [...] subverting the monopolies of the master class, through the representation of the laboring classes in the Commons's House of

---

3 See this volume, pp. 333-34.—Ed.
Parliament by the enactment of the People's Charter, when alone they will be enabled to make laws in their own interest, to repeal those that are injurious, and to obtain the command of means of work, high wages, cheap food, steady trade, and independent self-employment."\(^a\)

Written on November 4, 1853
First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3928 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 885, November 18, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 637, November 26; published simultaneously in abridged form in German in *Die Reform*, No. 87, November 19, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

\(^a\) *The People's Paper*, No. 79, November 5, 1853.—*Ed.*
There is no longer a doubt that military operations have begun on the Danube. Omer Pasha has crossed that river at Widin, occupied Kalafat, a village on the opposite side, and marched his advanced guard upon Krajova, while another attack of the Turks, from Rustchuk, has been made upon the opposite town of Giurgevo, and a third and fourth attack in the direction of Braila and Turnu are spoken of. At the same time another engagement, in which the Russians were the attacking party, has taken place at Oltenitza. This last affair is reported by one of our dispatches to have lasted three hours and to have ended in the repulse of the Russians; while another dispatch, received from Vienna on the evening of the 8th inst., states that the battle lasted twenty-eight hours, and that even the result was not ascertained. The former account seems more likely to be true.

The results of the other rencontres are also variously stated. That at Giurgevo appears by all accounts to have been fruitless; of the effects of those near Braila and Turnu, we are ignorant; as to the advance from Kalafat, some telegraphs report advantages gained by the Turks and a repulse of the Russians—others, the Turks to have been checked at once, and driven back upon Kalafat. The probabilities remain in favor of the first report.

What is certain, on the whole, is this: Omer Pasha, from reasons hereafter to be considered, has abandoned what we have before this declared to be the natural position of the Turks on this frontier, namely, the defensive. He has taken offensive steps, and profiting by the withdrawal of the Russians from Lesser Wallachia,

---

[a] See this volume, pp. 336 and 427.—Ed.
he crossed the Danube at the extreme left of his own position, at Widin, on the 28th of October; with what force, we are utterly at a loss to make out. However, as since then we have only heard of simulated or partial attacks of the Turks on other points, and as it would be a gratuitous madness to pass a river like the Danube in the face of a powerful enemy, with a force of no consequence, we may take it for granted that Omer Pasha has with him the main portion of his disposable active army. For, unless convinced by undoubtful intelligence, we will not believe that he has committed himself, so far as some dispatches maintain, by crossing the Danube with 7,000 men, and having no nearer supports or reserves than 8,000 men at Sofia, 150 miles off. Yet, as the main body of the Turkish army has but very lately been concentrated at Varna, Shumla and Rustchuk, we find it equally difficult to explain how Omer Pasha should all at once succeed in concentrating the gross of his army at Widin, 250 miles, on an average, distant from the above places.

The most probable solution is, that on seeing the advance of the Russians toward Widin, Omer Pasha has shifted the position of his army in a considerable degree to the left; leaving the defense of the direct road to Constantinople to the garrisons of Rustchuk, Silistra, Varna and Shumla, he has taken Rustchuk for the support of his right, Widin for that of his left wing, Nicopolis for the rallying point of his center. In this position, extending from Rustchuk to Widin, some 200 miles, he has rallied to his left wing whatever troops he could collect with him, and passed the Danube, thus apparently turning the right wing of the Russians. He expected to fall upon their advance corps and to force them to retreat behind the river Shil, the passage of which he might either force in front, or by sending near Rahova another corps across the Danube, which would thus turn the Shil. The river Aluta, the second tributary of the Danube which runs across the road from Widin to Bucharest, might be forced in the same way, by throwing another portion of the Turkish center across the Danube at Nicopolis and Turnu, below the junction of this river with the Aluta. Finally, simulated attacks lower down, at Giurgevo and Braila, might contribute to lead the Russians into error as to the real points at which the Turks were arriving.

There can be hardly a doubt that, leaving political motives for a moment out of the question, such must have been the plans of Omer Pasha. The London Times speaks of an actual passage of the

---

\[^{a}\text{No. 21579, November 7, 1853.—Ed.} \]
Turks at Giurgevo; but this is an evident falsehood. There is not an ensign in any disciplined army who would commit such a blunder as to cross the greatest river in Europe—where it is broadest and most difficult, too—with two corps, at two different points, 250 miles asunder, in the presence of a respectable and concentrated enemy.

What, then, does Omer Pasha's maneuver amount to? It is an attempt to turn the flank of the enemy, and to roll up by simultaneous flank and front attacks his whole line of battle. Such a maneuver is perfectly justified when you can bring, unawares, your own main strength upon the enemy's flank; when your front is safe from attack; when your retreat, in case of a check, is secured; and when, by rolling up, from one flank to the other, the enemy's position, you cut off his communications with his base of operations. Now, in the present instance, the latter conviction is not fulfilled. On the contrary, while Omer Pasha's retreat may be menaced by the right wing of his corps in Wallachia being outflanked, and the road to Kalafat thus cut off (in which case his only retreat would be into Austria), the attack from Kalafat toward Bucharest does not at all interfere with the Russian line of retreat. It will be recollected that, upon that ground, we stated some time ago, the only useful line of attack for the Turks to be that from the Danube toward the Sereth, or the narrow strip of land which divides Bessarabia from the Austrian frontier. Instead of the movement which would at once have menaced, if not interrupted the Russian line of communications, the Turks attack at the opposite end where, even in case of victory, no decisive success is to be expected. As to the Turkish front being safe from attack, that may be the case, insofar as the main operations taking place between Widin and Krajova or Slatina, the Russians are not likely to cross the Danube lower down—unless they were bolder in their strategy than we know them to be. But at the same time, the Turkish front from Widin to Rustchuk is equally impeded by the large river which separates it from the enemy, and there must be comparative inaction in that quarter.

The main condition, however, is not fulfilled in this instance.

We have a splendid historical example of this sort of maneuver in the battle of Jena. Napoleon succeeded in bringing the mass of his forces unawares upon the left flank of the Prussians, and in eight hours rolled them up so completely, that the Prussian army

\[a\] See this volume, pp. 336-37.—Ed.
was cut off from its retreat, and annihilated, and has never been heard of since as an army. But that took place on a ground twenty miles square and within twenty hours. Here we have a territory two hundred miles by fifty, with no roads, and the duration of every movement corresponding thereto. The surprise, the vigor and impetuosity of attack, to which Napoleon at Jena owed his complete success, must here, after a few efforts, literally stick fast in the mud. This will be more apparent if we look at the map. The Turks, from Kalafat, have to march upon Krajova. Here they meet with the first of those rivers, which descending from the Transylvanian Alps to the Danube, traverse Wallachia from north to south, and form as many lines of defense to be forced by an attacking army. The country is exactly similar in this respect to Lombardy, and the two rivers here in question, the Shil and Aluta, may be compared to the Mincio and Adige, whose military importance has so often been conspicuous.

Supposing the Turks force the passage of the Shil, which they may perhaps do, they will meet the first serious resistance on the Aluta, near Slatina. The Aluta is a much more formidable barrier by its width and depth; besides, with a little alacrity, the Russians may there concentrate an army capable not only of repelling all Turkish attacks, but of following up the victory at once. Indeed, a Russian victory at Krajova, unless very strongly defined, would not be of much importance, as in three forced marches the Turks could reach Kalafat and the Danube, and thus escape pursuit. But a Turkish defeat at Slatina, besides being more decisive from the greater mass of Russian troops collected there, would give the Russians five or six days of pursuit; and everybody knows that the fruits of a victory are not collected on the field of battle, but during the pursuit, which may bring about a total disorganization of the discomfited army. It is, then, not likely that Omer Pasha, if Gorchakoff wishes to oppose him there, will ever be able to cross the Aluta; for taking every chance in favor of the Turks, Omer Pasha cannot bring more than 25,000 men to the banks of that river, while Gorchakoff may easily collect 35,000 in good time. As to the flank attacks of the Turks from the southern shore of the Danube, they are tolerably harmless, if the attacking force does not dispose of a prodigious quantity of pontoons and other materials very rarely met with among the Turks. But supposing that even the Aluta were forced, and even the Arges, another important river further east, who will imagine that Omer Pasha can succeed in forcing the Russian retrenchments at Bucharest, and in putting to flight, in a pitched battle, an army which must
certainly outnumber by about one-third the troops he could bring against it?

If the war, then, is conducted upon anything like military principles on the Russian side, Omer Pasha's defeat appears certain; but if it is carried on not according to military but to diplomatic principles, the result may be different.

The voluntary retreat of the Russians from the important military position of Kalafat, after so many troops had been sent there to menace Servia; the unresisted passage of the Danube by Omer Pasha; his comparatively unmolested and very slow movements in Lesser Wallachia (the country west of the Aluta); the insignificance, as far as we can judge, of the Turkish attacks on all other points; lastly, the strategical errors implied in the advance from Widin, and which nobody can for a moment suppose Omer Pasha to have overlooked—all these facts seem to give some ground for a conclusion which has been adopted by some competent judges, but which appears rather fanciful. It is, that there is a sort of tacit understanding between the two opposing generals, by which Lesser Wallachia is to be ceded by the Russians to the Turks. The Aluta, say those who entertain this opinion, forms a very comfortable natural barrier, across which the two armies may look at each other the whole dreary winter long, while the diplomatists again busy themselves to find out a solution. The Russians, by receding so far, would not only show their generosity and peaceable feelings, but they would at the same time get a sort of right upon the usurped territory, as a joint occupation of the Principalities by Russians and Turks is a thing exceedingly in harmony with existing treaties. They would, by this apparent generosity in Europe, escape real dangers in Asia, where they appear to be worse off than ever, and above all, they would at any moment be strong enough to drive the Turks out of the strip of territory allowed to them on the left bank of the Danube. Curious but by no means satisfactory evidence in favor of this theory may be found in the fact that it is openly propounded by Vienna journals enjoying the confidence of the Court. A few days will show whether this view of the question is correct, or whether actual war, in good earnest, is to be carried on. We shall be disappointed if the latter does not prove to be the case.

In Asia we begin to find out that both parties are a good deal weaker than was supposed. According to the Journal de Constantinople, the Turks had, on the 9th October, in Erzerum 10,000 men, as a reserve; in Batum, 4,000 regulars and 20,000 irregulars, intended, evidently, for an active army; in Bayazid, on the Persian
frontier, 3,000 men; in Kars and Ardahan, the two most important points on the Russian frontier (next to Batum), advanced guards of, together, 16,000 men. These were to be reenforced in a few days by 10,000 or 12,000 fresh troops from Syria. This certainly is a very considerable reduction from what other reports led us to suppose; they are 65,000 instead of 100,000! But on the other hand, if the news by way of Constantinople is to be trusted, the main pass of the Caucasus, connecting Tiflis and Georgia with Russia, is in the hands of the mountaineers; Shamyl has driven the Russians back to within nine miles of Tiflis; and Gen. Woronzoff, commander in Georgia, has declared that in case of a Turkish war he could not hold that province unless reenforced by 50,000 men. How far these accounts may be correct we cannot judge; but the reenforcements sent in great haste by sea to Jerkum Kale, Redut Kale and other points on the Transcaucasian coast prove that the star of Russia does not shine very brilliantly in that quarter. As to the strength of these reenforcements, reports differ; it was first said 24,000 men had been sent, but where were the Russians to get ships for such an army? It now turns out that the 13th Division, the first of the 5th corps (General Lüders) has been sent thither; that would be some 14,000 men, which is more than likely. As to the story of the Cossacks of the Black Sea having rounded by land the western point of the Caucasus, and succeeded in passing undisturbed along the rocky and narrow shore toward Redut Kale, to the strength of 24,000 men (this seems to be a favorite number with the Russians), the longer we looked at it, the more incredible it seems. The Tchornomorski Cossacks have plenty to do to guard the line of the Kuban and the Terek, and as to cavalry passing, single-handed and unattacked, in such force, a defile of one hundred and fifty miles, through a hostile population, where a few men might stop them or cut their column in two—these things are only heard of in Russia, where up to the present day it is affirmed that Suwaroff beat Masséna at Zurich.320

Here, then, is the best ground for the Turks to act. Rapid, concentrated attacks of the regulars on one main road to Tiflis—along shore, if the Turks can hold out at sea; by Kars or

---

a The figures are evidently taken from the report in The Times, No. 21578, November 5, 1853, which refers to the Journal de Constantinople of October 19, 1853. Instead of “on the 9th October” this sentence should read “on the 19th October”; this is evidently a misprint in the newspaper.—Ed.

b Tchornoye morye is the Russian for the Black Sea.—Ed.
Ardahan, in the interior, if they cannot—accompanied by an indefatigable, energetic, sudden warfare, according to their own fashion, by the irregulars, would soon put Woronzoff in an inextricable position, open a communication with Shamyl, and ensure a general insurrection of the whole Caucasus. But here more than on the Danube boldness, rapidity, and ensemble of action is required. It remains to be seen whether these qualities belong to the Turkish commanders in that region.

Written about November 8, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3934, November 25, 1853, as a leader
Frederick Engels

THE RUSSIAN DEFEATS

We have carefully examined the European journals brought by the Canada in order to gather all possible light as to the fighting which has taken place between the Turks and the Russians in Wallachia, and are able to add some important facts to those reported by the Washington, which we commented upon on Friday last. We knew then that several engagements had taken place, and with regard to their details we know little more now. Our reports are still incoherent, contradictory and scanty, and so will probably remain till we receive the official dispatches of the Turkish Generals. So much is, however, clear, namely, that the Turks have been maneuvered with a degree of skill and have fought with a steady enthusiasm sufficient to justify the laudations of their warmest admirers,—laudations that by the mass of cool and impartial men have been regarded as exaggerated. The result is a general surprise. Of Omer Pasha's talents as a commander, all persons were prepared to receive very brilliant proofs, but the merit of his army has not been recognized by western journalists or statesmen at its true value. It is true its ranks are filled by Turks, but they are a very different sort of soldiers from those Diebich drove before him in 1829. They have beaten the Russians with heavy odds and under unfavorable circumstances. We trust this may prove but the augury and beginning of far more conclusive defeats.

We now learn for the first time that the Council of War at Constantinople had concentrated at Sofia an army of some 25,000 men in order to operate in Servia in case of need. Of this force

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 450-56.—Ed.
and its destination, strange to say, no previous information seems to have reached Western Europe, but it is clear that Omer Pasha has made the best use of it. Its disposition at Sofia was a blunder since if the Servians should not revolt and make common cause with the Russians,—which under the reigning prince a they are not likely to do,—there is no occasion for an army in that quarter; while in case of a revolt the Turks must either march into the country and suppress it, for which, with the Russians in Wallachia, 25,000 men would not suffice, or else they must occupy the passes of the frontier and confine the Servians at home, for which a quarter of that force would be ample. Omer Pasha evidently viewed the matter in this light, for he has marched the corps straight to Widin, and added it to the force he had there previously. This reinforcement has, no doubt, essentially contributed to the victory he has now gained over the right wing of the Russians under General Dannenberg, a victory of which we have no particulars beyond the number of Russian officers killed and captured; but which must have been quite complete, and will prove morally even more beneficial to the Turks than it was materially.

We now learn, also, that the Turkish force which crossed from Turtukai (a point between Rustchuk and Silistra), to Oltenitza, was led by Ismail Pasha or [by] General Guyon (he has not renounced Christianity though he holds a high rank in the Sultan’s army), whose gallantry in the Hungarian war gave him a high reputation as a bold, energetic and rapid executive officer. Without remarkable strategic talent, there are few men who will carry out orders with such effect, as he has proved on the present occasion, where he repelled his assailant with the bayonet. The defeat of Gen. Pawloff at Oltenitza, must substantially open the country behind the Aluta, and clear the way to Bucharest, since it is proved that Prince Gorchakoff has not advanced to Slatina, as was reported, but remains at the Capital of the Principalities, wisely preferring not to divide his forces, which is again an indication that he does not think himself entirely secure. No doubt a decisive battle has been fought long ere this in the vicinity of that place. If Gorchakoff is not a humbug, and if he can concentrate there from seventy to eighty thousand men—a number which all reasonable deductions from the official force of the Russians still leave to him,—the advantage is decidedly on his side. But seeing how false and exaggerated are the figures reported from the Russian camp;

a Alexander Karageorge.— Ed.
seeing how much more powerful and effective is Omer Pasha's army than has been supposed, the conditions of the campaign become more equal than has been imagined, and the defeat of Gorchakoff comes within the probabilities of the case. Certainly, if the Turkish Generalissimo can concentrate for the decisive struggle fifty or sixty thousand troops already flushed with victory—and we now see nothing to prevent it—his chance of success is decidedly favorable. In saying this we desire to speak with moderation, for there is no use in making the Turks seem better off than they are because our sympathies are with them.

It is impossible to study the geographical structure of Wallachia, especially in a military point of view, without being reminded of Lombardy. In the one the Danube and in the other the Po and its confluents form the southern and western boundaries. The Turks have also adopted a similar plan of action with that pursued by the Piedmontese in the campaign of 1849, ending in the disastrous battle of Novara. If the Turks prove victorious, the greater will be their claim on our admiration, and the more palpable the bullying incapacity of the Muscovite. At all events Gorchakoff is no Radetzky and Omer Pasha no Ramorino.

Written about November 11, 1853

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3936, November 28, 1853, as a leader

Reproduced from the newspaper
Karl Marx

THE LABOR QUESTION

London, Friday, Nov. 11, 1853

Golden opportunities, and the use made of them, is the title of one of the most tragi-comical effusions of the grave and profound Economist.* The "golden opportunities" were, of course, afforded by free trade, and the "use" or rather "abuse" made of them refers to the working classes.

"The working classes, for the first time, had their future in their own hands! The population of the United Kingdom began actually to diminish, the emigration carrying off more than its natural increase. How have the workingmen used their opportunity? What have they done? Just what they used to do formerly, on every recurrence of temporary sunshine, married and multiplied as fast as possible. [...] At this rate of increase it will not be long before emigration is effectually counterbalanced, and the golden opportunity thrown away."

The golden opportunity of not marrying and not multiplying, except at the orthodox rate allowed by Malthus and his disciples! Golden morality this! But, till now, according to The Economist itself, population has diminished, and has not yet counterbalanced emigration. Overpopulation, then, will not account for the disasters of the times.

"The next use the laboring classes should have made of their rare occasion ought to have been to accumulate savings and become capitalists. [...] In scarcely one instance do they seem to have [...] risen, or begun to rise, into the rank of capitalists. [...] They have thrown away their opportunity."

The opportunity of becoming capitalists! At the same time The Economist tells the workingmen that, after they had at last obtained ten per cent. on their former earnings, they were able to pocket

* The Economist, No. 532, November 5, 1853.—Ed.
16s. 6d. a week instead of 15s. Now, the mean wages are too highly calculated at 15s. per week. But never mind. How to become a capitalist out of 15 shillings a week! That is a problem worthy of study. The workingmen had the false idea that in order to ameliorate their situation they must try to ameliorate their incomes. "They have struck," says The Economist, "for more than would have done them any service." With 15 shillings a week they had the very opportunity of becoming capitalists, but with 16s. 6d. this opportunity would be gone. On the one hand workingmen must keep hands scarce and capital abundant, in order to be able to force on the capitalists a rise of wages. But if capital turns out to be abundant and labor to be scarce, they must by no means avail themselves of that power for the acquisition of which they were to stop marrying and multiplying. "They have lived more luxuriously." Under the Corn Laws, we are told by the same Economist, they were but half-fed, half-clothed, and more or less starved. If they were then to live at all, how could they contrive to live less luxuriously than before? The tables of importation were again and again unfolded by The Economist, to prove the growing prosperity of the people and the soundness of the business done. What was thus proclaimed as a test of the unspeakable blessings of free trade, is now denounced as a proof of the foolish extravagance of the working classes. We remain, however, at a loss to understand how importation can go on increasing with a decreasing population and a declining consumption; how exportation can continue to rise with diminishing importation, and how industry and commerce can expand themselves with imports and exports contracted.

"The third use made of the golden opportunity should have been to procure the best possible education for themselves and their children, so as to fit themselves for the improvement in their circumstances, and to learn how to turn it to the best account. Unhappily, we are obliged to state that [...] schools have seldom been so ill attended, or school fees so ill paid."

Is there anything marvellous in this fact? Brisk trade was synonymous with enlarged factories, with increased application of machinery, with more adult laborers being replaced by women and children, with prolonged hours of work. The more the mill was attended by the mother and the child, the less could the school be frequented. And, after all, of what sort of education would you have given the opportunity to the parents and their children? The opportunity of learning how to keep population at the pace described by Malthus, says The Economist. Education, says
Mr. Cobden, would show the men that filthy, badly ventilated, overstocked lodgings, are not the best means of conserving health and vigor. As well might you save a man from starving by telling him that the laws of Nature demand a perpetual supply of food for the human body. Education, says *The Daily News*, would have informed our working classes how to extract nutritive substance out of dry bones—how to make tea cakes of starch, and how to boil soup with devil's dust.

If we sum up then the golden opportunities which have thus been thrown away by the working classes, they consist of the golden opportunity of *not* marrying, of the opportunity of living *less* luxuriously, of not asking for higher wages, of becoming capitalists at 15 shillings a week, and of learning how to keep the body together with coarser food, and how to degrade the soul with the pestiferous doctrines of Malthus.

On Friday last Ernest Jones visited the town of Preston to address the factory-hands locked out of the mills, on the labor question. By the appointed time at least 15,000 persons (the *Preston Pilot* estimates the number at 12,000) had assembled on the ground, and Mr. Jones, on proceeding to the spot, was received with an enthusiastic welcome. I give some extracts from his speech:

"Why have these struggles been? Why are they now? Why will they return? Because the fountains of your life are sealed by the hand of Capital, that quaffs its golden goblet to the lees and gives the dregs to you. Why are you locked out of life when you are locked out of the factory? Because you have no other factory to go to—no other means of working for your bread. [...] What gives the capitalist this tremendous power? That he holds all the means of employment.... The means of work is, therefore, the hinge on which the future of the people turns.... It is a mass movement of all trades, a national movement of the working classes, that can alone achieve a triumphant result.... Sectionalize and localize your struggle and you may fail—nationalize it and you are sure to win."

Mr. George Cowell in very complimentary terms moved, and Mr. John Matthews seconded, a vote of thanks to Ernest Jones for his visit to Preston and the services he was rendering to the cause of labor.

Great exertions had been made on the part of the manufacturers to prevent Ernest Jones visiting the town; no hall could be had for the purpose, and bills were accordingly printed in Manchester.

---

*a* When describing Jones and other speakers at the meeting in Preston on November 4, 1853, Marx closely followed the article "Immense Demonstration at Preston" published in *The People's Paper*, No. 80. The quotation from Jones' speech is given according to that article.—*Ed.*
convening an open-air meeting. The report had been industriously circulated by some self-interested parties, that Mr. Jones was going to oppose the strike, and sow division among the men, and letters had been sent that it would not be personally safe for him to visit Preston.

Written on November 11-12, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx

PROSPERITY.—THE LABOR QUESTION

London, Tuesday, Nov. 15, 1853

"The Trade Returns and the Money Market" is the title under which *The Economist* publishes an article intended to prove the general prosperity and the fair prospects of trade, although we are told in the same number that

"provisions are high and are still rising in price," that "a quarter of wheat will sell at 80 shillings," and that "the state of the Cotton trade [...] is not such as to make the millowners at all anxious to recommence work."3 "There is much of instruction," says *The Economist*, speaking of the tables of importations, "conveyed in these long columns of figures—so much that goes to confirm great principles which have been the subject of strong political contest—so much that explains the recent events, with regard to the Money Market, and [...] casts light upon the future—so much that is highly instructive to the statesman, the financier, the banker, and the trader, in enabling them to take an accurate view of the state of things at present, and to make a just estimate of their position hereafter—that we feel we cannot perform a better service than to call attention to some of the main facts developed by these returns, and trace their connection with other most important features of the time."

Let us then sit down at the feet of this prophet and hearken to his very circumlocutory oracles. This time the tables of importation are referred to in order to prove, not the lavish expenditure of the working classes, but the unspeakable blessings these very classes are reaping from free trade. These tables are as follows:

---

*a* "Faults and Follies of Wages Movement", *The Economist*, No.533, November 12, 1853. The tables and quotations below are cited from the above-mentioned article published in the same issue of *The Economist.*—*Ed.*
TABLE 1

Consumed from Jan. 5 to Oct. 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>lb. 2,668,822</td>
<td>3,162,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>lb. 25,123,946</td>
<td>28,607,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>lb. 42,746,193</td>
<td>45,496,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>cwt. 5,358,967</td>
<td>5,683,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>lb. 21,312,459</td>
<td>22,296,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>gals. 4,986,242</td>
<td>5,569,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One glance over this table shows us the fallacy of *The Economist*. All we know of the enumerated commodities is, not that they have been *consumed*, as is stated, but that they have been *entered* for consumption, which is quite a different thing. There is no shop-keeper so ignorant as not to be able to distinguish between the stock of commodities that may have entered his premises, and the stock that has been really sold and consumed by the public.

“This list may be regarded as including the chief articles of luxury of the operative classes,” and down *The Economist* puts it to the account of these classes. Now, one of these articles, viz., coffee, enters but sparingly into the consumption of the English operative, and wine does not enter it at all. Or does *The Economist* think the operative classes must be better off because their masters are consuming more wine and coffee in 1853 than in 1852? As to tea, it is generally known that, consequent upon the Chinese revolution and the commercial disturbances connected with it, a speculative demand has sprung up based on the apprehensions for the future, but not on the wants of the present. As to sugar, the whole difference between October, 1852 and 1853, amounts but to 324,261 cwt.; and I don’t pretend to the omniscience of *The Economist*, which knows, of course, that not one cwt. out of these 324,261 has entered the stocks of the shop-keeper or the sweetmeats of the upper classes, but that all of them must have inevitably found their way to the tea of the operative. Bread being dear, he will have fed his children upon sugar, as Marie Antoinette, during the famine of 1788, told the French people to live upon macaroons. As to the rise in the import of tobacco, the demand for this article on the part of the operatives regularly increases in the same proportion as they are thrown out of work, and their regular course of living is interrupted.
Above all, we must not forget that the amount of commodities imported in October, 1853, was determined not by the actual demand of that month, but by a conjectural demand calculated on an altogether different state of the home market. So much for the first table and its "connection with other most important features of the time."

**TABLE II**

*Imported from Jan. 5 to Oct. 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>62,506</td>
<td>173,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef salted</td>
<td>101,531</td>
<td>160,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork salted</td>
<td>77,788</td>
<td>130,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hams salted</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>14,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lard</td>
<td>14,511</td>
<td>102,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>263,102</td>
<td>580,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>633,814</td>
<td>1,027,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>238,739</td>
<td>820,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain and Flour</td>
<td>5,583,082</td>
<td>8,179,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>218,846</td>
<td>294,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>205,229</td>
<td>296,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>89,433,728</td>
<td>103,074,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To *The Economist* the glorious discovery was certainly reserved that, in years of dearth and imminent famine, the relative excess of imports above those of common years, of provisions, rather proves the sudden development of consumption than the unusual falling off of production. The sudden rise in the price of an article is no doubt a premium on its importation. But has any one ever contended that the dearer an article the more eagerly it will be consumed? We come now to a third class of importations, constituting the *raw materials* of manufactures:

**TABLE III**

*Imported from Jan. 5 to Oct. 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>971,738</td>
<td>1,245,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemp</td>
<td>798,057</td>
<td>788,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prosperity.—The Labor Question

As the production of 1853 has largely surpassed that of 1852, more raw materials were wanted, imported, and worked up. *The Economist*, however, does not pretend that the surplus of manufactures produced in 1853 has entered the home consumption. He puts it to the account of *exports*.

"The most important fact is the enormous increase in our exports. The increase upon the single months ending the 10th October is no less than £1,446,708, completing an aggregate increase [in the nine months] of £12,596,291; the amount being £66,987,729 in the present year, against £54,391,438 in the corresponding period of 1852... Taking only our exports of British produce, the increase is no less than 23 per cent. in the year."

But how does it stand with these additional £12,596,291. "A large portion of these exports are only on the way to their ultimate markets," where they will arrive just at the proper moment to completely undo them. "A considerable part of the increase is to Australia," which is glutted; "to the United States," which are overdone; "to India," which is depressed; "to South America," which is altogether unable to absorb the over-imports repelled from the other markets.

"The enormous increase of articles imported and consumed, is already paid by this country, or [...] the bills thrown for [...] them are running and will be paid in a very short period.... When shall we be paid for the exports? In six months, nine months, twelve months, and for some in eighteen months or two years' time."

It "is but a question of time," says *The Economist*. What an error!

If you throw this enormous surplus of manufactures upon markets already inundated by your exports, the time you wait for, may *never* arrive. What appears in your tables as an enormous list of imaginary wealth, may turn out an enormous list of real losses, a list of bankruptcies on a world-wide scale. What then do table No. III and the boasted figures of exports prove? What all of us were long since aware of, that the industrial production of Great Britain has enormously increased in 1853, that it has overshot the mark, and that its movement of expansion is becoming accelerated at the very moment when markets are contracting.

*The Economist* arrives, of course, at an opposite result.
"The pressure on the Money Market, and the rise in the rate of interest," he
tells us, "are but the transitory consequence of the large imports being immediately
paid, while the enormous surplus of exports is advanced on credit."

In his eyes, then, the tightness of the Money Market is but the
result of the additional amount of exports. But we may as justly say
that in these latter months the increase of exports has been but
the necessary result of the pressure on the Money Market. That
pressure was attended by an influx of bullion and an adverse
exchange—but is an adverse exchange not a premium on bills
drawn on foreign countries, or in other words, a premium on
exportation? It is precisely by virtue of this law that England, in
times of pressure on her own Money Market, deranges all the
other markets of the world, and periodically destroys the industry
of foreign countries, by bombarding them with British manufact-
ures at reduced prices.

The Economist has now found out the "two points" in which the
workingmen are decidedly wrong, decidedly blameable and
foolish.

"In the first place they are at issue in most cases, on the merest fraction of a
coin."

Why is this? Let The Economist answer himself:

"The dispute has been changed from being a question of contract to being a
struggle for power." "Secondly, [...] the operatives have not managed their own
business, but have submitted to the dictation of irresponsible, if not self-styled
leaders.... They have acted in combination, and through [...] a body of insolent
clubs.... We do not fear the political opinions [...] of the working classes
themselves; but we do fear and deplore those of the men whom they allow to
prey upon them and speak for them."

To the class organization of their masters the operatives have
responded by a class organization of their own; and The Economist
tells them that he will discontinue "to fear" them, if they dismiss
their generals and their officers and resolve to fight single-
handed. Thus the mouth-pieces of the allied despots of the north
assured the world again and again, during the period of the first
struggles of the French revolution, that they did "not fear" the
French people itself, but only the political opinions and the
political actions of the savage Comité du Salut Public, the insolent
clubs, and the troublesome generals.

In my last letter I told The Economist that it was not to be
wondered at if the working classes had not used the period of
prosperity to educate their children and themselves. I am now
enabled to forward you the following statement, the names and particulars of which have been given me, and are about to be sent to Parliament: In the last week of September, 1852, in the township of ... four miles from ..., at a bleaching and finishing establishment called..., belonging to ..., Esq., the undermentioned parties attended their work sixty hours consecutively, with the exception of three hours for rest!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>H.O.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M.L.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B.B.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M.O.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.N.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.T.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>C.O.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>S.B.</td>
<td>10!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ann B.</td>
<td>9!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.G.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>J.K.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boys of nine and ten working 60 hours consecutively, with the exception of three hours' rest! Let the masters say nothing about neglecting education now. One of the above, Ann B., a little girl only nine years of age, fell on the floor asleep with exhaustion, during the 60 hours; she was roused and cried, but was forced to resume work!!

The factory operatives seem resolved to take the education movement out of the hands of the Manchester humbugs. At a meeting held* in the Orchard by the unemployed operatives at Preston, as we hear:

"Mrs. Margaret Fletcher addressed the assembly on the impropriety of married females working in factories and neglecting their children and household duties. Every man was entitled to a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, by which she meant, that he ought to have such remuneration for his labor as would afford him the means of maintaining himself and family in comfort; of keeping his wife at home to attend to domestic duties, and of educating his children. [Cheers.] The speaker concluded by moving the annexed resolution:

"Resolved, that the married portion of the females in this town do not intend to go to work again until their husbands are fairly and fully remunerated for their labor.

"Mrs. Ann Fletcher (sister of the last speaker) seconded the resolution, and it was carried unanimously.

* On November 7, 1853.—Ed.
"The Chairman announced that when the 10 per cent. question was settled, there would be such an agitation raised respecting the employment of married women in factories as the millowners of the country little expected."\textsuperscript{a}

Ernest Jones, in his tour through the manufacturing districts, is agitating for a "Parliament of Labor."\textsuperscript{b} He proposes that

"a delegation from all trades shall assemble in the center of action, in Lancashire, in Manchester, and remain sitting until the victory is obtained. This would be an expression of opinion so authoritative and comprehensive as would fill the world with its voice, and divide with St. Stephen's\textsuperscript{b} the columns of the press.... At a crisis like this the ear of the world would hang more on the words of the humblest of those delegates than on those of the coroneted senators of the loftiest House."\textsuperscript{c}

The organ of Lord Palmerston is of a quite different opinion:

"Among ourselves [...]," exclaims The Morning Post,\textsuperscript{d} "the boasted progress has been effectually checked, and since the wretched failure of the 10th of April\textsuperscript{b} no further attempt has been made to convert laborers into legislators, or tailors into tribunes of the people."

Written on November 15, 1853
Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3938, November 30, 1853
Signed: Karl Marx

\textsuperscript{a} Quoted from "The Operatives of Preston" in The People's Paper, No. 79, November 5, 1853.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} The British Parliament.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} Ernest Jones, "A Parliament of Labour. To the Trades and Working Men in General", The People's Paper, No. 80, November 12, 1853.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{d} Of November 14, 1853.—\textit{Ed.}
The news from the seat of war, brought by the steamer *Humboldt*, confirms the report previously received by the *Europa* that the Turks, after having again and again made good their position at Oltenitza, against heavy odds, and with hard fighting, finally retired across the river about the 14th ult. and took up their position in their former entrenchments at Turtukai. We presume that when we receive our letters and journals this will be explained, but at present we do not altogether understand the reason for the movement. It is stated in the dispatch that it was accomplished without molestation, which precludes the supposition that it was the result of any decided advantage gained by Prince Gorchakoff, unless indeed we are to believe that the Russian commander had succeeded in mustering for his second attack on that place twice the force that he had brought against it on the first. But the truth is, that he had no such corps of 45,000 men for such a purpose, as will appear on a careful review of all the facts in our possession. It is also stated that the Turks return to Turtukai, in order not to expose themselves to the danger of a surprize at Oltenitza in winter, when retreat across the river would be difficult; but this statement contradicts the fact that they are acting on the offensive without a check hitherto and with undeniable preponderance of forces. Besides, their left wing is not only maintained at Widin, on the Wallachian side of the Danube, but is even strengthened, which indicates anything but a general retrograde movement on their part. And, taking the hypothesis of a projected movement, with a large force, across the river at Braila or Galatz, which is probably true, we are at a loss to understand why *Omer Pasha* should withdraw his troops from the strong
position at Oltenitza simply because he was about, with another body of men, to move decisively against the Russian left flank. But the perplexities of the case will be better understood by referring to the events of the campaign since its beginning.

It is certain first of all that the Turks were allowed to cross the river without serious opposition, both at Widin and Turtukai. There was nothing surprising in this, as military experience has established the impossibility of preventing an active enemy from crossing a river, however large; and also, that it is always most advantageous to attack him after he has got part of his troops across—thus falling upon them with a superior force, and while they have only one line of retreat and that encumbered. But that the Turks should establish themselves upon the left bank of the Danube; that in every action fought they should come off victorious; that they should keep possession of Oltenitza, not more than forty miles from Bucharest, for ten days without the Russians being able to dislodge them from that important position; and that they should finally retire from it unmolested and of their own accord—all this shows that the proportionate strength of the Turkish and Russian forces opposed to each other in that quarter has been greatly mistaken.

We know pretty accurately what forces the Turks had to dispose of; but as to the forces of the Russians, we have always been obliged to grope in the dark. Two army Corps, it was stated, had crossed the Pruth, and part of a third followed them shortly afterward. Supposing this to be correct, the Russians could not have less than 150,000 men in the Principalities. Now, however, when events have already shown that there is no such Russian force in Wallachia—now at last we receive an authentic account, by way of Vienna, of what they really have there. Their forces consist of:

1. The Fourth Army Corps, under Gen. Dannenberg, consisting of the following 3 divisions of infantry:
   A The 10th Division (Gen. Simonoff) ........................................ 16,000 men
   B The 11th Division (Gen. Pawloff) ........................................ 16,000 men
   C The 12th Division (Gen. Liprandi) ...................................... 16,000 men
   D One battalion of riflemen .............................................. 1,000 men
2. One brigade of the 14th Division, belonging to the Fifth Army Corps, and commanded by Gen. Engelhardt ....................... 8,000 men

Total, Infantry ............................................................. 57,000 men

---

a Below Engels makes use of the data from the report of the Vienna correspondent of The Times and the editorial in its No. 21587, November 16, 1853.—Ed.
3. Two divisions of light horse, commanded by Gen. Nirod and Gen. Fischbach, together 8,000 men, and 10 regiments of Cossacks. 6,000 men, making in all 14,000 men

4. One division of artillery, of about one battery (12 guns) for every infantry regiment, or altogether 170 to 180 guns.

It also appears, that the Fifth Army Corps, that of Gen. Lüders, is not even concentrated at Odessa, but has part of its troops at Sebastopol, and part in the Caucasus; that the Third Army Corps under Gen. Osten-Sacken, is still in Volhynia, or at least has but just crossed the Pruth, and cannot be brought down to the theater of war in less than three or four weeks; and that the Russian cavalry of reserve—mostly heavy horse—are behind the Dnieper, and will require five or six weeks to march to the place where they are wanted. This information is no doubt correct; and if it had been before us six weeks ago we should have said that Omer Pasha ought to pass the Danube, no matter where or how, but the sooner the better.

There is, in fact, nothing which can rationally explain the foolhardiness of the Russians. To march with something like 80,000 men into a cul-de-sac like Wallachia, to stop there a couple of months, to have, as the Russians themselves have confessed, about 15,000 men sick in hospital, and to trust to good luck, without getting further reinforcements, is a thing that has never been done, and that nobody had any right to suspect in people like the Russians, who are generally so very cautious, and always take care to be on the safe side. Why, this whole available army in Wallachia, after deducting detachments, would only come to some 46,000 men, who might, besides, be wanted at different points!

But such is the fact, and we can only explain it by an absolute confidence on the part of the Russians in the diplomatic intrigues of their friends in the British Government, by an unwarranted contempt for their opponents, and by the difficulties which the Russians must find in concentrating large bodies of troops and large masses of stores at a point so remote from the center of their Empire.

The Turks, on the other hand, are 25,000 strong at Kalafat, in Lesser Wallachia, and are strengthening that force. As to the ulterior movements of this corps we know little. They seem not to have advanced even as far as Krajova, and indeed, to have done nothing more than occupy the neighboring villages. The reason for this is also doubtful, and we can only suppose that Omer Pasha is in some way controlled in his movements by the Council at Constantinople, which originally stationed those 25,000 men at
Sofia. At any rate, as far as it is possible to judge at this distance, this corps is quite useless where it is, and its presence there is a mistake, since even for hypothetical and improbable use against the Servians, it is, as we have shown on a former occasion, either too large or too small. It would apparently have been far better to move it lower down the Danube, for it crossed on Oct. 28, and up to Nov. 15 it had not advanced much, or in any way operated actively. These fifteen days might have been better employed in moving it 150 miles lower down the Danube, as far as Sistova, where it would have been in immediate connection with the left wing of the Turkish grand army, and a couple of marches more would have brought it down upon Rustchuk, the headquarters of the Turkish left. That these 24,000 men united with the main body would have been worth twice their number at Kalafat nobody can doubt; and events support this opinion, for, as before stated, we have not yet heard that during the nineteen days since they crossed the Danube, they have given any active support to Omer Pasha.

The attacks of the Turks at Nicopolis and Rustchuk were mere feints. They appear to have been well executed, with no more troops than was necessary, and yet with that vigor which is apt to lead an enemy into error as to the ulterior objects of the attacking party. The main attack was at Oltenita. What force they brought there is even now uncertain. Some reports say that as early as the 11th the Turks had 24,000 men at Oltenita, and the Russians 35,000 to oppose them. But this is evidently false. If the Russians were stronger than the Turks in the proportion of three to two, they would have very soon sent them back to the other side of the Danube, when the fact is that the 11th saw a Russian defeat.

It would seem now as much as ever that nothing but exceedingly bad generalship can prevent the Turks from driving Gorchakoff out of Wallachia. It is certain, however, that there have been some singular specimens of generalship on both sides. On the 2d of November the Turks crossed at Oltenita—evidently their main point of passage. On the 3d, 4th and 5th they successfully repulsed the attacks of the Russians, thereby establishing their superiority upon the left bank of the Danube. During these three days their reenforcements ought to have arrived, and they ought to have been at once in a position to march upon Bucharest. This was the way Napoleon acted, and every general

---

* See this volume, pp. 457-58.—*Ed.*
since his time has known that rapidity of movement can in itself make up for deficiency of strength, inasmuch as you fall upon your opponent before he has time to concentrate his forces. Thus, as men say in trade, Time is money; so we may say in war, Time is troops. But here in Wallachia, this maxim is neglected. The Turks quietly keep possession of Oltenitza during nine days, from the 6th to the 15th, and excepting petty skirmishes, nothing at all is done, so that the Russians have time to concentrate their forces, to dispose them as maturely as possible, and if their line of retreat is menaced, to restore and secure it. Or are we to suppose that Omer Pasha intended merely to keep the Russians near Oltenitza till his main army had crossed lower down and entirely intercepted their retreat? Possibly, though this is an operation which, with 24,000 men at Kalafat and 24,000 at Oltenitza, presupposes some 50,000 more lower down toward Orsova. Now, if he had such a force there, as very possibly he may, they might have passed the time much better than in all these artificial and subtle maneuvers. In that case, why not throw 70,000 or 80,000 men in one mass across the Danube at Braila, and cut the Russians in Wallachia off at once from their communications? As we have said, it is probable that this movement is now to be made, but why this long delay, and why these complicated preliminaries, does not appear. With so great a preponderance of force all ready on the line of operations, there was no particular advantage to be gained by deceiving Prince Gorchakoff. He should rather have been cut off and crushed at once.

As to the Turkish soldiers themselves, in the few engagements where they have acted, they have so far come out in capital style. The artillery has everywhere proved that the Emperor Nicholas did not exaggerate when he pronounced it among the best in Europe. A battalion of riflemen, organized only ten weeks before the beginning of hostilities, and armed with Minié rifles, then just arrived from France, has, during this short time, gained high proficiency in the skirmishing service, and furnished first-rate marksmen, who well know how to use that formidable weapon; at Oltenitza they had an opportunity of showing this by picking off almost all the superior officers of the Russians. The infantry in general must be quite capable of the ordinary line and column movements, and besides, must have attacked at Oltenitza with great courage and steadiness, as at least on two days out of three, the charge of the Turkish infantry decided the battle, and that at close quarters; and with the bayonet, the Russian infantry, it is well-known, are no contemptible opponents.
The news from Asia is even more decisively in favor of the Turks than that from Europe. It appears certain that there has been a general and combined rising of the Circassian tribes against the Russians; that they hold the Gates of the Caucasus, and that Prince Woronzoff has his communications cut off in the rear, while he is pressed by the Turkish forces in front. Thus the war everywhere opens with disasters for the Czar. Let us hope that such may be its history to the end, and that the Russian Government and people may be taught by it to restrain their ambition and arrogance, and mind their own business hereafter.

Written about November 18, 1853
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3944, December 7, 1853, as a leader
In one of the English newspapers to arrive here recently by steamer we discover to our amazement that Mr. D. Urquhart, often mentioned lately as an agitator for the anti-Russian meetings in England, is described as a tool in the service of Russia. We can only put this absurdity down to intrigues on the part of “free Slavdom”, for the whole of Europe has so far known Urquhart only as a dyed-in-the-wool, almost maniacal Russophobe and Turkophile. When he was Secretary to the embassy in Constantinople the Russians had even demonstrably tried to poison him. Therefore a few remarks about a man whose name is on everyone’s lips but whose actual significance hardly anyone can account for.

Urquhart systematically rides a fixed idea. For 20 years he has been unsuccessfully denouncing Palmerston and the Russian tricks and dodges, and was, therefore, naturally bound to go half-crazy, as would anybody who had a particular idea that was right, but of which he could not convince the world. The fact that Palmerston has been able to hold on until today with his diplomacy, he puts down to the quarrel between the Whigs and Tories, which is partly, but of course only partly, correct. For the English Parliament of today, which judges every issue not on its own merits but solely according to whether a party is “in office” or “out of office”, he, who is basically conservative, sees no other salvation but strengthening the royal prerogative, on the one hand, and local, municipal self-government, on the other. To put up a front

---

a The reference is to the article “A Russian Movement in England”, in The People’s Paper, No. 80, November 12, 1853.— Ed.
against Russia he wants the West to form as compact and uniform a mass as the Russian. He, therefore; will not hear of parties and is a bitter enemy of all efforts to bring about centralisation. As all the revolutions since 1848 have temporarily been favourable to Russia's progress, he foolishly attributes this outcome to Russian diplomacy, seeing it as Russia's original motive. Russia's agents are, therefore, according to Urquhart, the secret commanders of the revolutions. As Austria is the direct counter-force to Russia within the old conservative system, he shows a preference for Austria and a dislike of anything that could imperil its international power. In contrast to the Russian way of levelling things out, on the one hand, and to the revolutionary way of doing so, on the other, he clings to the individuality and particular characteristics of peoples. In his eyes, therefore, the Jews, the Gypsies, the Spaniards and the Mohammedans, including the Circassians, are the four finest peoples, as they have not been tainted by the vulgarism of Paris and London. From all this it is clear that his conception of history had necessarily to assume a very subjective character. History to him is more or less exclusively the work of diplomacy. As far as the objective, material conception of history is concerned, he thinks it is like making crimes into general laws instead of bringing them to trial.

"He is an honest, obstinate, truth-loving, enthusiastic, totally illogical old man, tormenting himself with his deep-seated prejudices", as one of his critics says of him.

However, as he has but one cause in life, his campaign against Russia, which he conducts with monomaniacal acumen and a great deal of expert knowledge, none of this does any harm. The knight with one cause in life is bound once more to be "the noble knight of the woeful countenance", nor is there any lack of Sancho Panzas, here or in Europe. A modified example of this species appears in the guise of "A.P.C.", a the London A-B-C scholar from the Tribune.528

Written about November 20, 1853
First published in Die Reform, No. 112, December 19, 1853
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the German
Published in English for the first time

---

a F. Pulszky.—Ed.
KARL MARX

THE KNIGHT
OF THE NOBLE CONSCIOUSNESS

---
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Written about November 21-28, 1853

First published as a pamphlet in New-York, January 1854

Signed: Karl Marx

Printed according to the pamphlet
Translated from the German
Published in English for the first time
The man of small-scale war (see Decker's *Theorie des kleinen Kriegs*) does not need to be a man at all noble, but must have a *noble* consciousness. According to Hegel, the consciousness that is noble becomes transmuted necessarily into a consciousness that is *base*.\(^a\) I shall elucidate this transmutation from the effusions of Herr Willich—who is Peter the Hermit and Walther Havenought in one person. I shall confine myself to the *cavaliere della ventura*\(^b\); the *cavalieri del dente*\(^c\) standing behind him I leave to their mission.

To make it clear from the outset that the man of the noble consciousness is wont to express truth in the "higher" sense by lies in the "ordinary" sense, Herr Willich begins his reply to my *Revelations*\(^380\) with the words:

"Dr. Karl Marx published a report on the Cologne Communist trial in the *Neue-England-Zeitung* and the *Criminal-Zeitung*."\(^d\)

I have never reported on the Cologne Communist trial in the *Criminal-Zeitung*. It is common knowledge that I published the *Revelations* in the *Neue-England-Zeitung* and Herr Willich published Hirsch's confessions\(^e\) in the *Criminal-Zeitung*.

\(^a\) G.W.F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, section "Die Bildung und ihr Reich der Wirklichkeit".— Ed.

\(^b\) Knight of fortune, adventurer.— Ed.

\(^c\) Parasites.— Ed.


\(^e\) W. Hirsch, "Die Opfer der Moucharderie, Rechtfertigungsschrift", *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, April 1, 8, 15, 22, 1853 (see this volume, pp. 40-43).— Ed.
On p. 11 of the *Revelations* it is stated: “From the list of documents stolen from the Willich-Schapper party and from the dates of these documents it follows that although the party had been warned by Reuter’s burglary, it still constantly found ways and means of having its documents stolen and allowing them to fall into the hands of the Prussian police.” On p. 64 this passage is repeated.\(^a\)

“Herr Marx,” replied Herr Willich, “knows very well that these documents were themselves mostly falsified, and in part invented.”

*Mostly* falsified, therefore not *wholly* falsified. *In part* invented, therefore not wholly invented. Herr Willich, therefore, admits: both before and after Reuter’s burglary, documents belonging to his faction found their way to the police. Just as I assert.

So the noble-mindedness of Herr Willich consists in detecting a *false consciousness* behind a *correct fact*. “Herr Marx knows.” How does Herr Willich know what Herr Marx knows? I know of some of the documents in question that they are genuine. About none of them do I know that during the proceedings at the trial it was shown to be falsified or invented. But I *ought* to have known “more”, since “a certain Blum, who was among Willich’s closest associates”, was “Marx’s informant”. Blum, therefore, flourished\(^b\) in Willich’s immediate neighbourhood. So much the more distant did he keep himself from me. All that I know about Blum, to whom I have never spoken, not even metaphorically,\(^c\) is that he is said to be a Russian by birth and a shoemaker by trade, that he also plays the part of Morison, swears by Willich’s Morison pills, and now probably lives in Australia.\(^331\) About the activity of the Willich-Kinkel missionaries, I received information from Magdeburg, not London. Hence the man of the noble consciousness could have spared himself the certainly painful operation of publicly vilifying one of his sons in the faith on the basis of mere suspicion.

At first the noble-minded one tells a lie attributing a non-existent informant to me, then he tells a lie denying the existence of an existing letter. He quotes: “Page 69 of the *Revelations*, note A\(^d\) from the *alleged* letter of Becker’s.”

---

\(^a\) See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 406.—*Ed.* 
\(^b\) A pun in German: “Blume” means “flower”—*Ed.* 
\(^c\) A pun on words: “durch die Blume sprechen” means “to speak metaphorically”—*Ed.* 
\(^d\) See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 452.—*Ed.*
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evom

edelmüthigen Bewußtsein,

evom

Karl Marx.

Title page of the first edition of Marx’s pamphlet *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness*
Herr Willich is too noble-minded to assume that “a man of intellect and character” like Becker could fail to see the intellect and character of a man like Willich. Hence, he converts Becker’s letter into an alleged one and me into a forger. He does so, of course, out of nobility of mind. The alleged letter is still in the possession of defence counsel Schneider II. I sent it to Cologne for the defence at the time of the trial, because it refutes that Becker had any part in Willich’s stupidities. Not only was the letter written by Becker, but the Cologne and London postmarks testify to the date of despatch and receipt.

“Previously, however, Frau Kinkel wrote a fairly long, informative letter to me” (Willich); “Becker in Cologne undertook its despatch. He told her that the letter had been mailed—I have never seen it. Has Herr Marx, Becker, or the post, kept it?”

Not the post, Willich asserted. Perhaps Becker? As long as he was in freedom, no Willich had asked him about it. Therefore, “Herr Marx”. In his quiet way, Herr Willich contrives to make out that I publish letters which Becker did not write to me and that I suppress letters which Becker entrusted to me for despatch. Unfortunately, Becker was so kind as never to trouble me with any mailing of letters, whether from Frau Johann or from Herr Johann Gottfried.a Neither the prison nor the Black Bureau stands in the way of approaching Becker with inquiries of such a neutral content. Herr Willich lyingly perpetrates a foul insinuation out of a pure intention to promote virtue and to depict the elective affinity between the good, between the Kinkels and Willichs, as victorious over all divisive arts of the wicked.

“The party situation within the proletariat is that between the Marx party and the Willich-Schapper party, according to Herr Marx’s designation, not mine.”

The man of the noble consciousness has to prove his own modesty by the overweening conceit of others. Therefore, he converts the “designation of the Cologne bill of indictment” (see p. 6 of the Revelations) into “Herr Marx’s designations”. Similarly, out of modesty he converts the party situation within a particular German secret society, about which I speak (see loc. cit.), into the “party situation within the proletariat”.

“When in the autumn of 1850 Techow came to London—Marx contrived to have Dronke write to him that Techow had made highly contemptuous statements about me; the letter was read out. Techow arrived, we spoke to each other as man to man, the information given in the letter had been invented!!”

---

a An allusion to Gottfried Kinkel and his wife, Johanna Kinkel.—Ed.
b See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 402.—Ed.
When Techow came to London, I had Dronke write to me, I received the letter, I read it aloud, and then Techow came. The false consecutio temporum reflects the embarrassment of the noble-minded one, who is trying to create a false causal connection between me, Dronke's letter and Techow's coming. In Dronke's letter, which incidentally is addressed to Engels and not to me, the incriminating passage reads word for word as follows:

"Today I caused Techow to change his opinion somewhat, although in doing so I became involved in a heated dispute with him and Schily"—Schily is at this moment in London—"and he repeatedly declared the attacks on Sigel to be a personal whim of Willich's, to whom he incidentally denies even the slightest military talent."

Dronke, therefore, speaks not of Techow's highly contemptuous statements in general, but of Techow's contemptuous utterances about Herr Willich's military talent. Hence, if Techow did declare anything to have been invented, it was not the information in Dronke's letter, but the information by the noble-minded one about Dronke's information. In London, Techow did not modify the view he held in Switzerland about Herr Willich's military talent, although perhaps he did modify other views he had held about the false ascetic. My connection with Dronke's letter and Techow's coming is, therefore, confined to the fact that I read out Dronke's letter, just as I as President of the Central Authority had to read out all letters. Thus, among others, a letter from Karl Bruhn, in which he, too, made merry over Willich's military talent. At the time, Herr Willich was convinced that I had let Bruhn write this letter. But since Bruhn, unlike Techow, has not yet gone to Australia, Herr Willich prudently suppresses "this sample of my tactics". Similarly, I had to read out a letter in which Rothacker writes:

"I will join any other community,—but this one" (viz. Willich's) "never".

He relates how, owing to simple opposition to Willich's views on "the striking arming of Prussia", he incurred the fate of having one of Willich's henchmen

"demand his immediate expulsion from the League, while another wanted to have a commission appointed to investigate how this Rothacker had come into the League, which he considered suspicious".

Herr Willich was convinced that I had Rothacker write this letter. But since instead of digging for gold in Melbourne,

---

*a Of the Communist League.—Ed.
Rothacker is putting out a newspaper in Cincinnati, Herr Willich has again found it convenient to deprive the world of this further "sample of my tactics".

In accordance with his nature, the noble-minded one wants to evoke delight whenever he goes, and to receive homage everywhere. If, therefore, he finds his good opinion of himself contradicted, if Techow denies him military talent or Rothacker denies him political competence, or if Becker goes so far as to call him "stupid", then these unnatural experiences are accounted for by pragmatic reference to the tactical opposition between Ahriman—Marx and Engels—and Ormuzd—Willich; accordingly, his nobility of mind finds expression in the extremely base occupation of detecting, inventing, and lying about the secrets of this imagined tactic. We see, says Hegel, how this consciousness is concerned not with what is highest, but with what is lowest, namely with itself.

"Here," exclaims Herr Willich triumphantly, "are some samples of the tactics of Herr Marx."

"The first contradiction between Marx, Engels and myself showed itself when the invitation to a meeting was sent to us from the men of the revolution living in London who possessed a greater or lesser sphere of influence. I wanted to accept it; I demanded that our party line and organisation should be safeguarded, but that the scandal of internal dissensions among the émigrés should not be spread outside. I was voted down, the invitation was refused, and from that day date the disgusting dissensions among the London émigrés, the consequences of which are still present today, although now they have certainly lost all significance for public opinion."

Herr Willich, as a "partisan" in the war, finds that in peace also it accords with his mission to go from one party to another, and it is fully in accord with the truth that his noble-minded desires for a coalition were voted down. The admission is all the more naive since Herr Willich later tried to spread the word that the émigrés had expelled us from their guild organisation. Here he admits that we had expelled the émigrés' guild from our midst. So much for the facts. Now for their transfiguration. The noble-minded one has to prove that it was only due to Ahriman that he was prevented from the noble work of obviating all the evil that had befallen the émigrés. To this end he had once again to resort to lying with an evangelist-like distortion of secular chronology (see Bruno Bauer's *Synoptiker*).

---

*A* A pun on the word *Parteigänger* (partisan) the second component of which is derived from an old German word meaning "to go", "to walk".—Ed.

*B* B. Bauer, *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*.—Ed.
withdrawal from the Workers' Society of Great Windmill Street and their split away from Willich in the meeting of the Central Authority on September 15, 1850. From that day they withdrew from all public organisations, demonstrations, and manifestations. It was, therefore, since September 15, 1850. On July 14, 1851 "the notable men of all factions" were invited to Citizen Fickler, on July 20, 1851 the "Agitation Union" was founded, and on July 27, 1851 the German "Émigré Club". "From that day", when the secret desires of the noble-minded one were fulfilled, "date the disgusting dissensions" among the "London émigrés", and the struggle on both sides of the ocean between the "Émigrés" and the "Agitators", the great war between frogs and mice.

Now who will give me words and who the tongue,
To sing of such brave deeds in sonorous sounds!
For ne'er was strife upon this earth begun
More proudly fought on bloodier battle grounds;
Compared to this all other wars are roses.
To tell of it my lyric art confounds
For on this earth there ne'er was seen such glory
Or noble valour bright as in this story.

(After Boiardo, Orlando Innamorato, Canto 27)

The "significance of these disgusting dissensions" never existed in "public opinion", but only in the private opinion of the frog-and-mouse warriors. But "the consequences are still present". Even the stay of Herr Willich in America is a consequence. The money which found its way from America to Europe in the shape of a loan made the journey from Europe back to America in the shape of Willich. One of his first occupations there was the formation of a secret committee in ..., to safeguard the Holy Grail, the democratic gold, for Gottfried of Bouillon and Peter the Hermit against Arnold Winkelried-Ruge and Melanchthon-Ronge.

Although the "noble ones" were left to themselves and, according to the expression of Eduard Meyen, were all united "up to and including Bucher", the process of scission proceeded so famously, not only among the main armies but also within each camp, that the Agitation Union was soon reduced to a half-complete pleiad, while the Émigré Club, in spite of the cohesive power of the

---

a See present edition, Vol. 10, p. 483.—Ed.
b An allusion to Batrachomyomachia—The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice, a mock-heroic Greek poem, which parodies Homer's Iliad.—Ed.
c An allusion to Gottfried Kinkel and August Willich.—Ed.
man of the noble consciousness, was reduced to the trinity of Willich, Kinkel, and the innkeeper Schärttnner. Even the trinitarian loan-regency—so attractive was the noble consciousness—degenerated into something which cannot even be called a duality, namely, Kinkel-Willich. Herr Reichenbach was too respectable to remain as the third in such an alliance for long. He learned to know the "personal character" of the noble-minded one from practical experience.

Among the samples which the noble-minded one gives of the "tactics of Marx", are included also his experiences with Engels. At this point I insert a letter from Engels himself:

"Manchester, November 23, 1853. I, too, have the honour to figure in the novel which Herr August Willich published to justify himself in the New-Yoker Criminal-Zeitung (dated October 28 and November 4). I am compelled to put on record a few words on this matter, insofar as it concerns me.

"That friend Willich, who confuses pure idleness with pure activity and, therefore, is exclusively concerned with friend Willich, possessed an excellent memory in everything that touches on his person, and that he kept a kind of register of every remark made about him even in beer-drinking company, long ago ceased to be a secret to those who had the pleasure of his acquaintance. Friend Willich, however, for a long time past has known how to make very good use of his memory and his register. On each occasion when trifles of this sort came to be spoken of again, a slight distortion, a few apparently unintentional omissions, made him the hero of the dramatic event, the focal point of a group, of a living picture. In the details of Willich's novel as in its entirety, the struggle always and everywhere turns on the artless and therefore persecuted Willich. In each separate episode we find at the end honest Willich making a speech and the infamous opponents defeated, broken, crushed and knuckling under in the consciousness of their nullity. Et cependant on vous connaît, ô chevaliers sans peur et sans reproche!"

"In Willich's novel, therefore, the era of suffering, during which the noble-minded one had to suffer so much iniquity at the hands of Marx, Engels and the other impious ones, is at the same time an era of triumph, in which he always victoriously crushes his opponents, and each new triumph surpasses all the previous ones. Friend Willich depicts himself, on the one hand, as the suffering

---

a And nevertheless one knows you, o you knights without fear and without reproach!—Ed.
Christ, who took on himself the sins of Marx, Engels and Co., but on the other hand, as the Christ who came to judge the living and the dead. It was left for friend Willich to unite two such contradictory roles simultaneously in one person. One who represents these two aspects simultaneously, must indeed be believed.

"For us, who have long known by heart these self-indulgent fantasies with which an elderly bachelor fills his sleepless nights, for us the only surprising thing is that all these idiosyncrasies still crop up today in the same unaltered form as in 1850. Now for the details.

"Friend Willich, who converts Herr Stieber and Co. into agents of a German ‘federal police’, which has not existed since the long past affair of the demagogues, and who relates a quantity of equally wondrous ‘facts’, asserts with his usual accuracy that I wrote a ‘pamphlet’ on the Baden campaign of 1849. Friend Willich, who has studied with rare thoroughness that part of my work in which he is mentioned, knows very well that I never issued any such ‘pamphlet’. What I wrote was a series of articles on the campaign for an Imperial Constitution in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue, Hamburg and New York, 1850, in one of which I published an account of my experiences during the Palatinate-Baden campaign. In this article, of course, friend Willich also figures and, he says, this article was ‘very appreciative’ of him, but immediately brought him into conflict with his habitual modesty by making him, as it were, a ‘competitor of so many other great statesmen, dictators and generals’.

“And what was the nature of this great ‘appreciation’ on my part which so rejoices the noble heart of Herr Willich? It consists in the fact that I ‘appreciated’ Herr Willich as, in certain circumstances, a thoroughly useful battalion commander, who in twenty years, when a Prussian lieutenant, had acquired the requisite knowledge; who was not without aptitude for a small war, particularly a guerilla war, with, finally, the advantage that he was the right man at the right place as leader of a volunteer corps of 600-700 men, whereas the majority of the superior officers in that campaign were persons who either had had no military training at all or one wholly unsuitable for their position. To say that Herr Willich could lead 700 men better than a student, non-commissioned officer, schoolmaster or shoemaker, taken at

---

339 The reference is to the fourth article, “To Die for the Republic!” of Engels’ “The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution” (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 203-39).—Ed.
random, is of course ‘very appreciative’ in the case of a Prussian lieutenant who had had twenty years to prepare himself! *Dans le royaume des aveugles le borgne est roi.* And it goes without saying that in his subordinate position he bore less responsibility, hence could make fewer mistakes than his ‘competitors’ who were divisional or top-ranking generals. Who knows whether Sigel, who was out of place as an “Obergeneral”, would not also have achieved something as a simple battalion commander?

“And now for the doleful lament of modest Willich, who meanwhile, by virtue of seniority, has been promoted by some American newspapers to the rank of ‘general’, probably through my fault,—that my ‘appreciation’ had exposed him to the danger of also becoming a general in partibus, and not merely a general, but commander of an army, a statesman, indeed—a dictator! Friend Willich must have developed some peculiar notions of the brilliant rewards which the Communist Party holds in store for a moderately good battalion or volunteer-corps commander who joins it.

“In the above-mentioned article I spoke of Willich only as of a soldier, for he could be of public interest only in that capacity, since it was but later that he became a ‘statesman’. If I had possessed the malice towards him that he ascribes to me and my friends, if I had been interested in giving a picture of his personal character, what stories could have been told! If I were to have confined myself even to merely the amusing aspect, how could I have left out the story of the apple tree under which he and his Besançons had sworn an oath to die while singing a song rather than once again forsake German soil. How could I have failed to relate the comedy at the frontier, when friend Willich behaved as if this oath was now going to be fulfilled; when some honest fellows came to me in full earnest to induce me to make brave Willich abandon his resolve; when finally Willich asked the assembled corps whether they would not rather die on German soil than go back into exile, and after a long general silence a single death-defying Besançon cried out: ‘stay here!’; and when in conclusion the whole company with great satisfaction and with their weapons and baggage crossed into Switzerland. Would not the subsequent history of the baggage itself have made quite an episode, not without value today as Willich himself invites half the world to speak out about his ‘character’. Anyone who should desire further details about this and other adventures need only

---

*a In the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is king.—* Ed.
turn to one of his 300 Spartans, who had at that time searched in vain for their Thermopylae.\textsuperscript{341} They were always ready to relate behind Willich's back the greatest scandals about his personal character. Of this I have plenty of witnesses.

"I am not going to waste any words on the story about my 'courage'. To my surprise at the time, I discovered in Baden that courage is one of the commonest of all qualities, and not worth speaking about; that crude courage alone, however, is of no more value than mere goodwill, and that, therefore, it often happens that each individual is a hero as regards courage, and yet the whole battalion takes to its heels as one man. We have an example of this in the expedition of Willich's corps to Karlsdorf, which is described at some length in my account of the campaign for an Imperial Constitution.\textsuperscript{3}

"On this occasion, namely, on New Year's Eve 1850, Willich claims to have preached me a victorious moral sermon. Since I am not accustomed to keep a record of how I spend the transition from one year to the next, I cannot vouch for the date. At any rate, Willich never delivered the sermon in the shape in which he has had it printed.

"In the Refugee Committee,\textsuperscript{342} he says, I and several others behaved in an 'unworthy' manner towards the great man. Shocking!\textsuperscript{b} But where then were the victorious moral arguments at the time when Willich, pulveriser of the impious, suddenly found himself powerless against mere 'unworthy behaviour'. No one will demand that I should pay serious attention to such silly remarks.

"In the meeting of the Central Authority,\textsuperscript{c} when it came to a challenge to a duel between Schramm and Willich, I am supposed to have committed the crime of having 'left the room' together with Schramm shortly before the scene took place, and, therefore, of having prepared the whole scene in advance.

"Previously it was Marx who was alleged to have 'egged on' Schramm, now for a change I am supposed to have done so. A duel between a Prussian lieutenant, an old hand at pistol shooting, and a commerçant, who perhaps had never had a pistol in his hand, was truly a remarkable means to 'get rid' of the lieutenant. Yet friend Willich maintained everywhere, orally and in writing, that we had wanted to get him shot.

---

\textsuperscript{a} See present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 215-18.— \textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Engels uses the English word.— \textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} In late August 1850.— \textit{Ed.}
"It is quite possible—I do not keep a record of when certain needs cause me to leave the room—that I left the room at the same time as Schramm; but it is not likely, since from the minutes of that meeting of the Central Authority deposited with me I see that on that evening Schramm and I took turns in recording the minutes. Simply, Schramm was furious at Willich's shameless behaviour, and to the great astonishment of us all he challenged him to a duel. A few minutes before, Schramm himself had no inkling that it would come to this. Never was an action more spontaneous. Here again Willich relates that he made a speech, saying: 'You, Schramm, leave the room!' Actually, Willich appealed to the Central Authority to expel Schramm. The Central Authority ignored his request and Schramm departed only after being personally addressed by Marx, who wanted to avoid any further scandal. On my side there is the minute book, on that of Herr Willich is his personal character.

"Frederick Engels"

Herr Willich relates further that in the Workers' Society he gave an account of the "unworthy behaviour" of the Refugee Committee, and that he made it the basis for a motion.

"When the indignation against Marx and his clique rose to a climax," the noble-minded one reports, "I voted for the matter to be dealt with by the Central Authority. This took place."

What took place? Willich's voting or the Central Authority's dealing with the matter? What magnanimity! His imperious vote rescues his enemies from the popular indignation that had risen to a climax. Herr Willich forgets the fact that the Central Authority was the secret committee of a secret society, whereas the Workers' Society was a public, open society. He forgets that treatment of the matter by the Central Authority could not therefore be made the subject of a vote in the Workers' Society, and so the Samaritan scene in which he figures as the hero could not have happened. Friend Schapper will help him to refresh his memory.

From the public Workers' Society, Herr Willich leads us into the secret Central Authority, and from the Central Authority to Antwerp, to the duel, to his duel with Schramm:

"Schramm came to Ostend in the company of a former Russian officer, who according to his own account went over to the Hungarians in the Hungarian revolution, and who vanished without trace after the duel."

---

*The duel was fixed for September 11, 1850.—Ed.*
This "former Russian officer" is no other than Henryk Ludwic Miskowsky.

"This is to testify," states one of the certificates of the former Russian officer, "that the bearer Henri Lewis Miskowsky, a Polish gentleman, has served during the late Hungarian war 1848-1849 as officer in the 46th battalion of the Hungarian Honveds, and that he behaved as such praiseworthy and gallantly.

"London, November 12, 1853. L. Kossuth, late Governor of Hungary." a

Mendacious man of noble consciousness! But the intention is noble. The opposition of good and evil must be presented in striking contrast as a living picture. What an artistic grouping! On one side the noble-minded one, surrounded

"by Techow, now in Australia, Vidil, French captain of Hussars, then in exile and now a prisoner in Algiers, and Barthélemy, owing to French newspapers known as one of the most resolute revolutionaries".

In short, on one side is Willich in person, surrounded by the élite of two revolutions. On the other side is Schramm, the depraved, deserted except for a "former Russian officer", whose participation in the Hungarian revolution is not a matter of fact, but only occurred "according to his own account", and who even "vanished without trace after the duel", and is, therefore, in the final analysis, the devil himself. In a picturesque description, virtue puts up at the "best hotel" in Ostend, where a "Prussian prince" is lodged, whereas depravity, together with the Russian officer, "lived in a private house". The Russian officer does not seem to have entirely "vanished after the duel", since, according to Herr Willich's further account, "Schramm remained behind at the stream with the Russian officer". Moreover, the Russian officer has not vanished from the world as the noble-minded one hopes, which is proved by the statement reproduced below:

"London, Nov. 24, 1853

"Under the date October 28, in the Criminal-Zeitung there is an article by Herr Willich in which, among other things, he describes the duel he fought with Schramm in Antwerp in 1850. I regret to say that not all points of the description give the public a truthful account. The article says: 'The duel was arranged, etc.; Schramm came accompanied by a former Russian officer, etc., who, etc., vanished.' This is an untruth. I was never in the service of Russia, and all the other Polish officers in the Hungarian war of liberation could, just as much as myself, be called Russian. I served in Hungary from the beginning of the war in 1848 until 1849 when the end came at Villagos. Furthermore, I have not vanished without trace. After Schramm's shot, which he fired at Willich at half a pace from the initial position, had missed, Willich fired at Schramm from where he stood and his bullet

---

a This text is in English in the original. —Ed.
wounded Schramm slightly in the head. I remained with Schramm because we had no doctor" (Herr Willich had arranged the duel), "washed and bandaged his wound, paying no attention to the seven persons who were haymaking nearby, who had witnessed the duel, and who could have become dangerous for me. Willich and his named companions left the scene in haste, while Schramm and I remained where we were, watching them go. Soon they were out of sight. I must point out, furthermore, that Willich and his companions were already at the scene of the duel when we arrived, and that they had marked out the duelling ground, on which Willich took up a position that placed him in the shade. I pointed this out to Schramm, who said: let it be. Schramm was in good spirits, fearless and quite unperturbed. That I was compelled to remain behind in Belgium was not unknown to the persons concerned. I do not wish to dwell on the other circumstances of this in form so peculiar duel.

"Henryk Ludvic Miskowsky"

The wheel-work of the noble-minded one is wound up. He conjured up a Russian officer only to make him vanish without trace. In his place I must now necessarily make my appearance on the battlefield as Samiel, albeit in incorporeal form.

"Early next morning" (after Herr Willich's arrival in Ostend), "he" (a friendly French citizen) "showed us the Précurseur de Bruxelles, in which newspaper there was a private correspondent's report containing the following passage: 'A number of German refugees have arrived in Brighton. A message from this town informs us: in the next few days Ledru-Rollin and the French refugees from London will hold a congress in Ostend together with Belgian democrats.' Who can claim the honour of calling this idea his own? It did not come from a Frenchman, it was too à propos for that. This honour belongs exclusively to Herr Marx, for although one of his friends may have undertaken it—the brain is the source of ideas and not the hand."

"A friendly French citizen" showed Herr Willich and Co. the Précurseur de Bruxelles. He showed them something that does not exist. There is, of course, a Précurseur d'Anvers. Systematic falsification and distortion in regard to topography and chronology is an essential function of the noble consciousness. Ideal time and ideal space are the appropriate framework for its ideal productions.

In order to prove that this idea, namely the article in the Précurseur de Bruxelles "came from" Marx, Herr Willich assures us that "it did not come from a Frenchman". This idea did not come from! "It was too à propos for that." Mon dieu, an idea which Herr Willich himself can only describe in French could not come from a Frenchman? But how does the Frenchman appear on the scene at all, noble-minded one? What has the Frenchman to do with Willich and Schramm and the former Russian officer and the Précurseur de Bruxelles?
The spokesman of the noble-minded one's thoughts gives tongue out of season and betrays the fact that he finds it à propos to conjure away an essential intermediate link.

Before Schramm had challenged Herr Willich to a duel, the Frenchman Barthélemy had agreed to fight a duel with the Frenchman Songeon, and this was to take place in Belgium. Barthélemy chose Willich and Vidil as seconds. Songeon travelled to Belgium. The incident with Schramm came in between. Both duels were then to take place on the same day. Songeon did not turn up. On his return to London, Barthélemy asserted publicly: Songeon was responsible for the article in the *Précurseur d’Anvers*.

The noble-minded one hesitated for a long time before he finally applied the idea concerning Barthélemy to his own person and the idea about Songeon to me. Originally, as Techow himself told Engels and me after his return to London, the noble-minded one was firmly convinced that through Schramm I aimed at his removal from this world, and he put this idea in writing everywhere. On closer reflection, however, he found it impossible that a diabolical tactician could hit on the idea of getting rid of Herr Willich by means of a duel with Schramm. Hence, he seized on the idea "which did not come from a Frenchman".

*Thesis:* "This honour belongs exclusively to Herr Marx." *Proof:* "For although one of his friends may have undertaken" (to *undertake* an idea!) "it" (for the pure-minded one an *idea* is not feminine* but sexless),—"the brain is the source of ideas and not the hand." "For although!" A significant "*although*"! To prove that Marx had *invented* "it", Herr Willich imputes that a friend of Marx's had *undertaken* "it", or rather "may have undertaken it". *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

"If," says the noble-minded one, "if it is established that Szemere, Marx's friend, betrayed the crown of Hungary to the Austrian Government, that *would be* a convincing proof, etc."

However, precisely the opposite is true. But that has no bearing on the matter. If Szemere had committed treason, then for Herr Willich that *would* be a "convincing" proof that Marx had undertaken the article in the *Précurseur de Bruxelles*. *Although, however, the premise is not* an established fact, the conclusion remains valid, and it is established that if Szemere betrayed holy Stephen's crown, Marx betrayed holy Stephen himself.

---

*In German “Idee” is of feminine gender.—Ed.*
After the Russian officer vanished without trace, Herr Willich reappeared, and this in the "Workers' Society in London", where

"the workers unanimously condemned Herr Marx" and "on the day after his resignation from the Society in a general meeting of the London District unanimously expelled him from the League".

Previously, however,

"Marx with the majority of the Central Authority adopted a resolution to transfer the Central Authority from London"

and, despite Schapper's well-meant remonstrances, resolved to form a section for themselves. According to the statutes of the secret society the majority had the right to transfer the Central Authority to Cologne and provisionally to expel the entire Willich group, which was not entitled to pass resolutions in regard to it. The striking fact remains that on this occasion the noble-minded one, with his predilection for petty dramatics, in which Herr Willich plays a great rhetorical role, allowed the catastrophe itself, the scene in which the split occurred, to pass without taking advantage of it. The temptation was great, but unfortunately the dry text of the minutes exists and it proves that the triumphant Christ sat for hours silent and embarrassed in face of the accusations of the evil ones, then finally made off, left friend Schapper in the lurch, and did not recover his speech until he was in the "circle" of the believers. En passant: whereas Herr W. in America proclaims the glories of the "Workers' Society linked with him by respect and confidence", even Herr Schapper has considered it necessary for the time being to resign from Herr Willich's Society.

For a moment the man of the noble consciousness rises from the sphere of "tactical" procedure characteristic of him to the sphere of theory. Or so it seems. In actual fact he continues to furnish "samples of the tactics of Herr Marx". On p. 8 of the Revelations it says: "The Schapper-Willich party" (Herr Willich quotes it as Willich-Schapper) "have never laid claim to the dignity of having their own ideas. Their own contribution is the peculiar misunderstanding of other people's ideas".\(^a\) In order to show the public how well provided he is with ideas of his own, Herr W. reports as his latest discovery, and indeed as a refutation of the views of Engels and myself, "what institutions" the petty bourgeoisie would "adopt" if it came to power. In a circular letter\(^b\) drawn up by Engels and myself, which the police of Saxony

\(^{a}\) See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 403.—*Ed.*

\(^{b}\) Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Address of the Central Authority to the Communist League" (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 277-87).—*Ed.*
found on Bürgers, and which was published in the most widely-read German newspapers and forms the basis of the Cologne bill of indictment, there is a rather lengthy account of the pious wishes of the German petty bourgeoisie. This provides the text for Willich’s sermon. The reader should compare the original and the copy. How human of virtue to copy vice, even if with a “peculiar misunderstanding”! The improved sentiments compensate for the inferior style.

On p. 64 of the Revelations it says that in my view the Communist League “aims at forming not the government party of the future but the opposition party of the future” a Herr Willich is so noble that he craftily omits the first part of the sentence, “not the government party”, in order firmly to seize on the latter part, “the opposition party of the future”. By this ingenious halving of the sentence he proves that the Party of office-seekers is the true Party of the revolution.

The other idea of “his own” which Herr Willich produces is that the practical opposition between the noble consciousness and its opponents can be also theoretically expressed as “a division of mankind into two species”, the Willichs and the anti-Willichs, the noble species and the ignoble species. Concerning the former, we learn that its main characteristic lies in the fact “that they recognise one another”. To be boring is the privilege of the noble-minded one when he ceases to amuse by his samples of tactics.

We have seen how the man of the noble consciousness distorts or adapts facts by means of lies, or accords ludicrous hypotheses the rank of serious theses,—all in order to show that the opposite to himself is in fact the ignoble, the base. We have seen how in consequence his whole activity consists exclusively in discovering the base. The reverse aspect of this activity is that the actual complications with the world into which he himself gets entangled, however compromising they may appear to be, are transformed into proofs of his own noble-mindedness. To the pure, all is pure, and an opponent who fails to see the nobility of his deeds proves by that very fact that he is impure. The noble-minded one, therefore, does not have to justify himself, but has merely to express his moral indignation and astonishment at an opponent who compels him to provide justification. Hence the episode in which Herr Willich pretends to justify himself could just as well have been omitted altogether, as anyone can see by comparing my Revelations, Hirsch’s confessions and

---
a See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 449.—Ed.
Herr Willich’s reply. Hence, I shall give only a few examples to characterise the men of the noble consciousness.

Herr Willich was less compromised by my *Revelations* than by Hirsch’s confessions, although the latter were originally intended to glorify him as the deliverer of his own enemies. Hence, he is careful to avoid dealing with Hirsch’s confessions. He avoids even any mention of them. Hirsch is the notorious tool of the Prussian police against the party to which I belong. In contrast to this fact, Herr Willich puts forward the suggestion that *really* Hirsch was chosen by me to “smash” the Willich party.

“Very soon he” (Hirsch) “intrigued with some followers of Marx, in particular a certain Lochner, in order to smash the Society. As a result of this he was put under observation. He was found out, etc. On a motion from me, he was expelled; Lochner stood up for him and was likewise expelled.... Hirsch *then* intrigued particularly against O. Dietz.... This intrigue was again immediately discovered.”

That Hirsch was expelled as a spy from the Workers’ Society of Great Windmill Street on a motion from Herr Willich, I myself reported in the *Revelations*, p. 67. This expulsion carried no weight with me, since I ascertained what Herr Willich himself now confirms, namely, that it took place not on the basis of proven facts, but on the suspicion of imaginary intrigues between Hirsch and me. I knew Hirsch to be innocent of this crime. As for Lochner, he demanded proof of Hirsch’s guilt. Herr Willich replied that Hirsch’s sources of subsistence were unknown. But what about the sources of subsistence of Herr Willich? asked Lochner. On account of this “unworthy” utterance, Lochner was brought before a *court of honour* and since he refused to repent his sin in spite of all spiritual admonition, he was “expelled”. After Hirsch had been expelled, and Lochner had been sent off after him, Hirsch

“*then* intrigued particularly against O. Dietz with a very suspicious former police agent, who denounced Dietz to us”.

Stechan, who had escaped from a Hanover prison, came to London, joined Willich’s Workers’ Society and denounced O. Dietz. Stechan was neither “suspicious” nor a “former Saxon police agent”. What led him to denounce O. Dietz was the fact that the examining magistrate in Hanover had shown him a number of letters sent by him to London addressed to Dietz, the secretary of Willich’s Committee. At approximately the same

---

*See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 451.— Ed.*
time as Stechan, Lochner appeared on the scene, also Eccarius II, who had just been released from prison in Hanover and deported, Gimpel, for whose arrest a warrant had been issued on account of his participation in the Schleswig-Holstein affairs, and Hirsch, who had been imprisoned in Hamburg in 1848 because of a revolutionary poem, and who asserted that he was again being hunted by the police. Together with Stechan, they formed a kind of opposition and committed the sin against the Holy Ghost of contesting Herr Willich's articles of faith in the public discussions of the Society. All of them were struck by the fact that Stechan's denunciation of Dietz was answered by the expulsion of Hirsch by Willich. Soon all of them resigned from the Workers' Society and for a period formed with Stechan a society of their own. They did not come into contact with me until after their resignation from Herr Willich's Society. The noble-minded one betrays his lie by distorting the time-sequence and omitting Stechan, the essential but irksome intermediate link.

On p. 66 of the *Revelations* I say: "Not long before the court action in Cologne, Kinkel and Willich sent a journeyman tailor as emissary to Germany, etc."

"'Why,' exclaims the noble-minded one indignantly, 'why does Herr Marx lay stress on the journeyman tailor?'

I do not "lay stress" on the journeyman tailor in the way that, for example, the noble-minded one lays stress on Pieper, "the private tutor with Rothschild", although as a result of the Cologne Communist trial Pieper lost his job with Rothschild and instead won a place on the editorial board of the organ of the English Chartists. I call the journeyman tailor a journeyman tailor. Why? Because I must not mention his name and yet prove to the Herren Kinkel-Willich that I was well acquainted with the personality of their emissary. The noble-minded one, therefore, accuses me of high treason against all journeyman tailors and tries to secure their votes by a Pindaric ode to journeyman tailors. In order to spare the good reputation of journeyman tailors, he magnanimously omits to say that Eccarius, whom he calls one of the expelled he-goats, is a journeyman tailor, which so far has not prevented Eccarius from being one of the greatest thinkers of the German

---

\(a\) Johann Friedrich Eccarius.— *Ed.*

\(b\) August Gebert.— *Ed.*

\(c\) See present edition. Vol. 11, p. 450.— *Ed.*

\(d\) *The People's Paper.—Ed.*
proletariat and from gaining a position of prestige among the
Chartists themselves by his English articles in *The Red Republican*,
the *Notes to the People*, and *The People's Paper*. This is how Herr
Willich *refutes* my revelations of the activity of the journeyman
tailor whom he and Kinkel sent to Germany.

We now come to the case of Hentze. The man of the noble con-
sciousness tries to cover up his own position by an attack on me.

"Among other things, he" (Hentze) "lent Marx 300 talers."

In May 1849 I gave Herr Rempel an account of the financial
difficulties of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which increased as the
number of subscribers grew larger since expenses were in cash but
receipts were to come in later. More, considerable losses were
caused by the desertion of almost all the shareholders as a result
of the articles in favour of the Paris June insurgents and against
the Frankfurt parliamentarians, the Berlin agreement-seekers, and
the members of the March Associations.\(^\text{345}\) Herr Rempel referred
me to Hentze, and Hentze advanced the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*
300 talers against my written undertaking. Hentze, who at the
time was himself being harried by the police, found it necessary to
leave Hamm and travelled with me to Cologne, where I was
greeted by the news of my expulsion from Prussia. The 300 talers
borrowed from Hentze, the 1,500 talers for subscriptions which I
received through the Prussian post, and the rapid printing-press,
etc., belonging to me, were all used to cover the debts of the *Neue
Rheinische Zeitung* to compositors, printers, paper merchants, office
workers, correspondents, editorial personnel, etc. No one knows
this better than Herr Hentze, since he himself lent my wife a
travelling case in which to pack her silver in order to take it to a
pawnshop in Frankfurt and thus obtain the means to meet our
private needs. The account books of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*
are in Cologne in the care of the merchant Stephan Naut, and I
authorise the noble-minded one to have an officially certified
extract from them made for him there.

After this digression, let us return to the matter in hand.

The *Revelations* does not find it at all unclear that Herr Willich
was Hentze's friend and received support from him. What it finds
unclear (p. 65\(^*\)) is that Hentze, whose house had been searched
and whose documents were seized, who was proved to have
sheltered Schimmelpfennig on a secret mission in Berlin, and who,

\(^{345}\) See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 450.—*Ed.*
on his own "admission", was an accomplice of the League, that this Hentze at the period when the Cologne trial was approaching a decision, when the attention of the Prussian police was strained to the utmost and every half-suspected German in Germany or England was being kept under the strictest surveillance, that this Hentze received permission from the authorities to travel to London and to consort freely there with Willich, and then came to Cologne in order to give "false evidence" against Becker. The specific time gives the relationship between Herr Hentze and Herr Willich its specific character, and the circumstances mentioned must have appeared strange to Willich himself, although he did not know that Hentze communicated with the Prussian police by telegraph from London. It is a question of the specific time. Herr Willich correctly feels that this is so, and therefore declares in his noble manner:

"He" (Hentze) "came to London before the trial" (this I, too, maintain), "not to me, but to the Great Exhibition."

The noble-minded one has his own Great Exhibition just as he has his own Précurseur de Bruxelles. The real Great Exhibition in London closed in October 1851; Herr Willich makes Hentze travel "to it" in August 1852. This circumstance can be testified to by Schily, Heise, and the other guarantors of the Kinkel-Willich loan, on each of whom Herr Hentze danced attendance in order to gain their votes for the transference of the American money from London to Berlin.

Long before Herr Hentze stayed with Herr Willich he had been invited to appear at the Cologne court trial as a witness, not for the defence but for the prosecution. As soon as we learned that Herr Willich had instructed Hentze to testify against Becker, "the man of intellect and character" (p. 68 of the Revelations⁴), the necessary information was sent at once to lawyer Schneider II, Becker's defence counsel. The letter arrived on the day when Hentze was being heard as a witness; the nature of his testimony agreed with our prediction. For that reason, Becker and Schneider cross-examined him publicly about his relation to Willich. The letter is to be found in the dossiers of the defence in Cologne, and the report on the cross-examination of Hentze in the Kölnische Zeitung.

I do not put forward the argument: If it is established that Herr Hentze did this or that, that would be a striking proof of the

---

⁴ See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 452.—Ed.
activity of Herr Willich; “for although” friend Hentze “may have undertaken it—the brain is the source of ideas and not the hand”. I leave this dialectic to the man of the noble consciousness.

Let us return to Herr Willich’s proper domain:

“A few more samples of the tactics” (pursued by Marx) “for their full appreciation.”

At the time of passive resistance in Hesse, of the mobilisation of the Landwehr\(^a\) in Prussia, and of the simulated conflict between Prussia and Austria,\(^{346}\) the noble-minded one was on the point of achieving a military insurrection in Germany, to be brought about by sending “to some persons in Prussia a short draft plan for forming committees of the Landwehr”, and by the willingness of Herr Willich “\(\text{himself}\) to go to Prussia”.

“It was Herr Marx, who having been informed by one of his agents, made my intended departure more widely known and subsequently boasted of having hoaxed me with false letters from Germany.”

Indeed!\(^b\) Becker sent me with comical marginal notes the lunatic letters with which Willich favoured the public in Cologne. I was not so cruel as to deprive my friends of the enjoyment of reading them. Schramm and Pieper took delight in hoaxing Herr Willich with replies, not “\textit{from Germany}” but through the \textit{London post}. The noble-minded one will take care not to produce the postmarks of the letters. He asserts that he “received one letter in an imitated handwriting and recognised it as false”. This is impossible. These letters were all written by the same hand. While, therefore, Herr Willich “boasts” of having discovered a non-existent imitated handwriting, and of having discovered one that was false among a number of letters each of which was in its way as genuine as any of the others, he was much too noble-minded to recognise the hoax from the glorification of his person couched in Asiatic hyperbolae, the crudely comic account of his fixed ideas, and the romantic exaggeration of his presumptions. Even if Herr Willich had seriously intended his departure, it was frustrated not by my “making it more widely known to third persons”, but by what was made known to Herr Willich himself. For the last letter which he received tore away the transparent veil. Until the present moment his vanity has compelled him to declare the letter which undeceived him to be \textit{false}, and the letters which made a fool of

\(^{a}\) Army reserve.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) Marx uses the English word.—\textit{Ed.}
him to be genuine. Does the noble-minded one, because he is virtuous, believe that there shall indeed be sect and cakes but no humour in the world? It was ignoble of the noble-minded one to withhold from the public the enjoyment of these letters.

“As regards the correspondence with Becker mentioned by Marx, what is said about it is false.”

As regards this false correspondence and Herr Willich’s intention to travel to Prussia in person, and my making it more widely known to third persons, I found it appropriate to send a copy of the Criminal-Zeitung to ex-Lieutenant Steffen. Steffen was a witness for the defence on behalf of Becker, who had entrusted all his documents to him for safe-keeping. Compelled by the police to leave Cologne, he is now a teacher in Chester, for he belongs to the ignoble species of human beings who have to earn their living, even in exile. The man of the noble consciousness, true to his ethereal nature, does not live from capital, which he does not possess, nor from work, which he does not perform. He lives from the manna of public opinion, from the respect of other people. Hence he fights for this as his sole capital.

Steffen writes to me:

“Chester, November 22, 1853

“Willich is very angry at your giving me fragments from a letter of Becker’s. He describes the letter, and therefore also the passages quoted from it, as fictitious. To this clumsy assertion I counterpose the facts in order to provide documentary evidence for Becker’s view of Willich. One evening, with a hearty laugh, Becker gave me two letters and told me to read them when I was in low spirits; the contents would be the more effective in cheering me up, because I would be in a position to judge them from a military standpoint in view of my earlier circumstances. In fact, on reading those letters sent by August Willich to Becker, I found they contained extremely comic and remarkable orders of the day to the troops (to make use of an appropriate royal Prussian expression), in which the great Field-Marshal and social Messiah sends out from England the order to capture Cologne, to confiscate private property, to establish an artificially contrived military dictatorship, to introduce a military-social code of laws, to ban all newspapers except one, which would have to publish daily orders about the prescribed mode of thought and behaviour, and a quantity of further details. Willich was kind enough to promise that when this job in Cologne and the Prussian Rhine province was done, he himself would come to separate the sheep from the goats and to pass judgment on the living and the dead. Willich claims that his ‘short draft plan would be easy to put into effect if some persons took the initiative’, and ‘that it would have highly important consequences’ (for whom?). For my edification I should very much like to know who were the deep-thinking ‘Landwehr officers’ who ‘later explained’ this to Willich, and whether these gentlemen, who made a pretence of believing in ‘the

---

a Marx uses the English phrase “sect and cakes”.—Ed.
highly important consequences of the short draft plan', stayed in England during
the mobilisation of the Prussian Landwehr or in Prussia, where the child of the
world was to be brought into being. It was very good of Willich to have sent the
birth announcement and the description of the child to 'some' persons. None of
these persons, however, seem to have been more inclined to act as godfather at the
baptism than Becker, 'the man of intellect and character'. On one occasion, Willich
sent over an adjutant named.... 3 This man did me the honour of having me
summoned and was very firmly convinced that he could judge the whole situation
in advance better than anyone confronted by the facts day by day. Hence he came
to have a very low opinion of me when I informed him that the officers of the
Prussian army would not consider themselves lucky to fight under his and Willich's
banner, and were not at all inclined to proclaim a Willichian republic at the earliest
possible moment. He was still more angry when he found that no one was stupid
enough to want to multigraph the Appeal, which he had brought with him
ready-made, inviting the officers to declare themselves immediately and openly in
favour of 'that' which he called democracy. Full of rage, he left 'the Cologne
enslaved by Marx' (as he wrote to me) and arranged for his nonsense to be
multigraphed elsewhere, sent it to a great many officers, and thus it came about
that the chaste secret of this cunning method of turning Prussian officers into
republicans was prostituted by the 'Spectator' of the Kreuzzeitung.

"Willich says he is absolutely incapable of believing that persons of 'Becker's
character and intellect' could laugh at his plan. He declares the utterance of this
fact a clumsy lie. If he had read the Cologne Trial, and after all he has every
reason to do so, he would have found that both Becker and I openly expressed the
judgment on his plan contained in the letter published by you. If Willich would
like to have a correct military description of the then existing situation, which he
depicts according to his fantasy, I can oblige him.

"I regret that it is not only in Weydemeyer and Techow that Willich finds
former comrades who deny him the wished-for admiration of his military genius
and practical understanding of the situation.

"W. Steffen"

Now for the final "sample of the tactics of Marx".

Herr Willich gives a fantastic description of a February banquet
in 1851 organised by Louis Blanc as a counter-demonstration to
Ledru-Rollin's banquet and against the influence of Blanqui.

"Herr Marx, of course, was not invited."

Of course not. Anyone could get in for two shillings, and a few
days later Louis Blanc asked Marx with great emphasis why he
had not been present at it.

"Thereupon" (where? at the banquet?) "an undelivered toast of Blanqui's, with an
introduction reviling the celebration and calling Schapper and Willich misleaders of
the people, was distributed as a leaflet among the workers in Germany."

The "undelivered toast of Blanqui's" 347 forms an essential part
of the story recounted by the noble-minded one, who, believing in

---
3 Marx also quotes this passage in his pamphlet Herr Vogt (see present edition,
Vol. 17). There the name Schimmelpfennig is given instead of dots.—Ed.
his words in the higher sense, is accustomed to state emphatically: “I never lie.”

Some days after the banquet the Paris Patrie published a toast which Blanqui had sent from Belle-Île to the organisers of the celebration at their request, and in which in his customary pregnant manner he scourged the entire Provisional Government of 1848 and particularly the father of the banquet, M. Louis Blanc. The Patrie said it was surprised that this toast had been suppressed at the banquet. Louis Blanc immediately declared in the London Times that Blanqui was an abominable intriguer and had never sent any such toast to the banquet committee. On behalf of the banquet committee, MM. Louis Blanc, Landolphe, Barthélemy, Vidil, Schapper, and Willich himself, stated in the Patrie that they had never received the toast in question. Before printing this statement, however, the Patrie made enquiries of M. Antoine, Blanqui’s brother-in-law, who had sent the toast for publication. Below the statement of the gentlemen mentioned above, the newspaper printed Antoine’s reply, which was to the effect that he had certainly sent the toast to Barthélemy and had received from him an acknowledgement of its receipt. “Thereupon”, M. Barthélemy declared that it was true he had received the toast but had put it aside as unsuitable without notifying the committee about it. Unfortunately, however, ex-Captain Vidil, who was one of the signatories, had already written to the Patrie that his military sense of honour and his instinct for truth compelled him to confess that he himself, Louis Blanc; Willich and all the others had lied in their first statement. The committee, he said, did not consist of the six persons named but had thirteen members. Blanqui’s toast had been submitted to all of them, it had been discussed by all of them, and after a fairly lengthy debate it was decided by a majority of seven to six to suppress it. He himself was among the six who had voted in favour of its being read out.

One can understand the jubilation of the Patrie when, after Vidil’s letter, it received M. Barthélemy’s declaration, which it published with the following “preface”:

“We have often asked ourselves, and it is a difficult question to answer, whether the demagogues are notable more for their boastfulness or their stupidity. A fourth letter from London has increased our perplexity. There they are, we do not know how many poor wretches, who are so tormented by the longing to write and to see their names published in the reactionary press that they are undeterred even by the prospect of infinite humiliation and mortification. What do they care for the laughter and the indignation of the public—the Journal des Débats, the Assemblée nationale and the Patrie will publish their stylistic exercises; to achieve this no cost to the cause of cosmopolitan democracy can be too high.... In the name of literary commiseration we therefore
include the following letter from ‘citizen’ Barthélemy—it is a novel, and, we hope, the last proof of the authenticity of Blanqui’s famous toast whose existence they first all denied and now fight among themselves for the right to acknowledge.”

So much for the history of Blanqui’s toast. As a result of “Blanqui’s undelivered toast”, the Société des proscrits démocrates [et] socialistes broke off its agreement with Herr Willich’s Society.

Simultaneously with the split in the German Workers’ Society and the German Communist Society, a split took place in the Société des proscrits démocrates [et] socialistes. A number of members suspected of gravitating towards bourgeois democracy, towards Ledru-Rollinism, handed in their resignations and were subsequently expelled. Ought then the man of the noble consciousness to tell this society what he now says to the bourgeois democrats, that Engels and Marx had prevented him from sinking into the arms of bourgeois democracy, from remaining “united by bonds of sympathy with all companions of the revolution”, or ought he to tell them that “in the split the various views about revolutionary development played no part”? On the contrary, the noble-minded one said that in both societies the split occurred as a result of the same diametrically opposed principles, that Engels, Marx, etc., represented the bourgeois element in the German Society just as Madier and Co. did in the French one. The noble-minded one is even afraid that mere contact with this bourgeois element could endanger the “true faith” and therefore with calm nobility moved that the bourgeois element should not be admitted to the Société des proscrits, “not even as visitors”.

Invented! False! exclaims the noble-minded one in his staunch monosyllables. “Samples of tactics” on my part! Voyons!

Trois délégués de la société démocratique allemande de Windmill-Street sont introduits. Ils donnent connaissance de leur mission qui consiste dans la communication d’une lettre dont il est fait lecture.” (In this letter the reasons for the split are allegedly set out.) “Le citoyen Adam fait remarquer l’analogie qui existe entre les événements qui viennent de s’accomplir dans les deux sociétés de chaque côté l’élément bourgeois et le parti prolétaire ont fait scission dans les circonstances identiques etc. etc. Le citoyen Willich demande que les membres démissionnaires” (he then corrects himself, as the minutes state, and says: “expulsés”) “de la société

—a P. Mayer [Editorial Preface to Barthélemy’s letter], La Patrie, No. 71, March 12, 1851.—Ed.
Allemande, ne puissent être reçus même comme visiteurs dans la société française."
(Extraits conformes au texte original des procès verbaux).
"L'archiviste de la société des proscrits démocrates [et] socialistes.
J. Clédat"^a

Herewith ends the mellifluous, singular, grandiloquent, unprecedented, truthful, and adventurous story of the world-renowned knight of the noble consciousness.

"An honest mind and plain; he must speak truth,
And they will take it so; if not, he's plain.
These kind of knaves I know."^b

London, November 28, 1853.

---

^a "Meeting of 30 Sept. 1850, citizen Adam in the chair.
Three delegates from the German Democratic Society of Windmill Street are introduced. They make known their mission, which is to deliver a letter that is read out." (In this letter the reasons for the split are allegedly set out.) "Citizen Adam calls attention to the analogy between the events which have taken place in the two societies, in both of them the bourgeois element and the proletarian party have separated from each other under identical circumstances, etc., etc. Citizen Willich moves that the members who have resigned" (he then corrects himself, as the minutes state, and says "who have been excluded") "from the German Society should not be admitted to the French Society, even as visitors." (Extracts conform to the original text of the minutes).

^b Quoted by Marx in English from Shakespeare's King Lear, Act 2, Scene 2.— Ed.
London, Tuesday, Nov. 29, 1853

Yesterday morning the Prussian Chambers\(^a\) were opened by a speech of the Prime Minister, Mr. Manteuffel. The passage relative to the eastern complication, as communicated to us by electric telegraph, is couched in terms clearly intended to allay the suspicions afloat with respect to a conspiracy between the courts of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna. It is the more remarkable as it is generally known that Frederick William IV, by the organ of the same Manteuffel, has condescended at various previous occasions, to solemnly communicate to his loyal people, that the Chambers have no call to intermeddle with matters of foreign policy, since the external relations of the state fall as much under the exclusive control of the crown, as the king's own desmesne lands. The above-mentioned passage, involving as it does, something like an appeal to the people, betrays the extreme difficulties the Prussian Government finds itself placed in, menaced on the one hand by Russia and France, and on the other by its own subjects, at the same time that it is stimulated by the high price of provisions, a deeply depressed commerce, and the remembrance of an atrocious breach of faith still to be expiated.\(^{348}\) The Prussian Government itself has cast off the refuge of working on public opinion through the means of the Chambers, which are deliberately constituted by the king as a mere sham, intentionally treated by the ministers as a mere sham, and accepted by the people as a mere sham, in a manner not to be misunderstood. It will not do to tell them now

\(^{a}\) "Opening of the Prussian Chambers", *The Times*, No. 21598, November 29, 1853.—*Ed.*
that these mock institutions are, all of a sudden, to be looked upon as the bulwarks of "Fatherland."

"The Prussians," says The Times of to-day, "have hardly shown the sense and sagacity for which they once had credit, by the undeserved contempt into which they have allowed the Chambers elected under the present constitution to fall."

On the contrary, the Prussians have fully shown their good sense, by allowing the men who betrayed the revolution in the hope of reaping its fruits, to enjoy not even the appearance of influence, and to prove to the government that they are not the dupes of its juggle, and that the Chambers, in their opinion, if they are anything at all, are but a new bureaucratic institution, added to the old bureaucratic institutions of the country.

Every one not thoroughly acquainted with the past history of Germany will be at a loss to understand the religious quarrels again and again troubling the otherwise dull surface of German society. There are the remnants of the so-called German Church, persecuted now, as eagerly as in 1847, by the established governments. There is the question of marriages between Catholics and Protestants, setting the Catholic clergy and the Prussian Government by the ears, as in 1847. There is, above all, the fierce combat between the Archbishop of Freiburg, excommunicating the Baden Government, and having his letter publicly read from the pulpits, and the Grand Duke ordering the recreant churches to be closed, and the parish priests to be arrested; and there are the peasants assembling and arming themselves, protecting their priests and driving back the gendarmes, which they have done at Bischofsheim, Königshofen, Grünsfeld, Gerlachsheim, where the Mayor of the village was forced to fly, and at many other villages. It would be a mistake to consider the religious conflict in Baden as possessed of a purely local character. Baden is only the battleground the Catholic party has deliberately chosen for attacking the Protestant princes. The Archbishop of Friburg represents in this conflict the whole Catholic clergy of Germany, as the Grand Duke of Baden represents all the great and small potentates confessing the reformed creed. What then are we to think of a country renowned on the one hand for the profound, bold and unparalleled criticism to which it has subjected all religious traditions, and surprising, on the other, all Europe, at periodically recurring epochs, with the
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resurrection of the religious quarrels of the 17th century? The secret is simply this, that all popular commotions, lurking in the background, are forced by the governments to assume at first the mystical and almost uncontrollable form of religious movements. The clergy, on their part, allow themselves to be deceived by appearances, and, while they fancy they direct the popular passions for the exclusive benefit of their corporation, against the government, they are, in truth, the unconscious and unwilling tools of the revolution itself.

The daily London press exhibits a great show of horror and moral indignation at an address issued by Mazzini, and found in the possession of Felice Orsini, leader of the National Band No. 2, destined to rise in the province of Lugagnano, which contains portions of Modena, Parma, and the Kingdom of Piedmont. In this address the people are exhorted to “act by surprise, as the people of Milan tried to do, and will again.” The address then says: “The dagger, if it strikes unexpectedly, does good service and supplies the place of muskets.” This the London press represents as an open appeal to “secret, cowardly assassination.” Now I want only to know how, in a country like Italy, where public means of resistance are nowhere, and police spies are everywhere, an insurrectionary movement could expect any chance of success if surprise be not resorted to? I want to know, if the people of Italy are to fight with the troops of Austria at all, with what kind of weapons they are to fight except with those left to them—with the daggers Austria has not succeeded in taking away? Mazzini is far from telling them to use the dagger for cowardly assassination of the unarmed foe—exhorts them to use it “by surprise,” it is true, but in the broad light [of] day, as at Milan, where a few patriots, armed only with knives, rushed on the guard-houses of the armed Austrian garrisons.

But, says The Times, “constitutional Piedmont is to undergo the same fate as Rome, Naples, and Lombardy!”

Why not? Was it not the King of Sardinia who betrayed the Italian revolution in 1848 and in 1849, and can Italy be transformed into a Republic with a King of Piedmont any more than Germany with a King of Prussia? So much as to the morality of Mazzini’s address. As to its political value, it is quite another
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question. I, for my part, think Mazzini to be mistaken, both in his opinions about the Piedmontese people and in his dreams of an Italian revolution, which he supposes is not to be effected by the favorable chances of European complications, but by the private action of Italian conspirators acting by surprise.

You will have seen by the London papers that Government has appointed a commission for inquiring into the corrupt practices and the whole organization of that most venerable body known as the Corporation of the City. The following are some of the facts contained in the reports of the commission, whose labors are still far from having arrived at a close:

The revenue of the Corporation of London is estimated at £400,000, without taking all items into account, and the gross amount paid away in salaries reaches the very considerable sum of £107,000, or more than 25 per cent. of the whole income. The legal salaries are set down at £14,700, of which the Recorder receives £3,000, the Common Sergeant, £1,500, and the Judge of the Sheriff's Court, £1,200. The Town Clerk receives £1,892; the Secretary, £1,249, and the Remembrancer, £1,765. The Chief Clerks at the Mansion-House and Guildhall receive between them £1,250, a year. The Mace-bearer receives £550, and the Sword-bearer £550; the Upper Marshal £450 or £500, the Under Marshal £200 or £300. These Bumbles draw besides, £70 for uniforms, £14 for boots, and £20 for cocked hats. Mr. Bennoch stated in his evidence that

"the whole expense of the establishments in the Corporation of London is much greater than the whole expense of the Federal Government of the United States, or, what is perhaps a more startling statement, its expenditure upon itself, in administering the funds of the Corporation, is larger than the whole amount of revenue from rents, tolls and fees from brokers which it receives."

The great secret of the Reform pills Lord John Russell intends to administer to the British public has at last come out. He proposes: 1, a repeal of the property qualification for members of Parliament, a qualification which has long since become a nominal one; 2, a readjustment of the constituencies by doing away with some small boroughs and adding more large ones; 3, a reduction of the county constituencies from the £20 to the £10 borough qualification. A fourth proposition to lower the franchise to £5 has been abandoned, as by this means, says The Times,
"the present electors would be virtually disenfranchised, because the class to be
admitted will greatly outnumber all others put together, and has only to be
unanimous to be supreme."

In other words, enfranchising the majority even of the small trading class would disenfranchise the minority. A very ingenious argument this. The most important feature of the Reform bill looming in the future is, however, not this point, or all its points taken together. This important feature is the general and absolute indifference its announcement meets with. Every police report attracts a great deal more of public attention than the "great measure," the new Reform bill, the common work of the "Ministry of all the talents."

Ernest Jones was quite right in anticipating that the first note sounded of the mass movement of the people and a national organization headed by a Labor Parliament would strike alarm into the moneyed classes, and force the London class papers to take notice of it. *The Times* has immediately seen the importance of this new movement, and has given for the first time a report of the Chartist meeting held in the People's Institute at Manchester. All its contemporaries are filled with leading articles on the labor movement and the Labor Parliament proposed by the Chartists, who were long since supposed to have died of exhaustion. *The Economist* has no less than four articles on the question. The reports, however, of the highly important meeting at Manchester cannot be said to afford any idea of its character or the business there transacted. I think fit, therefore, to give a report of my own. The following resolutions were proposed and adopted:

"1. That this meeting, after witnessing the futility of sectional struggles on the
part of isolated bodies of workingmen to maintain a just standard of wages and to
achieve the emancipation of labor, is of the opinion that the time has now arrived
when a united and mass movement of the working classes, based on a national
organization, and guided by one directing body, can alone insure adequate support
to the men now locked out of employment and on strike, and enable workingmen
in the future to emancipate labor from the thraldom of capital. The mass
movement of the people and national organization be not intended to, and shall
not, interfere with the present Trade Unions and combinations of workingmen,
but that its action be to centralize, concentrate and confederate the strength of all,
and of the entire body of workingmen. [...]"

"2. That to carry the foregoing resolution it will be imperatively necessary that
a Labor Parliament should meet as soon as possible; that Parliament to consist of
delegates elected by the workingmen of each town in public meeting assembled.
That the duties of that Parliament shall be to organize machinery whereby support
may be rendered to the people now out on strike, or locked out by the
manufacturers, by raising a national subscription of the most extensive character to
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lay down a specific plan of action for the guidance of the working classes in their contest with the employers, and to propound the means by which labor may be emancipated from the undue influence of capital and become independent, self-employing and remunerative, without the necessity of strikes.

"3. That this meeting elect a Committee to correspond for the above purpose with the various towns and districts to make all necessary arrangements for the calling of the Labor Parliament, and to arrange and publish the necessary details for the sitting of the delegates, as well as a programme of the business to be brought before the delegation."a

By far the most remarkable speech was that of Mr. Jones, of which I give some extracts:

"The employer says, in The London Times, you have nothing to do with his profits. You must only count your own heads, not his profits. If there are many heads, although you want more, you will get less. And that he calls the law of supply and demand. That alone, he says, should regulate your wages. But does it? [...] No! If you've no business to claim a rise of wages when his profits are high, he should not pull you down when his profits become low. But then he'll tell you, though not one hand less may be employed—'trade's bad, times are hard, my profits have grown smaller—I can't afford to pay you the same wages.' It is not the law of supply and demand, then, but the law of dear cotton and small profits that regulates your labor. [...] The law of supply may be true, but the law of life is truer. The law of demand may be strong, but the law of starvation will be stronger still! We say, if the one capital, money, has a right to profits, so has the other capital, labor, too; and labor has the greater right, because labor made money, and not money labor. What is profit? The capital that remains after deduction of all working charges. The wages you hitherto received are merely a portion of the working charges. That which only keeps soul and body together is no reward for toil. It is merely the necessary cost of keeping the human machine in working order. [...] You must have a surplus over and above the working cost of feeding and housing the machine of flesh and blood. You must have food for heart and brain, as well as for the mouth and belly. [...] The employer dreads your getting more wages; not because he can't afford to pay them, for his capital has increased more than 100 per cent, in the last seven years, and you asked for only 10 on your wage out of his 100 on your work. He dreads it, because higher wages would lead to independence; he dreads it, because higher wages would lead to education; he dreads it, because an enlightened people will not be slaves; he dreads it, because he knows you would then no more submit to work so many hours; he dreads it, because you would then not allow your wives to slave in the factory hell; he dreads it, because you would then send your children to school instead of the mill; he dreads it, because he knows if the wife was at the fireside, the child at the school and short time at the factory, the surplus hands that now beat wages down would flee from his control and labor would become a priceless pearl, gemming the diadem of human freedom. But the question has once more changed its aspect; it is not merely one of obtaining a share in the employer's profits, or a rise of 10 per cent.; it is one of preventing a fall of 20. [...] Good trade or bad trade makes little change to them; in the one they plunder the world abroad—in the other they
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plunder the world at home. [...] The question is rapidly changing for you, not into one of lower or higher wages, but into one of starvation or existence; of life in the factory hell or death at the factory door. The capitalists, those Cossacks of the West, first crossed the Danube of labor's rights; they have proclaimed their martial law of gold, and hurl starvation into our ranks from the batteries of monopoly. Town after town is placed in a state of siege. Non-employment digs the trenches, hunger scales the citadel of labor, the artillery of famine plays on the lines of toil. Every day their great confederation spreads; every day their movement becomes more national. [...] How are you prepared to confront them? Your movement is running into chaos and confusion. [...] As the lock-outs spread and your isolated action continues, you will be poaching in each other's preserves; the collectors of the one place will meet those of the others on the same ground—you will stand as foes where you should shake hands as allies—you will weaken each other's help where you should help each other's weakness. [...] The Wigan colliers were close to Preston, to Stockport, to Manchester, to Oldham, and they were left to fall unaided. [...] The factory operatives are on strike at Wigan too. And what do they say to the defeat of their brother workingmen the miners? They consider it a happy riddance. [...] They cannot help it—because they stand in each other's way. But why do they so stand? [...] Because you hedge your movement within the narrow limits of one trade, one district and one interest. [...] The movement of your employers is becoming national, and national must be your resistance also. As it is you are running into anarchy and ruin. Do not suppose that I impugn the wisdom, conduct or integrity of the Trades Unions. [...] 

"But the leading strings that support the child become impediments that clog the man. [...] That isolation which worked well in the infancy of the labor movement becomes ruin in its manhood. [...] Let all the trades be represented whose support you seek. [...] Place the cause of labor not in the hands of one mill, or one town, or even one district, but place it in the hands of a laborers' Parliament."

Written on November 29, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
As we have already observed, the retreat of the Turks from Oltenitza appears to indicate the conclusion of the first epoch of the Turko-Russian war; with it at least a first and distinct series of operations, beginning with the passage at Kalafat, seems to be concluded, to make room either for the tranquility of winter quarters, or for the execution of new plans not yet developed. The moment seems opportune for a review of the campaign up to that epoch, the more so as the official and non-official reports of the only action of consequence fought on the Danube, the Russian attack upon the Turkish tête-du-pont\(^a\) at Oltenitza, are just come to hand.

On the 28th of October the Turks crossed from Widin to Kalafat. They were hardly disturbed in their occupation of this point, except by reconnoitering skirmishes; for when the Russians were on the point of concentrating an effective force at Krajova for the attack on Kalafat, they were disturbed by the news of a second and more dangerous advance of the Turks, who, on the 2d of November, had crossed the Danube at Oltenitza, whence they seriously menaced the Russian communications. Simulated and secondary attacks were at the same time made by the Turks on the whole line of the Danube from Widin to Oltenitza, but these either found the Russians well prepared, or were not undertaken with a sufficient force to deceive the enemy and lead him into any serious error.

The corps at Kalafat therefore, remained unmolested and gradually received reinforcements, which are said to have swelled

\(^a\) Bridge-head.—*Ed.*
it to something like 24,000 men. But as this corps has neither advanced or suffered a repulse, we may for the present leave it out of consideration.

The passage at Oltenitzta took place according to Omer Pasha's report in the following way. Oltenitzta is a village situated near the confluence of the Arges River and the Danube. Opposite the mouth of the Arges there is an island in the Danube; on the southern bank of this river the village and fort of Turtukai are situated, on a steep bank rising to some 600 or 700 feet, on the top of which elevation the fort of Turtukai is constructed. The guns of Turtukai, therefore, form a most effective support to any corps crossing the river at this point. On the 1st Nov. the Turks crossed over to the island and there threw up solid entrenchments during the night. On the 2d they crossed from this island to the Wallachian shore, east of the Arges. Two battalions, with 100 horsemen and two guns passed in boats to the Wallachian side; a few gun-shots from Turtukai drove the Russian outposts from a lazaretto building situated near the riverside, and this building, which was immediately taken possession of by the Turks, proved a great advantage to them. It was massively constructed, with vaulted chambers, thereby offering, with hardly any additional labor, all the advantages of that great desideratum in field fortification, a réduit. Consequently the Turks at once began throwing up entrenchments from the Arges to the Danube; four hundred men were kept constantly employed, galianes and fascines having been prepared beforehand. From all the reports we receive, we can only conclude that these entrenchments were continuous lines, cutting off entirely every communication from the Russian positions to the Turkish points of landing. Fortification by continuous entrenched lines has been long since generally condemned and found ineffective; but the special destination of this entrenchment as a bridge-head, the fact that a capital réduit was found ready-made, the want of engineers among the Turks, and other circumstances peculiar to the Turkish army, may have rendered it, after all, more advisable to employ this antiquated system. In the Arges the Turks found a number of boats which were at once employed, together with what they had before, in the construction of a bridge across the Danube. All these works were nearly completed by the morning of Nov. 4.

At Oltenitzta, then, the Turks had a mere bridge-head on the left bank of the Danube; the Turkish army had not crossed the river,
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nor has it done so since; but it had a safe débouché on the left bank, which might be turned to account the very moment when a sufficient force was concentrated at Turtukai. They had the means, beside, of taking either the right or the left of the Arges; and, finally, all their operations in the vicinity of the river were protected by ten heavy guns in the fort on the heights of Turtukai, whose range, consequent upon this elevated position and the narrowness of the river at that point, extended at least half a mile beyond the bridge-head.

The bridge-head was occupied by three battalions of the line (2,400 men), two companies of guards (160 men), two of sharp shooters (200 men), 100 cavalry and some artillery, who attended to the 12 heavy guns placed in the Lazaretto. The right wing of the entrenchment was enfiladed and flanked by the guns of Turtukai, which besides could sweep the whole of the plain in front of the center of the bridge-head. The left wing, resting on the River Arges, was flanked by the battery on the island, but part of this ground was thickly studded with brush-wood, so as to offer considerable shelter to the Russians in approaching.

When on Nov. 4, the Russians attacked the Turkish lines they had, according to Omer Pasha, 20 battalions, 4 regiments of cavalry and 32 guns, altogether about 24,000 men. It appears they formed in the following order: twelve battalions and 14 guns opposite the center of the bridge-head; two battalions and two guns in the wood to the left (Russian right) on the river Arges, six battalions, en échelon, with four guns against the Turkish right, toward the Danube, their line being prolongated and outflanked by the cavalry. The center first formed a column of attack, after the fire of the Russian guns had been kept up for a time; the two wings followed; then the artillery, which had first fired at a distance of some 1,200 yards from the parapets came up to effective grape range (600 to 700 yards), and the columns of attack were hurried forward. As may be anticipated, the column of the Russian left (nearest the Danube) was shattered by the fire of the Turtukai guns; that of the center very soon shared the same fate; that of the right (on the Arges) was crushed by the fire from the island, and appears to have been far too weak to do any good. The attack was once or twice repeated, but without the ensemble of the first assault, and then the Russians had enough of it. They had marched resolutely up to the brink of the ditch (which must not be too literally understood), but the Turkish fire proved overwhelming before they came to a hand-to-hand fight.
During the fight Omer Pasha sent a battalion of regulars across the river to act as reserve. Thus the Turks engaged may be estimated at 3,600 infantry, with 44 heavy guns.

The forces of the Russians are less easily ascertained. While Omer Pasha speaks of twenty battalions, two British officers in his camp agree in reducing the force actually engaged to some 8,000 men. These two statements are not exactly contradictory. The Russians might have some twenty battalions in order of battle, and yet from the nature of the ground, or from contempt of their opponents, the actual mass of the attacking columns might not exceed eight battalions at a time; and a circumstance which the British officers do not mention, but which Omer Pasha reports, shows that the Russians had ample reserves. It is this, that every fresh attack was headed by a fresh battalion drawn from the reserves for the purpose. Besides, the reports of the two “officers of her Majesty’s guards” bear in every line the stamp of that ignorant and inexperienced self-sufficiency which belongs to subalterns of the privileged corps of all armies.

Upon the whole, therefore, we think Omer Pasha’s statement entitled to credit. There may have been eighteen or twenty Russian battalions present during the action, of which ten or twelve may successively have been brought to act, although from six to eight thousand may be the number of those who at a given time advanced simultaneously and ineffectually upon the Turkish entrenchments. The loss of the Russians, which must have amounted at least to 1,500 or 2,000, also proves what numbers they must have brought into the field. They were finally repulsed, leaving 500 muskets, plenty of baggage and ammunition, and 800 killed and wounded in the hands of the Turks, and retreated partially in disorder.

If we look at the tactics of this conflict on either side, we are surprised to find a gross blunder committed by the Russians, which was deservedly expiated by their signal defeat. They showed a contempt of their adversaries which has been seldom equaled. They had to attack pretty strong lines, with a capital réduit flanked by ten heavy guns on the island, commanded by twenty-two guns at Turtukai, which also commanded the ground in front of the lines; altogether, forty-four, or at least thirty-eight guns, all or mostly of heavy metal. Now every officer knows that in attacking a field fortification, you have first by your artillery to silence its guns and the batteries that may support it; then to destroy, as much as possible, the parapets, palisades and other defenses; then, by approaching your batteries still closer to the attacked works, to
sweep the parapets with a continued hail-storm of grape-shot, until at last you can risk launching your columns of attack upon the half-demolished work and its demoralized defenders. In order to do all this, you must have a decided superiority in the number and caliber of your artillery. But what do we see the Russian attempt? To storm a bridge-head, defended by artillery superior to their own in number, superior in caliber, and still more superior in practice, after a short cannonade from twelve 12-pounders and twenty 6-pounders! This Russian cannonade can only be considered as a mere formality, a sort of civility offered to the Turks, for it could have no serious purpose; and if, as all reports agree, the Russian batteries advanced up to within 650 yards of the bridge-head, it is a wonder that we do not hear of a number of dismounted guns. At the same time we must acknowledge the bravery of the Russian troops, who were very likely for the first time exposed to fire and that under such adverse circumstances, yet advanced to within fifty yards of the Turkish lines before they were crushed by the superior fire poured in upon them.

As to the Turks, we cannot say much in favor of their tactics either. It was very well that Omer Pasha during the assaults did not crowd together more troops in the bridge-head than were necessary for its defense. But how is it that he did not concentrate a reserve, especially of cavalry, on the Turtukai end of the bridge and on the island? that, as soon as the repulse of the Russians was becoming manifest, he did not launch his cavalry on the beaten foe? and that, after all, he was satisfied with the moral effect of the victory and neglected to gather all its fruits, by which he might have decided the campaign? We can only find two excuses: firstly, that the system of continuous lines in field fortification does not easily admit of any vigorous offensive action after the repulse of the enemy, as the uninterrupted lines do not offer any wide space for sudden and energetic sallies of masses of troops; and secondly, that Omer Pasha either distrusted the capacity of his troops for fighting in the open field, or that he had not troops enough at hand to follow up the victory.

This leads us to the strategic questions connected with this action. If Omer Pasha had had at Oltenitza the troops who were lounging without anything to do at Kalafat, would he not have acted with more decision? How was it that a corps of 12,000 men, with a reserve of equal force, was directed upon Kalafat, to menace that point of the Russian position, where of all points it must have been most desirable to the Russians to be attacked?
How came it that on the point where the Turks could gain decisive advantages these 24,000 men were not present?

But this is only one point. The Russians, it is now ascertained beyond doubt, could not muster more than 50,000 or 55,000 combatants in Wallachia at the end of October. Taking into consideration the want of roads, the intersected nature of the country, detachments not to be avoided, the regular wear and tear of an active army, the Russians, it is certain, could on no point muster more than 30,000 men in a single mass. Forty thousand Turks collected upon any given spot of Wallachia were sure to beat them, and there is no doubt that the Turks, if they had been so minded and taken proper steps in proper time, could have collected that body, or even twice as many, with comparative ease. But the interference of European diplomacy, irresolution in the Divan, vacillation in the Turkish policy towards Servia, and other similar considerations, appear to have produced a series of half-measures, which placed Omer Pasha in a very singular position when hostilities broke out. He knew the weakness of the Russians; he himself had a far superior army, eager to go to war; but his army was spread upon an extent of country three hundred and fifty miles long, and fifty to one hundred miles wide. The lameness of his operations in the first half of November was the necessary consequence of this. The passage at Kalafat, otherwise a mistake, thus became a sort of necessity, Widin being the natural point of concentration of some twenty thousand men, who without that passage would have been entirely inactive, being too far distant from the main army. This passage enabled them at least to paralyze a portion of the Russian forces, and to create a moral impression in favor of the Turks.

The passage at Oltenitza—which was intended evidently as the main attack by which Bucharest was to be taken, and the Russians allured westward by the Kalafat operation, to be cut off from their retreat—had no effect whatever, because the necessary forces for a march on Bucharest appear not to have been forthcoming. The moral effect of the combat at Oltenitza was certainly a great gain, but the inactivity after the victory—an inactivity which lasted nine days, and ended in the voluntary retreat of the Turks behind the Danube, in consequence of the rains setting in—this inactivity and retreat may not destroy the flush of victory on the check of the Turkish soldier, but it undermines the reputation of the Turkish General, most probably more than he deserves. But here, if the original fault lies with the Divan, there must be some fault with Omer Pasha. To pass twelve days on the
left bank of the Danube, to possess a bridge and a bridge-head strong enough to repel the united force of the Russians, to have behind him an army numerous and eager to fight and not to find means to carry 30,000 or 40,000 men across—why, all this cannot have been done without some negligence on the part of the General. The Russians may be thankful for their escape. Never did a Russian army get out of a scrape half as bad as this with so little material damage. They deserved to be cut to pieces, and they are all safe. Whether they will ever be taken at such advantage again may well be doubted.

Written about December 2, 1853


Reproduced from the newspaper
No more fighting of any account has taken place in Turkey since my last letter, but Russian diplomacy, more dangerous than Russian generalship, is again at work, and the revival of the famous London Conferences of 1840 and 1841, which terminated with sanctioning the treaty of Unkiair-Skelessi, under a slightly altered form, is more or less clearly announced through the medium of the ministerial papers on both sides of the Channel. *The Times* even hints at “vigorous measures of pacification,” viz.: a sort of *armed pacification* directed against Turkey by her self-styled protectors. There is one great diplomatic fact not to be misunderstood, namely, the last Note sent by the English Cabinet to Constantinople, presented by the British Ambassador to the Porte, rejected by the Divan on the 14th Nov., and turning out to be but a second edition of Reshid Pasha’s answer to Prince Menchikoff’s ultimatum in the month of May last. This is the manner in which the Palmerstons and Aberdeens give the Sultan to understand that, however the face of things may have otherwise changed, the relative situations of Turkey and Russia have undergone no change whatever since the month of May last, Turkey having won nothing nor Russia lost anything in the eyes of Western diplomacy.

As Prince Alexander of Servia forbids the Turkish troops to cross his territory, asks for the return of the Russian Consul-General, and treats, in his declaration to the Sultan, Turkey and Russia as the two protecting powers placed on the same footing with regard to the Principality, serious conflicts with Servia may be
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apprehended, which, fatal as they might have proved to Turkey at any other moment, are at present perhaps the only means of saving her from the claws of Western diplomacy. Every new incident adding to the present complication, driving bankrupt Austria out of her dangerous neutrality, augmenting the chances of an European war, and enforcing upon Turkey the alliance with the revolutionary party, must turn out favorable to her, at least in her conflict with Russia. The constitutional causes of her decay will, of course, continue to do their work, if not counteracted by thorough transformation of the Turkish rule in Europe.

From the war carried on in the Principalities between Russians and Turks, let us return for one moment to the war raging in the manufacturing districts of England between masters and men. You will remember the epoch when the masters fiercely opposed and denounced the short-time movement on the part of the men. Now the tables are turned, and, as I predicted at the time, the system of short time is enforced by the masters on the men. The lock-out exhibits its true meaning as a financial measure on the part of the masters, as a sort of antidote to an industrial over-production unparalleled in the "history of prices." Since Monday last the mills have resumed work, but only for four days per week, in the Rochdale district—Burnley, Bacup, Newchurch—at Bury in the Ashton district—Ashton, Stalybridge, Glossop, Hyde, Newton. Bolton will soon be obliged to follow. Manchester is deliberating the question not whether, but when, to give way. In two or three weeks short time will be general, save in some few favored branches of industry. This, of course, must be followed by a stoppage of the supplies to the Preston resistants. But even four days' work still overruns the demand. Just think that not three weeks ago the Preston masters had on hand a stock equal to twenty weeks' production, which proved almost unsalable. The industrial crisis has no longer to begin; it has fairly set in.

"The reduction of time," says The Times, "is accompanied by a reduction of wages to the standard [...] before the recent advances were obtained by the hands." "A pauper cannot dictate conditions—he must take what is offered him," says The Economist, in a fit of sincerity.
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I have repeatedly stated that the turn-outs of the men, by beginning at too late an epoch, when the opportunities afforded by unprecedented prosperity were already vanishing away, could not prove successful in an economical point of view, or as far as their immediate end was concerned. But they have done their work. They have revolutionized the industrial proletariat, and, stirred up by dear food and cheap labor, the political consequences will show themselves in due time. Already the idea of a Parliament of Labor which, in fact, means nothing but a general reassembling of the workingmen under the banners of Chartism, evokes the fears of the middle-class press.

"Mr. Ernest Jones [...]" says The Economist, "the editor of The People's Paper, is described as the successor of Mr. Feargus O'Connor, as Mr. O'Connor was the successor of Mr. Hunt.... From following Hunt and O'Connor, the workingmen got nothing but hard knocks and great losses; nevertheless, they place equal confidence in the successor of these great kings, and now look to be saved by Jones."a

From the following quotations you will see that the English class papers, if stimulated by party motives, as is the case with The Morning Herald, or if inspired, as The Morning Post, by a cynical but keen observer like Palmerston, know how to judge the present state of affairs, and how to deal with the vulgarism of Prosperity-Robinson b:

"To hear them now, you would suppose that the authority of millowners was nothing less than divine, and that the safety of the empire depended on their being allowed to exercise powers little short of those of the French Emperor c.... Some 60,000 of the workingmen of Lancashire are at this moment living on fare which barely suffices to keep soul and body together, without so much as a thought of a plunder or violence, although in towns which manufacturing economy has left wholly unguarded by police. Right or wrong these men have stood by their opinions and their leaders manfully, and it would not be easy to find another instance of a movement at once so peacefully and so effectually carried out."

(Morning Herald)

"Our economists boasted of the overwhelming blessings which would flow, past all our dreams, as the result of free trade; yet there we are with the winter before us, and the pestilence only waiting the return of spring, and just when our poor are most in need of more than usual food and clothing to raise their physical system up to the point most capable of resisting disease—just at this time, they are actually crushed by the unprecedented high prices of all the necessaries of life. Not a sign is visible of the milk and honey that were to enrich the land; while all that

---

a "The Labour Parliament", The Economist, No. 535, November 26, 1853.—Ed.
b A nickname of the Chancellor of Exchequer F. J. Robinson, who predicted prosperity on the eve of the crisis in 1825.—Ed.
c Napoleon III.—Ed.
was predicated of the perpetuity of cheapness and plenty seems in a fair way of being classed among the other thousand popular delusions by which society has been gulled.... English society is a filthy, pestilent, immoral, ignorant, cruel, blundering, discontented, and uncommonly hard up community.”

Such is the language of The Morning Post, a the drawing-room print, and the official organ of my Lord Palmerston.

Written on December 2, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

---

* The Morning Post, November 17, 1853.—*Ed.
London, Friday, Dec. 9, 1853

Your readers have followed, step by step, the diplomatic movements of the Coalition Cabinet, and they will not be surprised at any new attempt, on the part of the Palmerstons and the Aberdeens, to back the Czar\(^a\) under the pretext of protecting Turkey and securing the peace of Europe. Even the resurrection of a Vienna Conference\(^b\) or of a London Congress they are fully prepared for. The Metropolitan Stock Exchange was first informed by *The Morning Chronicle*,\(^b\) on Friday last, of England having succeeded in inducing Austria and Prussia to support the Western Powers in their attempt at a new mediation between the belligerent parties. Then came *The Morning Post* with the news of “this attempt” and with the consolatory announcement that...

“The in this attempt the cooperation of Prussia and Austria has been sought and obtained, and the four Powers have signed a protocol, engaging them, implicitly, to maintain the present territorial distribution of Europe, and inviting the belligerent Powers to come to an amicable adjustment of their differences by means of an European conference. The first step that will be taken, in consequence of this proceeding of the four Powers, will be to ascertain the views of Turkey on the bases upon which she will allow negotiations for an arrangement of the Eastern dispute to be conducted. This clearly ascertained, the four Powers will then invite Russia to state her views in regard to the [...] bases of the proposed arrangement, and then both Powers will be requested to send plenipotentiaries to a conference of the Great Powers, [...] at some time and place to be hereafter determined upon....

*The Czar’s dignity* might be preserved while the interests of Turkey would be fully upheld, in the first place by a treaty between Turkey and Russia of amity and peace and of commerce, stipulating for a due protection of the subjects of either state within the territories of the other, and, in the second place, by a treaty between the

\(^a\) Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Of December 2, 1853.—*Ed.*
Sultan\textsuperscript{a} and the five Powers, such a treaty as that of the Dardanelles of 1841, in which the Sultan should undertake to respect the existing constitutions and privileges of the Danubian Principalities and of Servia, and in which he should bind himself as in the treaty [of] Kainardji, but this time to Europe, and not to Russia—specially to protect the Christian religion within his dominions.”\textsuperscript{b}

At last came the thunderer of Printing House-square, announcing in a first edition\textsuperscript{c} that the alliance between the four Powers had been definitively concluded, and that they had laid down conditions which Russia and the Porte would, if necessary, “be forced to accept.” Instantly the funds rose; but the satisfaction of the stockjobbers proved short-lived, as the same Times announced in its second edition that the four Powers had indeed drawn up a protocol and presented the draft of a collective note, without having, however, bound themselves to enforce its acceptance. Down went the funds again. At last the “startling news” was reduced to the old story of the resurrection of the dead body of the late Vienna Conference—it would be preposterous to speak of its ghost—and a telegraphic dispatch confirmed the report that

“the Conference of the four Powers at Vienna had on the 6th forwarded to Constantinople another proposal for the arrangement of the pending differences founded on a new project, and that negotiations for peace will continue, even though hostilities should not be suspended.”

On the very eve of war the Vienna Conference, that retrospective Pythia, had just proposed to Turkey to accept Prince Menchikoff’s ultimatum. After the first defeat Russia had undergone, England and France took up Reshid Pasha’s answer to Prince Menchikoff’s ultimatum. What phase of the past transactions they will now have arrived at in their retrograde movement, it is impossible to predict. The Augsburger Zeitung states that the new propositions of the Conference express the desire of the four Powers to “prevent war.”\textsuperscript{d} A startling novelty this!

Insipid, as all this diplomatic gossip may appear at a moment, when the status quo has been supplanted by a status bellì, we must not forget that the hidden intentions of the British Cabinet transpire through these fantastical projects of conferences and congresses; that the ministerial papers throw out their feelers to ascertain how far the Ministry may venture to go; and that the

\textsuperscript{a} Abdul Mejid.—Ed.
\textsuperscript{b} Quoted, with slight digressions, from The Morning Post, December 6, 1853.—Ed.
\textsuperscript{c} Of December 6, 1853.—Ed.
\textsuperscript{d} Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 337, December 3, 1853.—Ed.
unfounded rumors of to-day more than once have foreshadowed the events of to-morrow. So much is sure, that if not accepted by Austria, the quadruple alliance has been proposed by England with a view to enforce upon Turkey the resolutions to be agreed upon by the four Powers. If no alliance has been concluded, a "protocol" has at least been signed by the four Powers, establishing the principles upon which to conduct the transactions. It is no less sure that the Vienna Conference, which prevented Turkey from moving till the Russian army had occupied the Principalities and reached the frontiers of Bulgaria, has again resumed its work and already dispatched a new note to the Sultan. That the step from a Vienna Conference to a European Congress, at London, is by no means a great one, was proved in 1839 at the epoch of Mehemet Ali's insurrection. The Congress pursuing its work of "pacification," while Russia pursued her war against Turkey, would be but a repetition of the London Congress of 1827-29, resulting in the destruction of the Turkish fleet, at Navarino, and the loss of Turkish independence, by the treaty of Adrianople. The bases upon which the British Cabinet have proposed, and the other Powers agreed to conduct negotiations, are clearly indicated by the ministerial papers. Maintenance of the "present territorial distribution of Europe." It would be a great mistake to consider this proposition as a simple return to the provisions of the peace of Vienna. The extinction of the Kingdom of Poland, the possession of the mouths of the Danube by Russia, the incorporation of Cracow, the transformation of Hungary into an Austrian province—all these "territorial arrangements" have never been sanctioned by any European Congress. A sanction, then, of the present "territorial distribution of Europe" would be, instead of a simple admission of Turkey to the treaty of Vienna, as is pretended, rather a sanction of all the violations of that treaty by Russia and Austria, since 1830. "A treaty of amity, and peace, and commerce between Russia and Turkey"—such are the identical terms in the preamble of the treaties of Kainardji, Adrianople and Unkiar-Skelessi. "A treaty as that of the Dardanelles of 1841," says the Palmerstonian paper. a Exactly so. A treaty like that which excluded Europe from the Dardanelles and transformed the Euxine into a Russian lake. But, says The Times, why should we not stipulate for the free entrance of the Dardanelles for men-of-war, and the free navigation of the Danube. But read the letter addressed by Lord Palmerston in

a The Morning Post.—Ed.
September, 1839, to Mr. Bulwer, the then Envoy at Paris, and we shall find that similar hopes were held out at that epoch.

"The Sultan, bound to respect the existing constitutions of the Principalities and Servia." But these existing constitutions distribute the sovereignty over the provinces between the Czar and the Sultan, and they have, till now, never been acknowledged by any European Congress. The new Congress then, would add to the de facto protectorate of Russia over Turkish provinces, the sanction of Europe. The Sultan would then be bound not to the Czar, but to Europe, to protect "the Christian religion within his dominions." That is to say, the right of interference between the Sultan and his Christian subjects by foreign powers, would become a paragraph of European international law, and, in case of any new conflicts occurring, Europe would be bound by treaty to back the pretensions of Russia, who, as a party to the treaty, would have a right to interpret in her sense the protection to be asked for by the Christians in the Sultan's dominions. The new treaty, then, as projected by the Coalition Cabinet, and as explained by its own organs, is the most comprehensive plan of European surrender to Russia ever conceived, and a wholesale sanction of all the changes brought about by the counter-revolutions since 1830. There is, therefore, no occasion for throwing up caps and being astonished at the change of the policy of Austria, a change, as The Morning Post feigns to believe, "effected suddenly within the last ten days."

As to Bonaparte, whatever his ulterior designs may be, for the moment the Parvenu Emperor is content enough to climb up into the heaven of the old legitimate powers, with Turkey as his ladder.

The views of the Coalition Cabinet are clearly expressed by The Guardian, the ministerial weekly paper:

"To treat Russia as a beaten enemy and fancy we have her by the throat because Russian troops have been foiled at the trenches of Oltenitza and some forts captured on the Black Sea, is simply ridiculous; these petty losses would in themselves but exasperate her pride and indispose her to treat till she could do so on better terms. But sovereigns, like other men, are governed by mixed motives. The Czar is a proud and passionate, but he is also a prudent man. He is engaged in a quarrel in which he may lose and cannot gain. His policy is that of his predecessors, who have throughout gained more by threatening than by waging war, and whose steady and undeviating system of encroachment had in it a vein of elastic pliability, which enabled them to avoid great disasters and even to turn minor reverses to profitable account. The preliminary resolution of the four Powers, that no change shall be made or permitted in the territorial arrangements of Europe, appears to be based on this rational view of his position and policy. It will disappoint those who see in imagination the feet of England on his neck, or who suffer themselves to be misled by the chimerical nonsense of the Protectionist
papers. But the business in hand is not the humiliation of Russia but the pacification of Europe" (in a Russian sense of course), "the establishment, as far as possible, of that durable peace for which the French Soldier-Envoy pledges his master's honor to the Sultan. And the coming treaty, we may be sure, [...] will not be a mere restoration of the status quo, but will attempt at least to settle on some permanent footing the relations of Turkey with Europe and of the Turkish Government with its Christian subjects, attempt—for, settle it so durably as we may, any arrangement which leaves a Turkish Empire in Europe will always be provisional at bottom. Such a provisional arrangement, however, is the thing now practicable and needful." b

The ultimate object, then, the powers aim at, is to help the Czar "to turn minor reverses to profitable account," and "to leave no Turkish Empire in Europe." The provisional arrangement will, of course, prepare that ultimate consummation as far as "the thing is now practicable."

Some circumstances, however, have singularly confounded the calculations of the Coalition politicians. There is intelligence of new victories gained by Turkey on the shores of the Black Sea and on the frontiers of Georgia. There is, on the other hand, a peremptory assertion representing the whole army in Poland as under orders for the Prouth, while we are informed from the frontiers of Poland that "in the night from the 23d and 24th ult., the brinka, or levy of men for the army, took place, and in places, where formerly one or two men were taken, eight or ten have now been drawn." This, at least, proves little confidence on the part of the Czar in the pacifying genius of the four Powers. The official declaration on the part of Austria, "that no alliance had been concluded between the four Courts," proves on her part that, willing as she is to enforce conditions upon Turkey, she dares not assume even the appearance of coercing the Czar to submit to conditions projected in his own interest. Lastly, the Sultan's reply to the French Ambassador that "at present an amicable arrangement is quite unacceptable without the complete abandonment by Russia of the pretensions which she has raised and without the immediate evacuation of the Principalities," has struck the Congress-mongers like a thunderbolt, and the organ of the crafty and experienced Palmerston now frankly tells the other fellows of the brotherhood the following piece of truth:

"To the immediate evacuation of the Principalities and the total abandonment of all her claims, [...] Russia cannot submit without a loss of [...] dignity and influence which it is foolish to suppose a power of her magnitude will endure
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a A. Baraguay d'Hilliers.— Ed.
b The Guardian, No. 418, December 7, 1853.— Ed.
without a desperate struggle. For this present attempt at negotiation we are sorry, therefore, that we can only prognosticate failure."\footnote{The Morning Post, December 8, 1853.—Ed.}

Defeated Russia can accept no negotiations at all. The business in hand is, therefore, to turn the balance of war. But how to effect this, but by enabling Russia to gain time? The only thing she wants is procrastination, time to levy new troops, to distribute them throughout the empire—to concentrate them, and to stop the war with Turkey till she has done with the mountaineers of Caucasus. In this way the chances of Russia may improve, and the attempt at negotiation “may be successful when Russia proves victorious instead of defeated.” Accordingly, as stated by the Vienna Ost-Deutsche Post, and the ministerial Morning Chronicle, England has urged on Turkey the propriety of consenting to a three months’ armistice.\footnote{The Morning Chronicle, December 7, 1853.—Ed.} Lord Redcliffe had a five hours’ interview with the Sultan, for the purpose of obtaining from His Highness that consent to the suggested armistice which his Ministers had refused, and the result was, that an extraordinary council of Ministers was convened to take the matter into consideration. The Porte definitively refused to accede to the proposed armistice, and could not accede to it without openly betraying the Ottoman people.

“In the present state of feeling,” remarks the to-day’s Times, “it will not be easy to bring the pretentions of the Porte within the bounds of moderation.”

The Porte is immoderate enough to understand that it is perfectly irreconcilable with the dignity of the Czar to be defeated, and that it must therefore grant him a three months’ armistice in order to frustrate its own success, and to help him to become again victorious and “magnanimous.” All hope of bringing about the three months’ armistice has not yet been parted with.

“Possibly,” says The Times, “an armistice recommended by the four Powers may fare better.”

The good-natured Morning Advertiser is

“unwilling to assume that these representations are correct,” because “a more direct attempt to betray the Ottoman cause into the hands of the Czar, or one better adapted to answer that purpose, could not have been devised by the most ingenious mind.”\footnote{The Morning Advertiser, December 8, 1853.—Ed.}
The confidence of the radical Morning Advertiser in "the honor and the good faith" of Palmerston, and its ignorance of the history of England's diplomatic past, seem equally incommensurable. This paper being the property of the Licensed Victuallers' Association, I suspect, that those very victuallers themselves write from time to time the editorial articles.

While England is thus occupied at Constantinople and Vienna, the outpost of Russia, let us see how on the other hand, the Russians manage affairs in England.

I have already, in a previous letter, informed your readers that at this very epoch, when the Coalition feigns to threaten Russia in the Black Sea, Russian men-of-war, the two frigates Aurora and Navarino,\(^357\) are fitting out in the Queen's dockyards at Portsmouth. On Saturday last\(^a\) we were informed by The Morning Herald and The Daily News, that six sailors had escaped from the Russian frigate Aurora, and nearly reached Guildford, when they were overtaken by an officer of the Russian frigate Aurora and an English inspector of police, brought back to Portsmouth, placed on board the Victorious—an English ship occupied by the crew of the Aurora, while out-fitting—subjected to cruel, corporeal punishment and placed in irons. When this became known in London, some gentlemen obtained, through the instrumentality of Mr. Charles Ronalds, solicitor, a writ of habeas corpus, directed to Rear-Admiral Martin, some other English officers of the navy, and to the Russian captain, commander of the frigate Aurora, ordering them to bring the six sailors before the Lord Chief Justice of England. The English dockyard authorities declined to obey the writ, the English captain appealing to the Vice-Admiral and the Vice-Admiral to the Admiral, and the Admiral feeling himself obliged to communicate with the Lord of the Admiralty, the famous Sir James Graham, who, ten years before, in the case of the Bandieras, placed the British Post Office at the service of Metternich.\(^358\) As to the Russian captain, although the Queen's\(^b\) writ was served on him on board the English ship the Victorious, and though he was fully informed of its nature by an interpreter, he threw it contempuously from the vessel, and when thrust through a port-hole, it was thrown out again. "If," said the Russian captain, "it came from Her Majesty in reality, it would be sent to his Ambassador or Consul." The Consul being absent, the Vice-Consul refused to interfere. On Dec. 6, fresh writs were

---

\(^a\) I.e., on December 3.—Ed.

\(^b\) Victoria.—Ed.
served on the naval authorities at Portsmouth, commanding them in the Queen's name to produce not only the six men in question before the Lord Chief Justice, but the Russian captain also. Instead of the writ being complied with, the Admiralty used every effort to tow the ship out of the harbor and to get her to sea, and the other day, the Aurora, Capt. Isylmetieff, was seen, by daylight, sailing for the Pacific, defying the writ of the habeas corpus. In the meantime, as we are informed, by yesterday's Daily News,

"the Russian corvette, Navarino, is still in dock, undergoing a thorough re-caulking and repair. A number of dockyard men are engaged on her."

Now mark in what manner this "startling" case has been dealt with by the Ministerial Press.

The Morning Chronicle, the Peelite organ, chose to remain silent, its own Graham being the most compromised man in the whole affair. The Palmerstonian Morning Post was the first to break silence, as its Lord could not let escape such an occasion of proving his mastership in making pleasant apparently difficult cases. The whole case, it stated, was greatly exaggerated and overrated. The six deserters, it stated on the authority of the Russian captain, who ordered them to be cruelly flogged and hulked,

"these seamen say that they did not desert from their own inclination, but were inveigled away by persons who introduced themselves to them in the streets,"a

these seamen having also contrived against their inclination and against the orders of the Russian captain to get ashore at Portsmouth,

"made them intoxicated and then took them away in a carriage, up the country," and then deserted the deserters, "giving them directions how to get to London, with the address of some persons, to whom to go to there."

The absurd story is invented by the Palmerstonian organ with a view to induce the public to believe, that the "deserters gave themselves up to the Police," a lie too gross to be reechoed by The Times itself. The whole affair, insinuates The Post, with a great show of moral indignation, was got up by some Polish refugees, who, probably, intended wounding the feelings of Lord Palmerston, its magnanimous master.

Another ministerial organ, The Globe,b states that

---

a Here and below Marx quotes from "The Russians at Portsmouth.—Singular Affair", The Morning Post, December 6, 1853.—Ed.
b Of December 7, 1853.—Ed.
"the plea that a foreigner is only bound to recognize processes coming to him from the Minister of his own country is manifestly untenable; otherwise, any foreigners in a British seaport could break our law and could be brought under no responsibility, except by the intervention of an Ambassador."

*The Globe* arrives therefore at the moderate conclusion that the reply of the Russian captain to the clerk who served on him the writ of habeas corpus "is not perfectly satisfactory." But in human matters it would be idle to aspire to anything like perfection.

"If the Russian captain had hanged them" (viz., the six recaptured sailors) "all at the yard-arm of his frigate the next morning, he would have been altogether [...] beyond the control of the English law," exclaims *The Times*.a

And why this? Because in the treaty of navigation concluded between Russia and Great Britain in 1840 (under the direction of Lord Palmerston) there is a provision to this effect:

"The Consuls, Vice-Consuls, and commercial agents [...] of the [...] high contracting parties, residing in the dominions of the other, shall receive from the local authorities such assistance as can by law be given them, for the recovery of deserters from the ships of war or merchant vessels of their respective countries."

But, good *Times*, the question is exactly what assistance the English authorities were warranted by law to give the Russian captain. As to the Russian authorities themselves, "sending their vessels to England to be repaired at this crisis in political affairs," it appears to *The Times*, "to be an act of great indelicacy and bad taste," and it thinks, "the position, in which the officers of these vessels have been placed here, is that of spies." But, it says, "the British Government could no more forcibly express its contempt for such politics" than by admitting the Russian spies into the Queen's own dockyards "even at some public inconvenience," by placing at their disposal British men-of-war, employing the dockyard men, paid out of the pockets of the British people, in their service and firing parting salutes to them, when they run away after having insulted the laws of England.

Written on December 9, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3960, December 26, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 896, December 27, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---
a *The Times*, No. 21605, December 7, 1853.—Ed.
London, Tuesday, Dec. 13, 1853

"With the fleets of France and England in the Black Sea, the astonished Sultan of Turkey is already surprised that one of his ships is captured with impunity by a Russian vessel. The spring will bring him further wonders."

Thus we were informed by last Saturday's Press. The following Monday brought the "further wonders," not expected until spring. Defeat of a Turkish squadron by a Russian fleet in the Black Sea, off Sinope—such were the contents of a Russian dispatch from Odessa, dated 5th inst., confirmed afterward by the French Moniteur. Although we are not yet in possession of the exact details of this occurrence, so much is clear that the Russian report greatly exaggerates the case; that the whole matter in question is to be reduced to the surprise of some Turkish frigates and a certain number of transports, which had on board troops, provisions, ammunition and arms, destined for Batum; that the Russian force was largely superior in number to the Turkish one, and that, nevertheless, the latter only surrendered after a desperate engagement, lasting an hour.

"Our fleet," says the Englishman, "at all events, is not there to prevent the Russians from attacking Turkey. The fleet is not there to interfere with Russian convoys of men and arms to the Caucasus. The fleet is not there to see that the

---

a Of December 10, 1853.— Ed.
b The reference is to the reports published on December 12, 1853 in The Times, No. 21609, and in Le Moniteur universel, No. 346.— Ed.
c A.Richards, "The New Battle of Navarino", The Morning Advertiser, December 13, 1853.— Ed.
Black Sea is not a Russian lake. The fleet is not there to help our ally, nor to save him from destruction. The fleet is not there to avert a Navarino, after the memorable pattern. Russian Admirals may maneuver, we suppose, within gun-shot of Constantinople, and the screws of England will continue as impassive as the prime screw of Lord Aberdeen himself. Will these costly farces be tolerated by the people?"

The coalition is exasperated at the Czar having beaten the Turks at sea instead of on the terra firma. A victory of the latter sort they wanted. Russian successes at sea may endanger their places, just at the moment when Count Buol has assured the Sultan\(^a\) of the Czar's strictly defensive intentions, and when Lord Redcliffe was urging on him a three months' armistice. It is very amusing to observe how the business of soothing down the public has been distributed between the several organs of the Coalition Ministry.

*The Times*, as the representative of the whole of the Cabinet, expresses its general indignation at the ingratitude of the Czar, and ventures even upon some menaces.

*The Morning Post*, of course, is still more warlike, and gives its readers to understand that the "untoward" event at Sinope could never have occurred if Lord Palmerston were the Premier, or at least the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"It is at least evident," says *The Post*,\(^b\) "that a Russian naval force, dispatched to act on the Turkish coast, has been able to strike a sudden and heavy blow at the resources of the Porte, precisely in the quarter where the Divan had the best reason to expect that if there were anything substantial, anything beyond mere ostentation, in the professed services of her allies, the value and operation of such services might now be expected to become available. It will hardly be urged, we suppose, that the Black Sea is an appropriate stage for another scene of the diplomatic comedy which has been played in the Principalities under the name of the 'Material Guarantee.\(^3\)\(^6\)\(^1\) [...] The Russians, therefore, may be taken to have abandoned the hypocrisy of their defensive attitude. [...] It must be a subject of deep regret, that the extent to which our" (read Aberdeen's) "suiting policy has gone, has brought heavy damage on our ally and a shadow of reproach on ourselves. It would be a matter of lasting blame and scandal, should a second such disaster be suffered to occur for want of that protection which our fleets were expressly dispatched to afford."

The philosophical *Morning Chronicle*, the special organ of the Peelites, thinks
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\(^a\) Abdul Mejid.— Ed.

\(^b\) Of December 13, 1853.— Ed.
“it not improbable that the power which has disturbed the peace of the world may now be disposed to acquiesce in the termination of the war.”

The Emperor Nicholas, on the plea that “he does not wish to oppose the expression of the free will” of the Hospodars Stirbei and Ghica to withdraw from the government of Moldavia and Wallachia, has, by rescript of Nov. 8, entrusted their functions to General von Budberg, placed, however, under the superior control of Prince Gorchakoff.

The fact of England urging upon Turkey an armistice at a moment when it cannot but assist the Czar in gaining time to concentrate his troops and to work at the decomposition of the ostensible alliance between France and England; the simultaneous intrigues of Nicholas to upset Bonaparte and to replace him by Henry V; the loudly boasted-of “fusion” of the two Bourbon branches negotiated in common by King Leopold, Prince Albert and the Princes of Orléans—such are the circumstances which induce the public to direct anew their attention to Windsor Castle, and to suspect it of a secret conspiracy with the courts of Brussels, Vienna and St. Petersburg.

“The present race of Englishmen,” says the aristocratic Morning Herald, “should see that the policy of this country be not made subordinate to Orleanistic dreams of restoration, Belgian terrors of annexation, and infinitesimal German interests.”

“There are,” insinuates Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper, “conspirators not watched by the Home Office [...], conspirators whose names, like stars upon a frosty night—glitter in The Court Circular. They do not live in St. John’s Wood, neither dwell they in Chelsea. No. They enjoy a somewhat larger accommodation in the Halls of Claremont. One of those conspirators—the frequent guest of our gracious Queen—called by compliment the Duke of Nemours, went fresh from his English home to Frohsdorf to make that bridge—that is, to bridge the abyss for the Bourbons back to France. And doubtless he will return and again eat his venison at Buckingham Palace or Windsor Castle. 

“You ministers,” writes the Paris correspondent of The Leader, “are doing what Victoria tells them to do. Queen Victoria wishes all that King Leopold wishes. King Leopold desires all that Emperor Nicholas desires, so that Nicholas is de facto the present King of England.”

The position of Bonaparte is at this moment more critical than ever before, although, at first view, his chances of fortune never
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a The Morning Chronicle, December 13, 1853.—Ed.
b “Our Foreign Conspirators”, Lloyd’s Weekly London Newspaper, No. 577, December 11, 1853.—Ed.
seemed more promising. He has succeeded in slipping into the
circle of European royalty. The character Nicholas has lost, he has
won. For the first time in his life he has become “respectable.”
The power which, combined with Russia, tumbled down his uncle* from
his gigantic throne, England, has been forced into an
apparent alliance with himself against Russia. Circumstances have
almost constituted him the arbiter of Europe. The prospect of a
European war, dragging along with it insurrectionary movements
in Italy, Hungary, and Poland—countries where the people
looking almost exclusively to the recovery of their national
independence, are by no means too scrupulous as to the quarter
from which to receive assistance—these eventualities seem to allow
the man of the 2d of December to lead the dance of the peoples,
if he should fail to play the pacificator with the kings. The
everous blunders committed by his predecessors have given his
policy even the appearance of national vigor, as he, at least, evokes
apprehensions on the part of the powers, while they, from the
Provisional Government down to the Burgraves of the Assemblée
Legislative,† had assumed only the power to tremble at every-
thing and everybody.

But now let us look at the opposite side of the medal. The
fusion between the two branches of the Bourbon dynasty,
whatever may be its intrinsic value, has taken place under the
auspices of the Courts of London and Vienna, and at the dictation
of the Emperor Nicholas. It is, therefore, to be considered as the
first act of a Holy Alliance directed against Bonaparte. On the
other hand it has, for the moment, conciliated the different parties
of the French Bourgeoisie, whose very divisions prevented them in
1848-51 from opposing the usurpation of the hero of Strasbourg
and Boulogne.‡ The blue Republicans themselves, meeting at the
house of Mr. Carnot, have decided, almost unanimously, that they
would lend their aid to the Legitimists in any attempt to overthrow
Bonaparte. These gentlemen seem fully resolved to run again
through the traditional cycles of restoration, Bourgeois-monarchy
and Republic. For them the Republic meant never anything but,
"Ote-toi de là, que je m’y mette,"§ and if they cannot take themselves
the place of their rival, they will at least inflict upon him the
greatest punishment they are aware of—the loss of place. The
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* Napoleon I.—Ed.

† An allusion to the abortive Bonapartist putsches in Strasbourg on September
30, 1836, and in Boulogne on August 8, 1840.—Ed.

‡ Go so that I can take your place.—Ed.
parts to be acted have already been distributed. The generals, the ministers, all the principal functionaries are already nominated. The danger threatening Bonaparte from this side is a military insurrection which, if it do not lead to the restoration of the Bourbons, may afford the occasion for a general outbreak. But after all this Malet conspiracy, dependent on the support of the Cossacks, is no more dangerous than the Ledru-Rollin conspiracy, dependent on the support of the Turks. Let me remark, en passant, that if the whole French emigration at London and Jersey were to meet, Ledru would hardly venture to present himself. The great majority of the French refugees belonging to different factions of the socialist party, have joined together in the Société des proscrits démocrates et socialistes, avowedly hostile to the pretensions of Ledru. He is said to possess still some influence with the French peasantry, but power must be conquered, not in the departments, but at Paris, and at Paris he will meet with a resistance he is not the man to overcome.

The serious dangers to be apprehended on the part of Bonaparte rise from quite a different quarter, viz.: from the high prices of provisions, the stagnation of trade, and the utter dilapidation and exhaustion of the Imperial exchequer. It was the peasantry who, in their superstitious faith in the magic powers of the name of "Napoleon," and in the golden promises held out by the hero of Strasbour, first imposed him on France. For them the restoration of the Bonaparte dynasty was the restoration of their own supremacy, after they had been abused by the restoration, speculated upon by the monarchy of July, and made by the Republic to pay the expenses of the revolution of February. They are now disabused, not only by dragonnades but by famine too. Incendiaryism spreads, at this moment, through France at an unparalleled pace. As to the middle classes, they were foolish enough to suspect the Assemblée Nationale of having caused, by the disputes and intrigues going on among its different factions, and by their common opposition to the executive power, the transitory commercial stagnation of 1851. They deserted not only their own representatives, but they provoked intentionally the coup d'état with a view to restore what they called "a regular Government," and above all, "sound business." They have now discovered that industrial crises are neither to be prevented by military despotism nor alleviated by its stretching public credit to its utmost limits, exhausting it by the most lavish expenditure, and making a financial crisis the inevitable partner of a commercial one. The middle class pine, therefore, for a new change of power,
to afford them at last "a regular Government" and "sound business." As to the proletarians, they accepted Bonaparte from the first moment only as a transitory necessity, as the destroyer of the république cosaque, and their avenger on the party of order. Weakened as they were by successive defeats before the 2d of December, and fully occupied as they were during the years 1852 and 1853, they have had time to watch the occasion when general causes and the universal discontent of all other classes would enable them to resume their revolutionary work anew.

The following Paris commercial report will throw some light on the social state of France:

"The state of commercial affairs in Paris during the last week is not satisfactory. Except the manufacturers who are preparing New Year's presents for the shop-keepers, and those employed in dress-making, trade appears to be at a complete standstill. One great cause of this is the dearness of provisions in the provinces, which prevents the mass of the population from making their usual purchases. The wheat crop, the chestnuts, and the vintage failed simultaneously in the central departments of France, and the peasants, being compelled to make sacrifices in order to buy bread, deprive themselves of everything but articles of first necessity. The provincial letters state that the principal portion of the cotton goods offered for sale at the late fairs found no buyers, which easily accounts for the stagnation in trade apparent at Rouen. All exportation is confined at present to the South American States. The markets of New-York and New Orleans are represented as glutted with French produce, and consequently no orders are expected from those quarters. The houses which fabricate generally for Belgium and Germany have almost all suspended their works, all orders from their correspondents abroad having ceased. [...] Business must be dull in Paris when the Bank of France finds, as it does at present, the commercial bills offered for discount decrease considerably in amount. The corn market, which was dull ten days since, with declining prices, has become animated, and the holders of wheat are more firm in their banks. The bakers have shown a greater inclination to purchase flour, and several buyers from the eastern departments have definitively arrested the downward tendency of prices. The corn factors in Paris not being able to execute all the orders received on Wednesday last, the buyers proceeded to Havre, where a decline of 2f. a barrel had previously been announced. Flour immediately on the arrival of the buyers rose from 44f. to 47f. the barrel, and wheat from 83f. to 86f. the measure of 200 kilogrammes. A similar rise took place in the markets through the department of the North. The corn market at Strasbourg has been well supplied, and wheat has declined 1f. the hectolitre; at Lyons the market was quiet, but without a fall. Rye has again risen in Paris; [...] sales 12,000 quintals of oats at 22f.9c. the 100 kilogrammes. A letter from Marseilles of the 2d inst., states that 341 ships, bearing 804,270 hectolitres of wheat

---

\[a\] A paraphrase of Napoleon's statement: "In fifty years Europe will be republican or Cossack" (cf. Karl Marx, _The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte_, present edition, Vol. 11, p. 182).—Ed.  
\[b\] The Economist has "... in their demands".—Ed.
entered that port between the 1st and 30th of November. These arrivals make 2,102,467 hectolitres of wheat imported into Marseilles by 714 ships, within the last 4 months."³

Written on December 13, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

³ "France", *The Economist*, No. 537, December 10, 1853.—*Ed.*
The most interesting and important piece of intelligence brought by the steamer *Africa* is the resignation of *Lord Palmerston* as a member of the Coalition Ministry under Lord Aberdeen.\(^{367}\) This is a master-stroke of that unscrupulous and consummate tactician. Those journals at London which speak for the Ministry, carefully inform the public that the event does not grow out of the Eastern difficulty, but that his conscientious Lordship, like a true guardian of the British Constitution, quits office because he cannot give his consent to a measure of Parliamentary Reform, even of the pigmy dimensions natural to such a Whig as Lord John Russell. Such is, indeed, the official motive of resignation he has condescended to communicate to his colleagues of the Coalition. But he has taken good care that the public shall have a different impression, and in spite of all the declarations of the official organs, it is generally believed that while the Reform Bill is the pretext, the Russian policy of the Cabinet is the real cause. Such has been for some time, and especially since the close of the last session of Parliament, the tenor of all the journals in his interest. On various keys, and in multiform styles, they have played a single tune, representing Lord Palmerston as vainly struggling against the influence of the Premier, and revolting at the ignominious part forced upon him in the Eastern drama. Rumors have been incessantly circulated concerning the division of the Ministry into two great parties, and nothing has been omitted to prepare the British public for an exhibition of characteristic energy from the chivalrous Viscount. The comedy having been thus introduced, the *mise en scène* arranged, the noble Lord, placed behind the curtain, has chosen, with astonishing sagacity, the exact
moment when his appearance on the stage would be most startling and effective.

Lord Palmerston secedes from his friends of the Coalition just as Austria has eagerly seized the proposition for new conferences; just as the Czar\textsuperscript{a} is spreading wider his nets of intrigue and war, effecting an armed collision between the Servians and Bosnians, and threatening the reigning prince of Servi\textsuperscript{b} with deposition should he persist in remaining neutral in the conflict; just as the Turks, relying on the presence of the British and French fleets, have suffered the destruction of a flotilla and the slaughter of 5,000 men by a Russian fleet three times as powerful; when Russian captains are allowed to defy the British law in British ports, and on board of British vessels; when the dynastic intrigues of the “spotless Queen” and her “German Consort”\textsuperscript{c} have become matters of public notoriety; and, lastly, when the dull British people, injured in their national pride abroad, and tortured by strikes, famine, and commercial stagnation at home, begin to assume a threatening attitude, and have nobody upon whom to avenge themselves but their own pitiful Government. By retiring at such a moment, Lord Palmerston throws off all responsibility from his own shoulders upon those of his late partners. His act becomes a great national event. He is transformed at once into the representative of the people against the Government from which he secedes. He not only saves his own popularity, but he gives the last finish to the unpopularity of his colleagues. The inevitable downfall of the present Ministry appearing to be his work, he becomes a necessary element of any that may succeed it. He not only deserts a doomed Cabinet, but he imposes himself on its successor.

Besides saving his popularity and securing a prominent place in the new administration, Lord Palmerston directly benefits the cause of Russia by withdrawing at the present momentous crisis. The Coalition Cabinet, at whose procrastinating ingenuity Russian diplomacy has mocked, whose Orleanist and Coburg predilections have ever been suspected by Bonaparte, whose treacherous and pusillanimous weakness begins even to be understood at Constantinople—this Ministry will now lose what little influence it may have retained in the councils of the world. An administration disunited, unpopular, not relied upon by its friends, nor respected

\textsuperscript{a} Nicholas I.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{b} Alexander Karageorgević.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{c} Queen Victoria and Prince Albert.— Ed.
by its foes; considered as merely provisional, and on the eve of
dissolution; whose very existence has become a matter of
doubt—such an administration is the least adapted to make the
weight of Great Britain felt in the balance of the European
powers. Lord Palmerston’s withdrawal reduces the Coalition, and
with it England herself, to a nullity as far as foreign policy is
concerned; and never has there existed an epoch when the
disappearance of England from the public stage, even for a week
or a fortnight, could do so much for the Autocrat. The pacific
element has triumphed over the warlike one in the councils of
Great Britain. Such is the interpretation that must be given at the
courts of Berlin, Paris and Vienna to Lord Palmerston’s resigna-
tion; and this interpretation they will press upon the Divan,
already shaken in its self-confidence by the last success of Russia,
and consulting under the guns of the united fleets.

It should not be forgotten that since Lord Palmerston became a
member of the Coalition Ministry, his public acts, as far as foreign
policy is concerned, have been limited to the famous gunpowder
plot, and the avowed employment of the British police as spies
against the political refugees; to a speech wherein he jocosely
treated the obstruction by Russia of the navigation of the Danube
as of no account; and, lastly, to the oration with which he
dismissed Parliament, assuring the Commons that all the Govern-
ment had done in the Eastern complication had been right—that
they might quietly disband since the Ministers remained at their
posts, and pledging himself “for the honor and good faith of the
Emperor of Russia.”

Besides the general causes we have enumerated, Lord Palmer-
ston has had a special reason for surprising the world with this last
act of self-sacrificing patriotism. He has been found out. His
prestige has begun to wane, his past career to be known to the
public. The people of England, who had not been undeceived by
his avowed participation in the conspiracy of the 2d of December,
which overthrew the French Republic, and by his gunpowder
comedy, have been aroused by the revelations of Mr. David
Urquhart, who has vigorously taken his Lordship in hand. This
gentleman, by a recently published work called the Progress of
Russia, by articles in the English journals, and especially by
speeches at the anti-Russian meetings held throughout the
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a See this volume, pp. 82-84.—Ed.
b July 7, 1853 (see this volume, p. 187).—Ed.
c On August 20, 1853.—Ed.
Kingdom, has struck a blow at the political reputation of Lord Palmerston which future history will but confirm. Our own labors in the cause of historical justice have also had a share, which we were far from counting upon, in the formation of a new opinion in England with regard to this busy and wily statesman. We learn from London, quite unexpectedly, that Mr. Tucker has reprinted there and gratuitously circulated fifty thousand copies of an elaborate article in which, some two months since, we exposed his Lordship’s true character and dragged the mask from his public career. The change in a public feeling is not a pleasing one for its subject, and he thinks perhaps, to escape from the rising tide of reprehension, or to suppress it by his present coup. We predict that it will not succeed, and that his lengthened career of official life will ere long come to a barren and unhappy end.

Written on December 16, 1853


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune

---

a [K. Marx] Palmerston and Russia, reprinted from the New-York Daily Tribune, where it was published as the third article in the series “Lord Palmerston” (see this volume, pp. 358-69).—Ed.
After a long delay we are at last in possession of official documents in relation to the two victories which Russia so loudly boasts of and so liberally rewards. We allude, of course, to the destruction of the Turkish squadron at Sinope and the engagement near Akhalzikh, in Asia. These documents are the Russian bulletins; but the fact that the Turkish official organ has maintained a profound silence on the subject, when its communications, if it had any to make, should have reached us before those from St. Petersburg, makes it certain that the Porte has nothing agreeable to publish. Accordingly we proceed, on the information we have, to analyse the events in question, in order to make our readers acquainted with the real state of the case.

The battle of Sinope was the result of such an unparalleled series of blunders on the part of the Turks that the whole affair can only be explained by the mischievous interference of Western diplomacy or by collusion with the Russians of some parties in Constantinople connected with the French and English Embassies. In November, the whole Turkish and Egyptian fleet proceeded to the Black Sea, in order to draw the attention of the Russian Admirals from an expedition sent to the coast of the Caucasus in order to land supplies of arms and ammunition for the insurgent mountaineers. The fleet remained eighteen days at sea without meeting with a single Russian man-of-war; some say the Russian squadron never left Sebastopol during all that time, whereby the

---

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to the publication of news, with comments, from Russian newspapers of December 23, 1853 in the English press, notably The Times, No. 21619 and The Morning Herald, No. 22349. — Ed.
expedition to the Caucasus was enabled to effect its object; others report that, being well informed of the plans of the Turks, it withdrew eastward, and merely watched the vessels conveying stores, which, in consequence, never reached the Caucasian shore, and had to return to Sinope, while the main fleet reentered the Bosphorus. The great amount of powder on board the Sinope squadron, which caused the explosion of several of them at a comparatively early period of the engagement, appears to be a proof that the latter version is correct.

Thus seven Turkish frigates, two steamers, three sloops, and one or two smaller ships, together with some transports, were abandoned in the harbor of Sinope, which is little better than an open roadstead, formed by a bay open towards the sea, and protected by a few neglected and ill-constructed batteries, the best of which was a castle constructed at the time of the Greek Emperors, and most likely before artillery was known in Europe. How it happened that a squadron of some three hundred guns, mostly of inferior caliber, was thus abandoned to the tender mercies of a fleet of three times its force and weight of metal, at that point of the Turkish shore, which from its proximity to Sebastopol is most exposed to a Russian attack, while the main fleet was enjoying the tranquil ripple of the Bosphorus, we have yet to learn. We know that the dangerous position of this squadron was well appreciated and warmly debated at headquarters; that the discordant voices of Turkish, French and British admirals, were loudly heard in the councils of war, and that the ever-meddling ambassadors were there also, in order to speak their minds upon the matter, but nothing was done.

In the meantime it appears, according to one statement, that an Austrian steamer reported at Sebastopol the position of the squadron. The Russian official report maintains on the contrary, that Nachimoff while cruising off the coast of Asia, descried the squadron, and took measures to attack it. But, if the Russians descried the Turks at Sinope, the Turks from the tower and minarets of the town must necessarily have descried the Russians long before. How then came it to pass that the Turkish batteries were in such bad trim, when a couple of days' labor might have done a great deal toward their repair? How happened it that the Turkish vessels were at anchor in places where they obstructed the fire of the batteries, and were not shifted to moorings more fit to meet the threatened danger? There was time enough for all this; for Admiral Nachimoff states that he first sent to Sebastopol for three three-deckers before he ventured the attack. Six days, from
November 24 to November 30, would not have been allowed to
eclipse without some effort on the part of the Turks: but indeed,
the report of the Turkish steamer Taïf, which escaped to
Constantinople, amply proves that the Turks were taken by
surprise. So far, then, the Russian report cannot be correct.

Admiral Nachimoff had under his command three ships-of-the-
line, one of them a three-decker, six frigates, several steamers, and
six or eight smaller vessels, a force of at least twice the weight of
metal of the Turkish squadron. Yet he did not attack until he got
three more three-deckers, which, by themselves, should have been
quite sufficient to perform the exploit. With this disproportionate
superiority he proceeded to the assault. A fog, or as some say, the
use of the British flag, enabled him to approach unmolested to a
distance of 500 yards. Then the fight began. The Russians, not
liking to stand under canvas on a lee shore, dropped their
anchors. Then the firing from the two moored fleets, without any
naval maneuvers, and having rather the character of a cannonade
on shore, went on for four hours. The possibility of doing away
with all naval tactics, with all movements, was very favorable to the
Russians, whose Black Sea fleet, manned almost exclusively with
"land-lubbers," and especially with Polish Jews, might have had
very poor success if opposed to the well-manned Turkish ships in
deep water. Four hours were required by the Russians before they
could silence the feeble ships of their opponents. They had,
besides, this advantage, that any stray shot on their part would do
harm either in the batteries or in the town, and what a number of
misses, in comparison to the hits, they must have made, appears
from the almost total destruction of the place, accomplished long
before the hostile fleet was silenced. The Russian report says only
the Turkish quarter was burnt down, and that the Greek quarter
escaped as if by miracle. This is, however, contradicted by better
authority, which states that the whole town is in ruins.

Three Turkish frigates were burnt during the action, four were
run ashore and burnt afterwards, along with one steamer and the
smaller vessels. The steamer Taïf, however, cut her cables, boldly
steamed through the Russian lines, and escaped to Constantinople,
although chased by Admiral Korniloff with three Russian steamers.
Considering the clumsiness of Russian naval maneuvers, the
bad position of the Turkish fleet in front, and in the line of fire,
of their own batteries, and above all the absolute certainty of
destruction, it would have perhaps been better if the whole Turkish

\[1\] Published in *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 356. December 22, 1853.—*Ed.*
squadron had got under weigh and borne down as far as the wind permitted upon the enemy. The ruin of some, which could by no means be avoided, might have saved at least a portion of the squadron. Of course the direction of the wind must have decided as to such a maneuver, but it seems doubtful whether Osman Pasha ever thought of such a step at all.

The victory of Sinope has no glory for the Russians, while the Turks fought with almost unheard of bravery; not a single ship having struck its flag during the whole action. And this loss of a valuable portion of their naval force, the momentary conquest of the Black Sea, and the dejecting moral consequences of such an event upon the Turkish population, army and navy, is entirely due to the "good offices" of Western diplomacy, which prevented the Turkish fleet from standing out and protecting or fetching home the Sinope squadron. And it is equally due to the secret information given to the Russians enabling them to strike the blow with certainty and safety.

The second victory of which the Russians boast, came off at Akhalzikh, in Armenia. The Turks have for some time past been checked in the offensive movements which they had effected on the Georgian frontier. Since the taking of Shefkatil, or St. Nicholas, not a place of any importance has been taken, nor any victory gained of more than ephemeral effect. And this in a country where the Russians must fight under all imaginable disadvantages, where their land communications with Russia are reduced to two roads infested by insurgent Circassians, where their sea communications might very easily be cut off or endangered, and where the Transcaucasian country occupied by them, with Tiflis for its centre, might be considered more as an independent state than as part and parcel of a mighty empire.

How is this check of the Turkish advance to be explained? The Turks accuse Abdi Pasha of treason and have recalled him; and certainly it is very curious that Abdi Pasha is the only Turkish General in Asia, who has been allowed by the Russians to gain local and partial victories. But there are two mistakes on the part of the Turks which explain the want of success in the beginning and the actual defeat in due course afterward. They have spread and divided their army upon all the long line from Batum to Bayazid; their masses are nowhere strong enough for a concentric attack upon Tiflis, though part of them are at the present moment, enjoying the undisputed and useless possession of the city of Erivan. The country is barren and rocky, and it may be difficult to feed a large army there; but quick concentration of all
resources and rapid movements are the best means against famine in an army. Two corps, one for covering Batum and attacking on the coastline, another for a direct march upon Tiflis through the valley of the Kura would have been sufficient. But the Turkish forces have been divided and subdivided without any necessity whatever, and to the almost entire disabling of every one of the different corps.

In the second place, the inactivity in which diplomacy held the Turkish fleet allowed the Russians to land two divisions of infantry (of the 5th corps) in Mingrelia, and thus to reenforce Prince Woronzoff's Caucasian army by nearly 20,000 men. Thus strengthened, he not only arrested the Turks on the coast, but has now had the satisfaction of seeing a corps under Gen. Andronnikoff deliver the beleaguered fortress of Akhalzikh, and beat the enemy on the open field near that town. The Russians pretend that with about 10,000 men they have routed 18,000 Turks; of course we cannot rely upon such statements; but must confess that the great number of irregulars in the Turkish Anatolian army and the almost total absence of European officers, particularly in the higher commands and on the staff, must make them but a poor match for an equal number of Russians. The Russians pretend they have taken ten or twelve pieces of cannon, which may be true, as in that impassable country the vanquished party must necessarily abandon most of its guns; at the same time they confess they have made only 120 prisoners. This amounts to a confession that they have massacred almost all the wounded on the field of battle, they being necessarily left in their hands. Besides, they prove that their measures for pursuit and intercepting the retreat of at least part of the enemy, must have been wretchedly planned. They had plenty of cavalry; a bold charge into the midst of the fugitives would have cut off whole battalions. But this action offers, so far as our reports go, but little military or political interest.

On the Danube, the Russians have done nothing more than repeat the affair by which they opened the campaign, at Matchin, a fort, or a projecting rock opposite Braila. They appear to have made little impression. We have also, on good authority, a detailed statement of the Turkish troops concentrated at Widin. They consist of 34,000 infantry, 4,000 cavalry, and 2,000 artillery, with 66 field-guns, besides heavy artillery on the walls of Widin, and on the redoubts of Kalafat. Thus, 40,000 Turks are wasted in order to occupy the direct route from Bucharest into Servia. Forty thousand men, chained down to extensive fortifications which they
have to defend, are too few to withstand the attack of a large army, and a great deal too many to defeat roving expeditions of small bodies. With the force already collected at Shumla, these 40,000 men would there be worth twice their number elsewhere. Their absence, next to diplomatic interference, ruined the operation of Oltenitza. It is impossible that Omer Pasha should not know, that if he stands with 100,000 men between Silistra and Rustchuk, the Russians, in numbers sufficient to do mischief, will never attempt to pass by him in order to throw themselves into the mountains of Servia. Such a disposition of his troops cannot accord with his judgment, and he must chafe desperately at the maleficent influences which force it upon him.

Written about December 23, 1853

Frederick Engels

THE EUROPEAN WAR

At last, the long-pending question of Turkey appears to have reached a stage where diplomacy will not much longer be able to monopolize the ground for its ever-shifting, ever-cowardly, and ever-resultless movements. The French and British fleets have entered the Black Sea in order to prevent the Russian Navy from doing harm either to the Turkish fleet or the Turkish coast. The Czar Nicholas long since declared that such a step would be, for him, the signal for a declaration of war. Will he now stand it quietly?

It is not to be expected that the combined fleets will at once attack and destroy either the Russian squadron or the fortifications and navy-yards of Sebastopol. On the contrary, we may rest assured that the instructions which diplomacy has provided for the two Admirals\(^a\) are so contrived as to evade, as much as possible, the chance of a collision. But naval and military movements, once ordered, are subject not to the desires and plans of diplomacy, but to laws of their own which cannot be violated without endangering the safety of the whole expedition. Diplomacy never intended the Russians to be beaten at Oltenitz; but a little latitude once given to Omer Pasha, and military movements once begun, the action of the two hostile commanders was carried on in a sphere which was to a great extent uncontrollable by the Ambassadors at Constantinople. Thus, the fleets once removed from their moorings in the Beikoz roads, there is no telling how soon they may find themselves in a position from which Lord Aberdeen’s prayers for
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\(^a\) J. W. Dundas and F. Hamelin.— Ed.
peace, or Lord Palmerston's collusion with Russia cannot draw them, and where they will have to choose between an infamous retreat or a resolute struggle. A narrow land-locked sea like the Euxine, where the opposing navies can hardly contrive to get out of sight of each other, is precisely the locality in which conflicts under such circumstances, may become necessary almost daily. And it is not to be expected that the Czar will allow, without opposition, his fleet to be blockaded in Sebastopol.

If, then, a European war is to follow from this step, it will be in all likelihood a war between Russia on one hand, and England, France and Turkey on the other. The event is probable enough to warrant us in comparing the chances of success and striking the balance of active strength on each side, so far as we can do so.

But will Russia stand alone? What part will Austria, Prussia and the German and Italian States, their dependants, take in a general war? It is reported that Louis Bonaparte has notified the Austrian Government that if in case of a conflict with Russia, Austria should side with that power, the French Government would avail itself of the elements of insurrection which in Italy and Hungary only require a spark to be kindled again into a raging fire, and that then the restoration of Italian and Hungarian nationality would be attempted by France. Such a threat may have its effect upon Austria; it may contribute to keep her neutral as long as possible, but it is not to be expected that Austria will long be enabled to keep aloof from such a struggle, should it come to pass. The very fact of the threat having been uttered, may call forth partial insurrectionary movements in Italy, which could not but make Austria a still more dependant and still more subservient vassal of Russia. And then, after all, has not this Napoleonic game\(^372\) been played once already? Is it to be expected that the man who restored the Pope\(^a\) to his temporal throne,\(^373\) and who has a candidate cut-and-dried for the Neapolitan monarchy,\(^b\) will give to the Italians what they want as much as independence from Austria—unity? Is it to be expected that the Italian people will rush headlong into such a snare? No doubt they are sorely oppressed by Austrian rule, but they will not be very anxious to contribute to the glory of an Empire, which is already tottering in its native soil of France, and of a man who was the first to combat their own revolution. The Austrian Government knows all this, and therefore we may assume that it will be more influenced by its
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\(^a\) Pius IX.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Napoléon Lucien Charles Murat, son of Joachim Murat, Marshal of France and King of Naples.—\textit{Ed.}
own financial embarrassments than by these Bonapartistic threats; we may also be certain that at the decisive moment, the influence of the Czar will be paramount at Vienna, and will entangle Austria on the side of Russia.

Prussia is attempting the same game which she played in 1780, 1800 and 1805. Her plan is to form a league of neutral Baltic, or North German, States, at the head of which she can perform a part of some importance, and turn to whichever side offers her the greatest advantages. The almost comical uniformity with which all these attempts have ended by throwing the greedy, vacillating and pusillanimous Prussian Government into the arms of Russia, belongs to history. It is not to be expected that Prussia will now escape her habitual fate. She will put out feelers in every direction, offer herself at public auction, intrigue in both camps, swallow camels and strain at gnats, lose whatever character may perchance yet be left to her, get beaten, and at last be knocked down to the lowest bidder, who, in this and in every other instance, will be Russia. She will not be an ally, but an incumbrance to Russia, for she will take care to have her army destroyed beforehand, for her own account and gratification.

Until at least one of the German Powers is involved in a European war, the conflict can only rage in Turkey, on the Black Sea and in the Baltic. The naval struggle must, during this period, be the most important. That the allied fleets can destroy Sebastopol and the Russian Black Sea fleet; that they can take and hold the Crimea, occupy Odessa, close the Sea of Azov, and let loose the mountaineers of the Caucasus, there is no doubt. With rapid and energetic action nothing is more easy. Supposing this to occupy the first month of active operations, another month might bring the steamers of the combined fleets to the British Channel, leaving the sailing vessels to follow; for the Turkish fleet would then be capable of doing all the work which might be required in the Black Sea. To coal in the Channel and make other preparations, might take another fortnight; and then, united to the Atlantic and Channel fleets of France and Britain, they might appear before the end of May in the roads of Kronstadt in such a force as to assure the success of an attack. The measures to be taken in the Baltic are as self-evident as those in the Black Sea. They consist in an alliance, at any price, with Sweden; an act of intimidation against Denmark, if necessary; an insurrection in Finland, which would break out upon landing a sufficient number of troops and a guarantee that no peace would be concluded except upon the condition of this province being reunited to
Sweden. The troops landed in Finland would menace Petersburg, while the fleets should bombard Kronstadt. This place is certainly very strong by its position. The channel of deep water leading up to the roads will hardly admit of two men-of-war abreast presenting their broadsides to the batteries, which are established not only on the main island, but on smaller rocks, banks and islands about it. A certain sacrifice, not only of men, but of ships, is unavoidable. But if this be taken into account in the very plan of the attack, if it be once resolved that such and such a ship must be sacrificed, and if the plan be carried out vigorously and unflinchingly, Kronstadt must fall. The masonry of its battlements cannot for any length of time withstand the concentrated fire of heavy Paixhans guns, that most destructive of all arms when employed against stone walls. Large screw-steamers, with a full complement of such guns amid ships, would very soon produce an irresistible effect, though of course they would in the attempt risk their own existence. But what are three or four screw-ships of the line in comparison with Kronstadt, the key of the Russian Empire, whose possession would leave St. Petersburg without defense.

Without Odessa, Kronstadt, Riga, Sebastopol, with Finland emancipated, and a hostile army at the gates of the capital, with all her rivers and harbors closed up, what would Russia be? A giant without arms, without eyes, with no other resource than trying to crush her opponents under the weight of her clumsy torso, thrown here and there at random wherever a hostile battle-cry was heard. If the maritime powers of Europe should act thus resolutely and vigorously, then Prussia and Austria might so far be relieved from the control of Russia that they might even join the allies. For both the German powers, if secure at home, would be ready to profit by the embarrassments of Russia. But it is not to be expected that Lord Aberdeen and M. Drouyn de Lhuyss should attempt such energetic steps. The powers that be are not for striking their blows home, and if a general war breaks out, the energy of the commanders will be shackled so as to render them innocuous. If nevertheless, decisive victories occur, care will be taken that it is by mere chance, and that their consequences are as harmless as possible for the enemy.

The war on the Asiatic shore of the Black Sea might at once be put an end to by the fleets; that on the European side would go on comparatively uninterrupted. The Russians, beaten out of the Black Sea, deprived of Odessa and Sebastopol, could not cross the Danube without great risk (except in the direction of Servia, for insurrectionary purposes), but they might very well hold the
Principalities, until superior forces and the risk of large bodies of troops being landed on their flank and rear should drive them out of Wallachia. Moldavia they need not evacuate without a general action, for flank and rear demonstrations would there be of little importance, as long as Chotin and Kishinev offered them a safe communication with Russia.

But as long as the war is confined to the Western Powers and Turkey on the one hand, and Russia on the other, it will not be a European war such as we have seen since 1792. However, let it once commence, and the indolence of the Western Powers and the activity of Russia will soon compel Austria and Prussia to decide for the Autocrat. Prussia will probably be of no great account, as it is more than likely that her army, whatever its capacities may be, will be wasted by presumption at some second Jena.376 Austria, notwithstanding her bankrupt condition, notwithstanding the insurrections that may occur in Italy and Hungary, will be no contemptible opponent. Russia herself obliged to keep up her army in the Principalities, and on the Caucasian frontier, to occupy Poland, to have an army for the defense of the Baltic coast, and especially of St. Petersburg and Finland, will have very few troops to spare for offensive operations. If Austria, Russia and Prussia (always supposing the latter not yet put to rout), can muster five or six hundred thousand men on the Rhine and the Alps, it will be more than can be reasonably expected. And for five hundred thousand allies, the French alone are a match, supposing them to be led by Generals not inferior to those of their opponents, among whom the Austrians alone possess commanders worthy of the name. The Russian Generals are not formidable, and as to the Prussians, they have no Generals at all; their officers are hereditary subalterns.

But we must not forget that there is a sixth power in Europe, which at given moments asserts its supremacy over the whole of the five so-called "Great" Powers and makes them tremble, every one of them. That power is the Revolution. Long silent and retired, it is now again called to action by the commercial crisis, and by the scarcity of food. From Manchester to Rome, from Paris to Warsaw and Pesth, it is omnipresent, lifting up its head and awaking from its slumbers. Manifold are the symptoms of its returning life, everywhere visible in the agitation and disquietude which have seized the proletarian class. A signal only is wanted, and this sixth and greatest European power will come forward, in shining armor, and sword in hand, like Minerva from the head of the Olympian. This signal the impending European war will give,
and then all calculations as to the balance of power will be upset by the addition of a new element which, ever buoyant and youthful, will as much baffle the plans of the old European Powers, and their Generals, as it did from 1792 to 1800.

Written on January 8, 1854

First published simultaneously in English in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3992, February 2, 1854, as a leader, and in German in Die Reform, February 3 and 4, 1854

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
The charge against Mr. Szemere of having revealed the place where the Hungarian crown was concealed, was first brought forward by the Vienna Soldatenfreund, the avowed organ of the Austrian police, and this single fact should have sufficed to prove the falsehood of the accusation.

The police is not used to gratuitously denounce its own accomplices, while it is one of its habitual tricks to throw suspicion on the innocent, in order to cover the culpable. A man of the standing and the influence of Mr. Szemere would be the very last to be spontaneously sacrificed by the Austrian police, had they been able to secure his cooperation. If the secret was not betrayed by the indiscretion of one of the agents of Mr. Kossuth—a case by no means improbable—I cannot but suspect the Count K. Batthyány, now resident at Paris, of having been the traitor. He was one of the very few persons initiated into the secret of the place where the regalia were hidden, and he is the only man among them who has applied to the Vienna Court for an amnesty. This last fact I have reason to suppose, he will not deny.

Lord Hardinge, the British Commander-in-Chief, has been prevailed upon to withdraw his resignation. As to the Duke of Norfolk, we are informed by the correspondent of The Dublin Evening Mail, that

"a bit of Palace gossip has got wind. [...] A certain noble Duke, who holds an office at Court, in commendam, with the highest hereditary feudal dignity in the State, made a little too free, it is said, with the champagne at the Royal table, the result of which was the loss of his most noble equilibrium in the dining-room, and the involvement of Majesty itself in the catastrophe. [...] The consequence of this
annoying contretemps has been the resignation of the noble Duke and the appointment of Earl Spencer as Lord High Steward of her Majesty's Household."^a

Mr. Sadleir, the broker of the Irish brigade, has again tendered his resignation of his ministerial post, which has this time been accepted by Lord Aberdeen. His position had become untenable after the public disclosures made before an Irish court of law as to the scandalous means by which he had contrived to get into Parliament. The control of the Cabinet of all the Talents over the Irish brigade will not be strengthened by this untoward event.

The bread-riots which occurred on Friday and Saturday at Crediton, Devonshire,^79 were a sort of popular answer to the glowing descriptions of prosperity which the ministerial and free trade papers thought fit to amuse their readers with at the obsequies of the year 1853.

The Patrie states from Trebizond that the Russian Chargé d'Affaires at Teheran, having demanded the dismissal of two of the most popular Ministers of the Shah of Persia, the people became excited, and the Commander of the Guard said he would not answer for public tranquillity if this demand were complied with. According to this account, it was the dread of an explosion from the dislike of the people for Russia that induced the Shah to renew his relations with the Chargé d'Affaires of England.

To the huge mass of diplomatic papers, communicated to the public, are now added a Note of the four Powers dated the 12th of December and jointly addressed by their respective Ambassadors at Constantinople to the Porte, and a new circular of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys to the French diplomatic agents, dated Paris, Dec. 30. On perusing the Note of the four Powers, we understand the extreme agitation which prevailed at Constantinople after the acceptance of the Note by the Porte became known, the insurrectionary movement occurring on the 21st, and the necessity the Turkish Ministry was placed in, solemnly to proclaim that the operations of the war would not be interrupted nor interfered with by the renewed peace negotiations. Just nine days after the intelligence of the treacherous and cowardly butchery at Sinope had reached Constantinople and aroused throughout the Ottoman Empire one tremendous cry for revenge, the four Powers coolly invite, and the Ambassadors of Great Britain and France force, the Porte to enter into negotiations with the Czar, the base of which is

---

that all the ancient treaties shall be renewed; that the firmans relative to the spiritual privileges octroyed by the Sultan to his Christian subjects, shall be accompanied by new assurances given to each of these Powers, consequently to the Czar; that the Porte shall name a plenipotentiary to establish an armistice; that it shall allow Russia to erect a church and a hospital at Jerusalem and pledge itself to the Powers, consequently to the Czar, to ameliorate its internal administrative system. The Porte shall not only not receive any indemnity at all for the heavy losses it has undergone consequent on the piratical acts of the Muscovite; all the chains in which Russia has made Turkey dance for a quarter of a century, shall not only be forged anew, but the prisoner shall be kept closer than before; the Porte shall lay itself at the mercy of the Autocrat by giving him humble assurances with regard to the firmans relative to the spiritual privileges of its Christian subjects, and pledging itself to him with regard to its internal administrative system; thus surrendering at once the religious protectorate and the dictation over its civil government to the Czar. In compensation for such a surrender the Porte receives the promise of "the most speedy evacuation possible of the Principalities," the invasion of which Lord Clanricarde declared to be "an act of piracy," and the assurance that the preamble of the treaty of July 13, 1841—which has proved so trustworthy a safeguard against Russia—shall be formally confirmed.

Although the unfathomable abjectness of these pitiful "Powers" reached its highest possible pitch in frightening, some days after the event of Sinope, the Porte into a negotiation on such bases, they will not get rid of their embarrassment in this sneaking way. The Czar has gone too far to suffer even the appearance of his pretended exclusive protectorate over the Christian subjects of Turkey to be supplanted by a European one, and already we are informed by the Vienna correspondent of The Times that

"Austria has demanded whether the Russian Court would object to a European protectorate over the Christians in Turkey. The reply, in most positive language, was that Russia would permit no other power to meddle in the matter of the Greek Church. Russia had treaties with the Porte, and would settle the question with her alone."

We are also informed by The Standard that

---

a Quoted from Clanricarde's speech in the House of Lords on August 8, 1853, published by The Times, No. 21502, August 9, 1853. — Ed.

h "Vienna, Sunday afternoon", The Times, No. 21633, January 9, 1854. — Ed.
“Nicholas will not accept any proposition not proceeding directly from the Turkish sovereign individually, thus rejecting any right of mediation or interference on the part of the European Powers—an insult to those Powers which none can regard as unmerited.”

The only important passage of the circular of Monsieur Drouyn de Lhuys is that announcing the entrance of the united squadrons into the Black Sea, with a view to

“combine their movements in such a manner as to prevent the territory or the flag of Turkey from being the object of any fresh attack on the part of the naval forces of Russia.”

Non bis in idem. La moutarde après la viande. The Morning Chronicle of yesterday published a telegraphic dispatch from its correspondent at Constantinople, dated the 30th, stating that the combined fleets had entered the Black Sea.

“The fleets may enter the Black Sea,” says The Daily News, “only to do what they have been doing in the Bosphorus—nothing.”

According to The Press,

“Orders have already been sent out for one ship from the English and one from the French fleet to enter the Black Sea, and under flag of truce to enter Sebastopol. When there they are to inform the Russian Admiral that if he leaves the port of Sebastopol he will be immediately fired into.”

Although the Russian fleet, at this not very propitious season, and after their glorious exploit at Sinope, have nothing whatever to call them out into the Black Sea, the Czar will not allow England and France to exclude him, even temporarily, from waters from which he has succeeded in excluding them ever since 1833. His prestige would be gone were he not to answer this communication by a declaration of war.

“A declaration of war of Russia against France and England,” says the Neue Preussische Zeitung, “is more probable than a speedy peace between Russia and Turkey.”

At Newry (Ulster), a great meeting was held for the purpose of taking into consideration the unprovoked aggression of Russia against Turkey. I am glad to be enabled, through the friendly communication from Mr. Urquhart of the Newry report, to give your readers the most remarkable passages of that gentleman’s speech. Having explained, on several occasions, my own views of the Oriental question, I need not point out those topics on which I

---

None can be punished twice for the same crime. Mustard after the supper.—Ed.
must disagree from Mr. Urquhart. Let me only remark that his views are confirmed by the intelligence that

"the peasants of Lesser Wallachia, assisted by the Wallachian soldiery, have risen against the Russians. The whole country in the environs of Kalafat and along the left shore of the Danube, is in motion. The Russian functionaries have evacuated Turmal."

After some introductory remarks Mr. Urquhart said:

..."In those matters which affect our gravest interests and intercourse with foreign States, there is neither restraint of law, nor guidance of system, there is no responsibility to the nation, no penalties for the omission of any duty, or for the perpetration of any crime; you are entirely destitute of all Constitutional means of restraint, because you are either kept in ignorance or you are misinformed. This system is, therefore, one calculated to pervert the nation, to corrupt the Government and to endanger the State. Meanwhile, you are opposed to a Government, the most crafty and systematic, the most hostile and unscrupulous, and which has worked its way to that preeminence of power by which it threatens the world, through the use which it has been enabled to make of the very Governments which it labors to overthrow—and there is this peculiarity in our condition, as there was formerly in that of Athens—that Russia has found or formed the chief instruments of her greatness in the breast of that State, whose public councils most opposed her policy. There is for this a substantive reason that England in such matters is the black spot of ignorance. The United States has a President, and he exercises the due prerogatives of royalty; there is a Senate which controls the executive, and has prior knowledge of its acts. [Hear, hear and cheers.] In France, there have been repeatedly Committees of Parliament, to investigate the national transactions, calling for documents, and bringing before them the Foreign Minister for examination. There, too, the nation is alert, according, at least, to its knowledge, and so is the Government; for on such matters hinge the existence of ministries and of dynasties. In Austria, there is at least a monarch, and he has knowledge of the acts of his servants. In Turkey and in Russia, you see that in one country the feeling of the people constrains the Government, and in the other the Government represents the will of the nation. England alone remains with a Crown without authority, with a Government without system, with a Parliament without control, and a nation without knowledge. [Hear, hear.] Reverting now to the application of this state of things, to the facts before us, I have first to tell you—and it is the salient matter—that Russia has no force to effect her threats, and that she has calculated merely upon the facility of terrifying you by groundless fears, that she has had no purpose whatever of making war on Turkey, that she has no means for doing so, that she has not even made disposition for such an object, that she has calculated upon you restraining Turkey, so that she might occupy her provinces, and calculates further upon you for forcing from that State such compliance with insolent demands as shall break up the Ottoman Empire. [Hear, hear.] It is by your Ambassador in Constantinople and by your squadron in the Bosphorus that she is about to achieve her ends. And here I must advert to a statement made by my gallant friend Colonel Chesney, and at the same time supply an omission which he has made. He stated, that as matters stood before the Pruth was crossed, Turkey was more than a match for Russia, but he did not give you the high estimate he entertains and has expressed of the military qualities of the Turks. He stated, even at the present moment, and with all the immense advantages which you have enabled Russia to acquire, he was still in doubt whether

---

a Stratford de Redcliffe.—Ed.
Turkey was not a match for Russia. On this point I have not the shadow of a doubt, if you grant me two conditions—the first, that your Ambassador and your squadron are withdrawn, the second, that Turkey recovers its emasculating reliance on foreigners. But after that came another statement, doubtfully indeed made, but which from his high authority, and there is no higher authority in these matters—may carry an undue weight or bear an unjustifiable interpretation. He said that the moment might be at present favorable for Russia, because the Danube was frozen, and she might push her forces across into Bulgaria. But what forces has she got to push into Bulgaria? Europe has for many months given need to exaggerated statements: we have been industriously informed of the vast accumulations of her forces prepared to come in action. They were currently rated at 150,000 men, and the people were ready to believe that 150,000 men sufficed for the conquest of Turkey. I received some time ago an official statement which reduced to 80,000 men the whole number that had crossed the Pruth, of which between 20,000 or 30,000 had already perished by disease or were in hospital. The statement was sent by me to one of the newspapers, but was not inserted, being considered incredible. Russia has now published her own statement, reducing the entire number to 70,000 men. [Cheers.] Putting aside then the relative strength of both Empires, if all their forces were brought up, it must be clear that Russia had no intention of making war with such an amount of force as this. Now what was the force which Turkey had to oppose? No less than, at the time referred to, 180,000 men between the Balkan and the Danube, now increased to 200,000 men in strong, fortified positions, with a Russian force reduced to 50,000 men at the outside, and these demoralized by defeat and infected by desertion. As to the qualities of the Turkish troops and their superiority to the Russians, you have heard the testimony of General Bern; you have the living testimony of Colonel Chesney—confirmed by the events which have filled Europe with astonishment and admiration. Observe we are not now upon the point of the relative power of the two Empires but of that of the intention and mode of proceeding of the one—Russia. My argument is that she did not propose making war; because on the one hand, she had not upon the spot the requisite force, and, on the other, that she could reckon on the Cabinet of England. Russia had no intention of making war—she has no intention now. This is what I have stated before the war—that she would enter and occupy the Principalities by the aid of England. How have I been able to prognosticate? Not, certainly, by the knowledge of Russia's designs, which thousands know as well or better than me, but by the knowledge of England's character. But let us reconsider the case—it is too important to pass it over. Colonel Chesney said that the real question was the reserve which Russia had behind the Pruth. Of that reserve he had heard lately a great deal. Osten-Sacken, with his 50,000 men, was on full march on the Danube to retrieve the disaster of Oltenitz. Now, the 50,000 men dwindled to 18,000, and the best of all is, that even they have not arrived. [Laughter and cheering.] Taking then Colonel Chesney's number, 75,000, reduced by deaths and sickness to 50,000, and throwing into these the 18,000 of ubiquitous reserve, we shall only have, after all, 70,000 men to operate against 200,000 strongly entrenched and in a mountainous region, and at a season of the year when hitherto the Russians have invariably retired from the field.

"Now let me recall the events of the late war in 1828 and '29. Turkey was then in convulsions. Then Mussulman's sword was turned against Mussulmans; the provinces were in revolt, Greece in insurrection, the old military force annihilated, the new conscripts scarcely disciplined, and amounting only to 33,000 men. The command of the Black Sea wrecked from Turkey by British broadsides, delivered in full force in the harbor of Navarino," and then it was that Russia, backed by England and France, made a spring upon Turkey and reached the center of her provinces before she knew that war was declared. And how many men do you think she then judged it prudent to employ? Two hundred and sixteen thousand. [Cheers.] And yet it was only by deception and through the influence of the
English Ambassador, who unfortunately had returned, that she was seduced to sign that treaty of Adrianople that was surprised from her. [Hear, hear.] Look at Turkey now, united in heart and feeling, with a heroism inspired at once by the love of country and detestation of outrages—with united authority, ample resources, able to dispose of 300,000 volunteers, of the most martial character to be found on the face of the earth—of 250,000 disciplined troops—victorious in Asia—with the command of the Black Sea—not lost, be it observed, as I shall presently show, at Sinope—with steam to convey, without loss of men or time, her contingents to the scene of action from the remotest provinces of the Empire, from the snowy heights of the Caucasus to the arid deserts of Arabia, from the wastes of Africa to the Persian Gulf—one spirit of indignation prevails—of manhood has been aroused. [Hear and cheers.] Yes, but as in the former war, a Navarino brought the Cossacks across the Balkan; so now may the screw propellers of Britain, even without war, bring Russian hulks to the Dardanelles. But I am speaking of Russian intentions. That is the point. It is in Downing-st. that this victory is to be achieved, and not in the East. Meanwhile, are you unscathed? Is there a man before me who does not suffer in substance? Is there one the price of whose bread is not enhanced, whose employment, or the employment of his capital is not curtailed? [Hear, hear.] Whose taxes are not increased? Is not Change-alley convulsed? Have we not seen by this movement of Russian troops a disturbance of the money market produced equal to two-thirds of that experienced in 1847—and yet Russia has never intended war. Have we not seen the Governments of Europe degraded and the ground-work laid of insurrections and convulsions—and yet Russia never intended war. Have we not seen the Ottoman Empire exhausting itself by an enormous military establishment of half a million of men, because Russia has displaced 70,000 troops to feed at her expense and at the expense of the operatives of Great Britain? And all this because you have believed people easy of belief that Russia was so strong that she could not be resisted—Turkey so weak that she could not be supported. Really we live in an age of dreams and of fables; we are men not to believe this only, we are men to believe that Russia is more powerful than all the powers of the world banded against her. The Times makes light of the army of Moslems, makes equally light of the armies of France and the navies of England, and gravely tells us that all Europe and Turkey to boot may as soon attempt to keep the Russians out of Constantinople, as to keep the north winds from blowing across the Sarmatian Plains. And the argument as regards Europe is just as good as respecting Turkey; yet Turkey will fall, if you persevere. Russia has displaced 70,000 men, and in consequence Turkey is moved with terror and indignation—England convulsed with fear and panic—Russia, too, convulsed with shouts of laughter. [Laughter and prolonged cheering.] I have said I would revert to the affair of Sinope, or as it has been justly termed, the little Navarino. I don't refer to that ungraceful event in reference to our conduct—for we have done in this nothing more disgraceful than in the rest—but I refer to it as bearing upon the relative strength of the two parties. So considered, it has added nothing to Russia's power, and taken nothing from that of Turkey, but the reverse. It has placed in the most unmistakable light the justifiable fears of the Russians of Turkish prowess. Here we have seen a fact without parallel even in our own naval annals—frigates laying themselves alongside line-of-battle ships, and commanders casting the torch into the powder magazine, and offering themselves up for holocaust on their country's shrine. What may not be achieved against a Government which in every act, and especially in this, is the object of abhorrence and disgust to every human being. Observe that the maritime force of Turkey is untouched; not a line-of-battle ship, not a steamer has been sacrificed. Now she is doubly insured in the command of the Black Sea if the diplomats are withdrawn;

---

\[a\] A street in London where the Stock Exchange is situated.—Ed.
and it is they, and they alone, who have produced the so-called disaster of Sinope. But that disaster was prepared for another end; it was as a rod and a goad to urge the lagging beasts of burden in Paris and in London, and to drive them into enforcing the terms of settlement upon the belligerents. Before I entered this meeting, I heard it stated by a gentleman of the Committee, that it was perfectly competent for England and France to interpose between them if they expected by so doing to secure peace. I know that what he has stated is the general impression throughout this land, but I did not the less on that account listen to him with horror. Who gave you the right to go about the world enforcing peace by arms? It is one thing to resist aggression, it is another thing to commit it. [Hear, hear!] You cannot interpose even to save Turkey, save by declaring war against Russia. Your interposition, however, will be for Russia's behalf, and at her dictation, and with the effect of imposing conditions on Turkey which must bring her fall.... In your negotiations you will propose to Turkey to relieve her from her past treaties with Russia in consideration of an European settlement. This has, indeed, been already put forward, and has been received with acclamation by a nation which has acclaims ready for every perversion. Good Heavens! a European settlement! That is what Turkey has to rely upon. Surely your treaty of Vienna was a European settlement, and what was the result? That settlement was important by its establishment of Poland; and what befell Poland? When Poland had fallen, what did your Minister tell you respecting that treaty? Why, it was this: 'That it had given to England the right to express an opinion regarding the events in Poland.' After going on to state that he had remonstrated on the subject before the event, he says: 'But Russia took another view of the case.' And so it will be with your present settlement; she will take another view of the case. [Loud cheers.] These words were stated in the House of Commons; they were uttered by the very Minister" (Lord Palmerston) "who has now in his hands the fate of Turkey, as he had of Poland. But now you are warned; then you were unconscious.... Let me refer to a piece of intelligence recently published in The Times newspaper. It is there stated that our Minister in Persia had had a difference with the Government of the Shah, who was on the point of yielding, when the Minister of Russia interposed to exasperate the quarrel. Thus there you have at the one and at the same moment Russia driving England out of Persia, and England imposing Russia on Turkey. This same letter mentions that an embassy had reached Teheran; that the Afghans were in the greatest state of ferment, and that Dost Mohammed, the implacable enemy of Russia, had much at heart the success of his embassy which was to move Persia to support Turkey. Now, you will recollect that sixteen years ago, England made war against the Afghans, with the purpose of dethroning Dost Mohammed, because he was the enemy of England and the firm ally of Russia. Now, perhaps your Government believed this. If it did, it is very strange that it was not upon Russia they made war, but upon the Afghans, which was exactly the course to throw them into the arms of Russia. But your Government entertained no such belief; it then perfectly knew that Dost Mohammed, as now appears, was the implacable foe of Russia, and it was on that very account that it had attacked him. The fact has been established, and in the House of Commons it has been proved, that documents had been absolutely forged representing Dost Mohammed falsely as the ally of Russia. The Envoy of England himself sent home the original for publication. [Shame.] This is but the legitimate result of the secrecy in the Government and that ignorance in the nation to which I already referred. There is not a man in this assembly upon whom my eyes can rest, who is not by sufferance a participator in this crime, and who by this indifference to his country's acts and honor is not degraded to the position of a slave, while under the delusion that he is a freeman. [Hear, hear.] May I tell you something of what is thought of you by strangers? You have heard recently much of German influences at Court. Perhaps you would like to hear something of the opinions of German cousins of the Queen;
and let me tell you, if Germany is Russian, it is England that has made her so. Listen now to these words:

"If Turkey is not interfered with by England and France she will conquer. If, on the contrary, the Western Powers, in their infatuated subservience cannot refrain from "mediating," or from meddling with the affairs of the East, Turkey is doomed, and universal dominion of the Muscovy Cossacks will soon sway the destinies of this world! Yet how noble has hitherto been the position and attitude of poor Turkey, in spite of all diplomatic embezzlement, and though she mistook a band of assassins for her friends. Matters look, indeed, gloomy! and I have hourly been expecting a bombardment by the allied fleets of her capital in order to bend her moral heroism to disgraceful submission. The Turks may truly say: "Longa est injuria, longae ambages, sed summa sequor fatigia rerum!"1 What a contrast in their present behavior as compared with that of England on similar occasions! they "make war"—England carries on piracy. Recollect only the "Declaration of Lima" and the invasion of Afghanistan,3 the bombardment of Copenhagen383 and the battle of Navarino and then think of Turkey as it stands there at present—abased and threatened, even invaded and provoked by the "civilized world;" she remains amid all her trials, calm and judicious, firm and resolute, but serene."

"You may judge by this that there are those in the loftiest station who may sigh in vain for the privilege which your indulgence affords to me of finding a vent for my indignation, and the opportunity of warning of coming events. Suffer me then to tell you the position in which you stand. Britain presents two features, she is an idiot at home, she is a maniac abroad, an armed maniac, endangering her own life and the lives of others. You are not so individually though you are so collectively. Awaken then your individual intelligence and restrain the corporate maniac until you have time to treat the disordered brain—this system from which all the evil proceeds." [Loud and long continued cheering.]

I may add to Mr. Urquhart's speech that Lord Palmerston's last coup d'éclat384 and the favor of the people bestowed upon him, have made him Prime Minister in reality, if not in name.

Written on January 10, 1854


Signed: Karl Marx

---

\(^{a}\) Vergilius, Aeneid, I, 341.—Ed.
At last, this long-pending "Eastern Question" appears to have reached a step where diplomacy will not much longer be enabled to monopolise this ground for its ever shifting and ever resultless movements. On the 3rd inst. the French and British fleets have entered the Black Sea, in order to prevent the Russian navy from doing harm either to the Turkish fleet or the Turkish coast. Once before the Czar Nicholas has declared that such a step would be, for him, the signal for a declaration of war. Will he now stand it quietly? There is a report to-day that the combined French and English fleets, together with the first division of the Turkish navy, are transporting 17,000 Turks to Batum. If this be correct, it is as much an act of war as if they made a direct attack upon Sebastopol, and the Czar cannot but declare war at once.

But would Russia stand alone? Which part would Austria and Prussia take in a general war?

It is reported that Louis Bonaparte has notified to the Austrian Government that, if in case of a conflict with Russia, Austria allied with this power, the French Government would avail itself of the elements of insurrection, which, in Italy and Poland, only required a spark to be kindled again into a raging fire, and that then the restoration of Italian and Polish nationality would be attempted by France. The Austrian government, however, we may confidently assume, will be more influenced by its own financial embarrassments than by the threats of Bonaparte.

The state of the Austrian Exchequer may be inferred from the late augmentation of its depreciated notes and from the recent expedient of the government enacting a discount of 15 ppt. upon the paper money issued by themselves. This device, working the
depreciation of their own paper, perhaps carries tax making ingenuity to its perfection, it is putting a tax on the payment of taxes. According to the German papers, the Austrian budget for 1854 will show a deficit of 45,000,000 flrs. on the ordinary service, and 50,000,000 flrs. on the extraordinary. For the 100th time Austria is moving towards a loan, but in a manner which promises no success. It is now proposed to raise a loan of 50,000,000 flrs. for the ostensible purpose of paying interest due and some other pressing demands.

When the news of the intended entrance of the united squadron into the Black Sea reached Vienna, the money changers had enough to do to change paper currency for silver coin. People with 100 and 200 florins thronged to their counting-houses with a view to secure their endangered treasures. Nevertheless, on the decisive moment, the influence of St. Peters burg at Vienna will be paramount and entangle Austria, on the side of Russia, into the coming struggle. As to Prussia, she is attempting the same game as in 1780, in 1800 and 1805,\(^{986}\) to form a league of neutral Baltic or Northern German States, at the head of which she might play a part of some importance and turn to which side was to offer her the greatest advantages.

That the Turko-European fleets can destroy Sebastopol and the Russian Black Sea fleet, that they can take possession of, and hold the Crimea, occupy Odessa, close the Sea of Azov and let loose the mountaineers of the Caucasus, there is no doubt. The measures to be taken in the Baltic are as self-evident as those in the Black Sea: an alliance at any price with Sweden; an act of intimidation against Denmark, if necessary; an insurrection in Finland, which would break out upon landing a sufficient number of troops, and a guarantee that no peace would be concluded except upon the condition of this province being reunited to Sweden; the troops landed in Finland, to menace Petersburg while the fleet bombards Kronstadt.

All will depend on the maritime powers of Europe acting resolutely and vigorously.

The *New Prussian Gazette* of the 29th ult. confirms the account of the Emperor of Russia having ordered all the forces in his empire to be placed on a war-footing. Not only has he withdrawn his deposits from the banks of England and France, but also ordered voluntary collections to be raised on the part of his nobility, and the railways in progress to be suspended, in order to devote to war all the men and money required for their construction.
On the other hand armaments in France are going on more actively than ever, the second moiety of the contingent of 800,000 men of the class of 1852 having been called out. In France, too, a loan of 200,000,000 frs. (about £8,000,000) has long been contemnedated, but the dearth of food, the failure in the wine and silk crops, the prevailing commercial and industrial distress, the great apprehensions entertained about the payments to be made at the end of February, the downward tendency of the funds and railway shares, all these circumstances tend by no means to facilitate such a transaction.

It is the intention of the British Government, as we are informed by The Times, to raise the number of seamen and marines for the current year to 53,000 men, which is an increase of about 8,000 on the number voted for last year, and a further addition to the 5,000 men, raised under the orders of Lord Derby's administration.\footnote{The Times, No. 21631, January 6, 1854.—Ed.} The total increase in the Navy since 1852 may therefore be stated of about 13,000 men. For the force now to be raised for the service of the fleet 38,000 will be seamen and boys, and 15,000 marines.

At last the murder is out, as regards the affair of Sinope. The statements published of the relative strength of Russia and Turkey at that place, show that the Russians had 3 steam two-deckers, one three-decker and 680 guns on their side more than the Turkish forces. So considered the event of Sinope has added nothing to Russia's power, and taken nothing from that of Turkey, but the reverse. Here we have seen a fact without parallel even in our own annals—frigates laying themselves alongside line-of-battle ships, and commanders casting the torch into the powder magazine and offering themselves up for holocaust on their country's shrine. The real maritime force of Turkey is untouched; not a line-of-battle ship, not a steamer having been sacrificed. This is not all. According to the last intelligence received, one of the finest three-deckers of the Russian fleet, the Rostislav, 120-gun ship, has been sunk by the Turks. This fact, kept back hitherto under the specious pretext that the Rostislav did not sink during the action, but immediately afterwards, is now admitted by the Russians, and forms a good set-off against the destroyed Turkish ships.\footnote{387} If one three-decker was actually sunk, we may expect that the other Russian vessels received very serious harm indeed during the action, and after all the victory of Sinope may have more disabled the Russian than the Turkish fleet. When the Pasha
of Egypt heard of the disaster at Sinope, he ordered the immediate armament of 6 frigates, 5 corvettes and 3 brigs, destined to fill up the chasm which has been produced in the material of the Turkish fleet.

The Egyptian steam-frigate *Pervaz-Bahri* disabled and taken after nearly five hours' struggle by the far larger Russian steam-frigate *Vladimir*, was so riddled with shot that she could hardly be brought into Sebastopol, and when there, sank at once. The *Pervaz-Bahri* was only carried into the harbour of Sebastopol by the aid of its chief engineer, Mr. Bell, an Englishman, who was promised on the part of Admiral Korniloff, if he succeeded in taking her there in safety, to be set immediately at liberty. When arrived at Sebastopol, instead of being released, Mr. Bell and his sub-engineers and stokers were put into close confinement, with the miserable allowance of 3d. a-day for their maintenance and given to understand that they would have to march 80 miles on foot, at this inclement season, into the interior. Prince Menchikoff, who commands at Sebastopol, was approved by the Czar and his Ministers, who turned a deaf ear to the representations of our Consul at Odessa and the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg. It was already known that at the battle of Sinope two English merchant men, following private trade, were headlessly and ruthlessly involved in the general destruction. The following is the simple narrative of the destruction of one of those vessels as given by a French paper:

"On the 30th November the brigantine *Howard*, belonging to Bideford, a seaport in the South of England, had finished the discharge of a cargo of coals to the Austrian Consul, Mr. Pirentz, at Sinope, and was then at anchor taking in ballast with a view of sailing to Fatsah for a cargo of corn, which she had engaged to carry to England, when the Russian fleet suddenly came in sight, and without giving any notice whatever, or affording any opportunity for foreign vessels to remove out of danger, commenced a heavy fire of shot and shells on the Turkish fleet lying at anchor and in a few minutes entirely destroyed the *Howard* and other merchant vessels in the harbour."^{d}

This atrocious infraction of international law is paraded in the Odessa bulletin, while the Russian journals simultaneously announced in insulting language that, while the English fleets dared not enter the Black Sea, the English Government dared not refuse the use of its dockyards to repair a Russian man-of-war.

^{a} Abbas Pasha.— *Ed.*
^{b} J. James.— *Ed.*
^{c} G. H. Seymour.— *Ed.*
^{d} "Londres, 5 janvier", *Journal des Débats*, January 7, 1854.— *Ed.*
The latest mails have brought us more supplementary news with regard to the military events which lately took place in Asia. It appears that the Turks have been compelled entirely to evacuate the Russo-Armenian territory, but the precise result of the engagements, which determined this retreat, is not yet known. One Turkish corps had penetrated on the direct road to Akhalzikh from Ardahan, while another body took the more southern road from Kars by Alexandropol (in Georgian, Gümri) to Tiflis. Both these corps, it appears, were met by the Russians. According to the Russian accounts the Turks were routed on either line and lost about 40 pieces of cannon; as to the Turkish accounts, we have nothing official, but in private correspondence the retreat is explained by the necessity of going into winter quarters. Certain it is, that the Turks have evacuated the Russian territory with the exception of Fort St. Nicholas, that the Russians followed them, and that their advanced guard even ventured to within a mile of Kars, where it was repulsed. We know, besides, that the Turkish army of Anatolia, recruited as it is from the Asiatic provinces, the seat of old Moslem barbarism, and counting in its ranks a great number of irregulars, unreliable though generally brave soldiers of adventure, fancy warriors, and filibusters of Kurdistan—that this army of Anatolia, is nothing like the staid, disciplined and drilled army of Rumelia, where the commander knows how many and what men he has from day to day under his command, and where the thirst for independent adventure and private plunder is held under check by articles of war and courts martial. We know that the Russians, very hard up for troops in the beginning of the Asiatic campaign, have been reinforced by the 13th division of infantry (16,000 men) under Lieut.-General Obrucheff II, and by a body of Cossacks from the Don; we know that they have been able to keep the mountaineers in bounds, to maintain their communication as well across the Caucasus by Vladikavkaz as by sea to Odessa and Sebastopol. Under these circumstances, and considering that the Turkish commander Abdi Pasha was either a traitor or a dunce (he has been recalled since and Ahmed Pasha has been sent in his stead), we should not wonder at all if the Turks had been worsted, although there can be no doubt of the exaggeration prevailing in the Russian bulletins.

On the Danube, the Russians have some time ago attacked

---

a The description of the engagement at Akhalzikh of November 26, 1853 is given above, on pp. 550-52 of this volume.—Ed.
Matchin, a fort situated on an arm of the Danube. A steamer came up with two gunboats; they were met by a hot fire; the gunboats, it is said, were sunk, and the steamer so far damaged that it had to make the best of its way home. Three or four skirmishes occurred, partly between the outposts at Kalafat, partly between the Russian posts on the Danube and small Turkish parties who crossed the river in order to surprise them. The Turks ascribe to themselves the advantage in all the encounters. It is to be regretted that the Turkish irregulars, fit more for this duty than for any other, have not long since been ordered to carry on this war on a small scale with the greatest activity. They would have proved more than a match for the Cossacks, disorganized the necessarily faulty system of outposts of the enemy, faulty because extending over a line 300 miles in length; they would have disturbed the Russian plans, obtained a perfect knowledge of the enemy's movements and might with proper caution and boldness have been victorious in every encounter.

From telegraphic news, received this moment, it appears that

"on the 6th of this month, a Turkish division, 15,000 strong, with 15 pieces of artillery, attacked the entrenched position of Chetatea, not far from Kalafat, and took it with storm; that the Russians lost 2,500 men, and that a reinforcement of 18,000 Russians marching from Karaul, was forced to retire with a loss of 250 men."

According to another report, the great majority of the population of Lesser Wallachia has risen against, and Krajova been placed in a state of siege by, the Russians.

Meanwhile Russia exhausted herself in efforts to seduce or alarm in all quarters of the world, on our Indian frontiers, in Persia, Servia, Sweden, Denmark, &c. In Persia the British minister had had a difference with the Government of the Shah, who was on the point of yielding, when the Russian Ambassador interposed not only to exasperate the Shah against England, but to drive him into active hostility too, and a declaration of war against the Porte. This intrigue, however, is said to have been baffled by the British Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Thompson's menace of withdrawing from Teheran, by the dread of an immediate explosion from the dislike of the Persian people for Russia, and by the arrival of an Afghan Embassy, threatening, if Persia formed an alliance with Russia, an invasion of the Persian territory by the Afghans.

A crowd of Russian agents was simultaneously overrunning Servia—seeking out and applying themselves to the places and

---

Marx quotes from the report in The Times, No. 21638, January 14, 1854.—Ed.
persons formerly known by their attachment to the banished family of the Obrenović—speaking to some of the young Prince Michael—to others of his old father Miloš—now making them hope, through the protection of Russia, for the extension of the limits of Servia—the formation of a new kingdom of Illyria, which should unite all those who spoke the Servian language actually under the domination of Turkey and Austria,—and now announcing to them, in case of resistance, innumerable armies and utter subjugation. Notwithstanding these intrigues, in opposite senses, that Russia ceased not to carry on, she has not succeeded in breaking the bonds between the Servians and the Sultan, but, on the contrary, two firmans were expected from Constantinople at Belgrade, the one suppressing all the relations existing between Servia and Russia, and the other confirming all the privileges conceded, at different epochs, to the Servian people. Then, the Russian Government has actively pursued negotiations at Stockholm and Copenhagen, for the purpose of inducing the governments of Sweden and Denmark to side with her in the approaching European struggle; the great object she has in securing their alliance being to obtain the closing of the passages of the Sound and Belts against the Western Powers. All she has effected till now, is the conclusion of a treaty between Sweden, Denmark and Prussia concerning an armed neutrality, and preparations of armaments, ostensibly directed against herself. Private letters from Sweden exult in the possibility of the Duchy of Finland, so shamefully seized by Russia without a declaration of war, being restored to the Scandinavian Kingdom. As to Denmark, the attitude, not of the people, but of the Court, is more equivocal. It is even rumoured that the present Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs will resign and be replaced by Count Reventlow-Criminil, a man known to be intimately connected with the Court of St. Petersburg. In France the “fusion” of the Orleanists and Legitimists owes to Russia the sort of success it has met with, while that same power is stirring up heaven and earth to destroy the entente cordiale existing between the Governments of England and France and to sow distrust between them. Attempts are being made by some of the Paris journals, in the pay of Mr. Kisseleff, to create a belief that the English Government is not sincere, and we see that in England a journal, in the pay of Mr. de Brunnow, in return casts doubts on the sincerity of the French Government.

---

a Abdul Mejid.—Ed.
b Ch. A. Bluhme.—Ed.
Another blow, principally aimed against the Western powers, is the Russian prohibition relative to the exportation of Polish corn.

In the meantime the movements of Western diplomacy were by no means hostile to Russia, but exhibited, on the contrary, rather too anxious a tendency to temporise with justice and to compromise with crime. It is now obvious to everyone that their course has been a mistaken and a mischievous one. The resurrection of the Vienna conference and the protocol drawn up by them on the 5th ult., the letter of the French and British Ambassadors at Constantinople to Reshid Pasha, the collective note of the 4 Great Powers presented to the Porte on the 15th, and accepted by the Sultan on the 31st ult., the circular of Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys, announcing the entrance of the united fleets into the Black Sea, to the French diplomatic agents, dated 30th ult., such are the principal events of the diplomatic history of the last 6 weeks. As to the protocol of the Vienna conference, your readers will have been informed of its contents before now. Can there be anything more ludicrous than its assertion that

"the assurances given on several occasions by the Emperor of Russia exclude the idea that that august Sovereign entertains any wish to interfere with the integrity of the Ottoman Empire,"

and anything more mischievous than its urging on Turkey the propriety of consenting to a month's armistice? Two days after the news of the disgraceful butchery at Sinope had reached Constantinople on the 5th ult., Reshid Pasha addressed a letter to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe and General Baraguay D' Hilliers, communicating the news from Sinope and asking that the fleets might enter the Black Sea. On the 12th, a week after the date of Reshid Pasha's note, he received a very indifferent answer on the part of the two Ambassadors, intimating to him that

"the presence of the United Squadron had 'a political signification,' consequently no military one, and that it was a 'moral support,' consequently no naval one."

Thus the Porte was coerced into the acceptance of the joint Note of the 4 Powers presented to her on the 15th December. This note grants the Porte not only no compensation whatever for the losses she has undergone consequent upon the piratical acts of the Autocrat; it insists not only upon the renewal of all the ancient treaties of Kainardji, Adrianople, UnkJar-Skelessi, etc., which have

---

a On the note of the four powers and Drouyn de Lhuys' circular see this volume, pp. 560-61.—Ed.
b Quoted from The Times, No. 21615, December 19, 1853.—Ed.
furnished, for a century and a half, the arsenal from which Russia has drawn her weapons of fraud, interference, progress and incorporation; but it allows the Czar to carry the point of the religious protectorate and administrative dictation over Turkey by stipulating that

"the communication of the firmans relative to the spiritual privileges octroyed by the Sublime Porte to all its subjects not Mussulmen, should be made to all the Powers, and accompanied by suitable assurances given to each of them,"

and that the Porte shall declare on its part its firm resolution to develop more efficaciously its administrative system and internal reforms.

These new propositions, while in their letter investing the 5 Powers of Europe with a joint protectorate over the Christian subjects of Turkey, give in reality the protectorate to Russia alone. The arrangement is to be, that France and Austria being Roman Catholic countries, are to have the protectorate over the Roman Catholic Christians in Turkey, and England and Prussia being Protestant countries, are to have the protectorate over the Protestant subjects of the Sultan, while Russia is to have the protectorate over those professing the Greek faith. Now, as the Roman Catholics do not number 800,000, nor the Protestants 200,000, while those who profess the Greek religion amount to nearly 10,000,000, it is plain that the Czar would indeed acquire the protectorate over the Christian subjects in Turkey. These proposals of the 4 Powers were not accepted by the Porte till on the 19th ult., when Riza Pasha and Halil Pasha had entered the Ministry, the success of the Peace or Russian party having been thus assured.

On the 21st ult., when it became known that the Council of Ministers had notified to the four Ambassadors the adoption of the propositions, they had suggested, the Saftas (students) assembled to present a petition against the resolution taken by the government, and the outbreak of disturbances was only prevented by the arrest of the ringleaders. So great was the exasperation which prevailed at Constantinople, that the Sultan did not venture to repair on the following day to the Divan, nor proceed, as usual, amidst the thunder of the cannon, and the hurrahs of the foreign war crew, to the mosque of Tophana; and that Reshid Pasha fled for refuge from his own palace in Stambul to the palace contiguous to the residence of the Sultan. On the following day the public mind was somewhat calmed by a proclamation on the
part of the Sultan, that no stop should be put to the military operations.
These tortuous, pusillanimous and inexplicable movements of the Western diplomacy, which, throughout the dreary history of the last 9 months, almost exhausted public patience, have thrown doubts upon the sincerity of the British Government, and, as the public feel themselves at a loss to understand the motives that may have caused the long endurance on the part of the Western Powers, secret influences are spoken of, and rumours are industriously spread, that Prince Albert, the husband of the Queen,\(^a\) is interfering in the affairs of the Executive; that he is not only attending on his Sovereign Lady at the meetings of her Council, but is using his influence to control the advice of the responsible advisers; that, while exercising his opportunity to be present at the meeting of the Queen with her Ministers, he is in constant and direct communication with foreign courts, including the Russian one, but except that of France. Another tale is, that the “fusion” of the Orléans and elder Bourbon branches of the late royal family of France receives almost as much countenance from our Court as it does from that of Russia, and the visit of the Duke of Nemours at the Court of Queen Victoria, fresh from the meeting with “Henry the Fifth,”\(^b\) is pointed at as a proof.

A fourth report, that the negotiations in the Eastern question, have, with the assent of Russia, been delegated to the sole intermediation of Count Buol-Schauenstein, brother-in-law of Count Meyendorff, is cited as evidence that this government has never desired independent or effective negotiations, but has, from the first, sought to aid the designs of Russia and her allies, while seeming to oppose her. Mr. Roebuck, it is confidently stated, will bring the whole question of Coburg influence before the House of Commons, while Lord Brougham is said to intend bringing it before the House of Lords. There is no doubt that the Coburg influences form, as this moment, the almost exclusive topic of conversation in the metropolis. Parliament will reassemble on the 31st instant.

So stern a winter as the present one has not been known since 1809. The intensity of the cold has been by no means the most trying incident; the incessant changes both of temperature and of the character of the weather have been far worse. The trains run on the railway with the greatest difficulty; in some parts transit

---
\(^a\) Victoria.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) Comte de Chambord.—\textit{Ed.}
appears to be quite cut off, and in the means of communication England is thrown back to times forgotten. The electric telegraph has been used to mitigate the inconvenience of commercial documents intercepted by snow drifts, and to prevent the noting of bills for unexplained non-payment. Nevertheless the noting of more than 500 bills in London illustrates the social anarchy occasioned by the uncommon inclemency of the season. The papers are filled with records of the fearful shipwrecks caused by the snow storms and gales, particularly on the Eastern coast. Although the recently published tables of trade, navigation and revenue show a continuance of the prosperity with which 1853 began, the severity of the season, coupled with the rising prices of the first necessaries, principally of corn, coals and tallow, acts as a hard pressure upon the condition of the lower classes. Numerous cases of starvation have occurred. Bread riots in the West are now forming an accompaniment to the lock-outs in the North.

Time, however, compels to defer a detailed account of trade and commerce to a following letter.

Written on January 14, 1854
First published in the Zuid Afrikaan, March 6, 1854, in English and Dutch

---

Note: "Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation for the Eleven Months Ended December 5, 1853", The Economist, No. 541, January 7, 1854.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

THE LAST BATTLE IN EUROPE

The letters of our London correspondents and the European journals enable us at last to appreciate in all its bearings the prolonged struggle between the Turks and Russians, of which Chetatea, a small village nine miles north of Kalafat, was the arena. Next to the fact that the series of sanguinary actions in question was characterized by great bravery and that the Turks came off victors, the most striking feature of the whole is that it is without practical result, so far as the expulsion of the Russians from Wallachia is concerned. This comes from a mistake on the part of the Turks to which we have more than once had occasion to direct the attention of our readers. We allude to their sending a separate army to Kalafat, in order to shut up the road to Servia, while the presence of a strong and concentrated force near Rustchuk and Orsova would have been the best guarantee against the Russians venturing into that province. Such a force would have menaced the communications of any Russian army marching westward, while a bridge and bridge-head at Oltenitza or somewhere therabouts, fortified like that of Kalafat, could have maintained a footing for them on the left bank of the Danube. But even without that, the Russians could not cross the Upper Danube and march into Servia, without leaving the Turks to cross the Lower Danube and march upon Bucharest. Of course, in saying this, we reckon the relative strength of the parties to be what it is in reality, and ascribe a decided superiority of numbers

a See this volume, pp. 474, 520-21.—Ed.
to the Turkish army of Rumelia, over the Russian army of Wallachia.

Now the fact is that the Turks have used their superiority in the very way to nullify it and provide for being finally beaten. They did not concentrate their forces on the Lower Danube, but divided them. While 30,000 to 35,000 men occupied Widin and Kalafat, the rest of the army remained on the Middle and Lower Danube. They occupy the arc of a circle, while the Russians occupy the chord of this arc. Thus the latter have less space to traverse in order to concentrate all their troops on a given spot. Moreover, the shorter roads of the Russians are through a level country, while the longer ones of the Turks pass over hills and cross many mountain torrents. The Turkish position is, then, as disadvantageous as can be, and yet it has been taken in order to satisfy the old prejudice that there is no better way of barring a road against an enemy than by placing yourself across it.

On the 20th of December Omer Pasha knew at Shumla, that the Russians were preparing a general attack upon Kalafat for the 13th of January. He had twenty-two days' time; yet such is the position of Kalafat with regard to the other stations of the Turkish army, that it does not appear that he could bring on any reenforcements except a few reserves from Sofia. On the other hand, that the Russians, without having received any considerable reenforcements from home—on January 3 Osten-Sacken's ubiquitous corps was not yet at Bucharest—should venture upon a concentration so far west, shows that either the state of the weather and of the Danube did not allow the Turks to cross the river lower down, or that Gorchakoff had other reasons to be assured of their inactivity in that quarter. The Turks at Kalafat were ordered to attack the Russians while yet in the act of concentrating themselves. The best way to do this was to repeat the experiment of Oltenitza. Why was not this done? The bridge at Kalafat stands, in spite of winter and floating ice, and there was no position lower down where a similar bridge and bridge-head could be erected. Or had Omer Pasha been ordered to keep on the right bank of the river? There is so much of a contradictory nature in the Turkish proceedings, bold and clever measures are so regularly followed by the most palpable sins of omission and commission, that diplomatic agency must be at the bottom of it. At all events, Gorchakoff would not have stirred an inch toward

---

*On the progress of the engagement at Oltenitza see this volume, pp. 316-22.—Ed.*
Kalafat, had he not been certain that the Turks would not repeat the Oltenitz movement.

Altogether some 30,000 Russians must have been sent against Kalafat, for with a lesser force they would hardly have ventured to attack a fortified position, defended by a garrison of 10,000 men, with at least 10,000 more for purposes of reserve or sally. At least one half, then, of the Russian active army in Wallachia was concentrated there. Where and how could the other half, spread over a long line, have resisted a Turkish force crossing at Oltenitza, Silistra or Orsova? And if the communication between Widin and Kalafat could be kept up without difficulty, then there was a possibility of crossing at other points. Thus the Russians by their position on the chord of the arc, the periphery of which was held by the Turks, were enabled to bring a superior force to the field of battle at Chetatea, while the Turks could not reinforce their corps at Kalafat, though aware of the intended attack long beforehand. The Turks, deprived of that movement of diversion which would have prevented the whole battle, deprived of the chance of succor, were reduced to their bravery and to the hope of cutting up the enemy in detail before his concentration was completed. But even this hope was slight, for they could not move very far from Kalafat, and every hostile corps of inferior strength could retire out of the circle of their operations. Thus they fought for five days, generally with success, but at last had to retire again to their entrenchments in the villages around Kalafat, the Russian forces being decidedly superior in strength at the end, when new reinforcements arrived. The result is that the Russian attack upon Kalafat is most probably averted or delayed, and that Turks have shown that in the open field, no less than behind ramparts and ditches, they can fight well. The murderous character of the encounters may be inferred from the statement of a letter from Bucharest, to the effect that in the engagements one whole regiment of Russian rifles, and all but 465 men of a regiment of lancers, were completely annihilated.

At Oltenitza the Turks were attacked in their entrenched positions by the Russians; at Chetatea the Russians were attacked in their entrenched positions by the Turks. On both occasions the Turks have proved victorious, but without reaping any positive results from their victory. The battle of Oltenitza happened just when the proclamation of an armistice was on its way from Constantinople to the Danube. And the battle of Chetatea curiously coincides with the news of the Divan having accepted the last proposals of peace, imposed upon them by their Western
allies. In the one instance the machinations of diplomacy are nullified in the clash of arms, while in the other the bloody work of war is simultaneously frustrated by some secret diplomatic agency.

Written on January 19, 1854


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
London, Friday, Jan. 20, 1854

The latest mails have brought us some supplementary news with regard to the military events which lately took place in Asia. It appears that the Turks have been compelled entirely to evacuate the Russo-Armenian territory, but the precise result of the engagements which determined their retreat, is not known. The Turks had penetrated on the direct road to Akhalzikh from Ardahan, while another body took the more southern road from Kars by Alexandropol (in Georgian, Gümri) to Tiflis. Both these corps, it appears, were met by the Russians; according to the Russian accounts, the Turks were routed on either line and lost about forty pieces of cannon; as to the Turkish accounts, we have nothing official, but in private correspondence the retreat is explained by the necessity of going into winter quarters.

The only thing certain is this, that the Turks have evacuated the Russian territory with the exception of Fort St. Nicholas; that the Russians followed them, and that their advanced guard even ventured to within a mile of Kars, where it was repulsed. We know, besides, that the Turkish army of Anatolia, recruited as it is from the Asiatic provinces, the seat of the old Moslem barbarism, and counting in its ranks a great number of irregulars, unreliable, though generally brave, soldiers of adventure, fancy warriors and filibusters, that this army of Anatolia is nothing like the stern, disciplined and drilled army of Rumelia, whose commander knows how many and what men he has from day to day under his command, and where the thirst for independent adventure and private plunder is held under check by articles of war and courts martial. We know that the Russians, who were very hard up for
troops in the beginning of the Asiatic campaign, have been reinforced by 16,000 men under Lieut.-Gen. Obruchoff II, and by a body of Cossacks from the Don; we know that they have been able to keep the mountaineers within bounds, to maintain their communication as well across the Caucasus by Vladikavkaz, as by sea to Odessa and Sebastopol.

Under these circumstances and considering that the Turkish commander Abdi Pasha was either a traitor or a dunce (he has been recalled since and placed under arrest at Kars; Ahmed Pasha was sent in his place), we should not wonder at all if the Turks had been worsted, although there can be no doubt of the exaggeration prevailing in the Russian bulletins. We read in the Augsburger Zeitung\(^a\) that

"towards the end of November, Shamyl made a desperate attempt to force his way to the south, in order to effect a direct communication with the Turks. The strength of his corps was estimated at from 10,000 to 16,000 men, and it is affirmed that the Murides, the flower of his troops, were cut to pieces."

This however wants confirmation.

At last the murder is out, as regards the affair at Sinope. One of the finest three-deckers of the Russian fleet—the Rostislav,\(^9\) 120-gun ship—was sunk there by the Turks. This fact—kept back hitherto under the specious pretext that the Rostislav did not sink during the action, but immediately afterward—is now admitted by the Russians, and forms a good set-off against the destroyed Turkish ships. If one three-decker was actually sunk, we may suppose that the other Russian vessels received very serious harm indeed during the action—and, after all, the victory of Sinope may have more disabled the Russian than the Turkish fleet. Altogether, the Turks appear to fight like Turks when on the water. The Egyptian steam-frigate Pervaz-Bahri, disabled and taken after nearly five hours' struggle by the far larger Russian steam-frigate Vladimir, was so riddled with shot that she could hardly be brought into Sebastopol, and when there, sank at once. So far, then, the prizes carried off by the Russians amount to nothing, and indeed the impossibility for them to carry off a single prize from Sinope shows both the obstinacy of the Turkish defense and the mutilated state of the Russian fleet after the action.

There is a report that the combined French and English fleets, together with the first division of the Turkish Navy, are

\(^a\) Issue No. 9, January 9, 1854.—Ed.
transporting 17,000 Turks to Batum. If this be true, it is as much an act of war as if they made a direct attack upon Sebastopol, and the Czar\textsuperscript{a} cannot but declare war at once. Immediately prior to the entrance of the combined fleets into the Black Sea, the Czar is said to have sent his mandate for the withdrawal of all his vessels of war from the waters of the Euxine to Sebastopol. A letter dated Odessa, Dec. 24, reports that

"the commander of the Russian flotilla in the Sea of Azov had sent one of his \textit{aides-de-camp} to Sebastopol to explain how critical his position was. Two corps of 12,000 men each were ready to be embanked at Sebastopol, when this operation of war was paralyzed by the news of the imminent entrance of the united fleets into the Euxine."

From the last telegraphic news received it appears that the Russians intended attempting a general attack on the Turkish lines at Kalafat, on the 13th inst., the Russian New-Year's day. They had already pushed forward about 10,000 men in entrenchments at Chetatea, a village nine English miles north of Kalafat, but were prevented from concentrating their whole available force by the Turkish General's getting the start of them, storming the enemy's entrenchments with 15,000 or 18,000 men, proving victorious in a series of most murderous encounters that took place on the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th inst., and finally forcing the Russians to retire in the direction of Krajova. The Russians themselves confess a loss of 1,000 killed and 4,000 wounded. Gen. Anrep, we are told by the telegraph, "who commanded the Russians, was severely wounded, as well as Gen. Tuinont." On the 10th, it is stated, the Turks who were commanded by Selim Pasha (the Pole Zedlinsky), again \textit{retired} to Kalafat. Thus far the telegraphic news, hitherto the only source of information about these most important events. The report winding up, on the one hand, with the retirement of the Russians on Krajova, and of the Turks, on the other, to Kalafat, evokes a suspicion that great strategical faults have again been committed on both sides. There is one report afloat that Omer Pasha caused a whole corps to pass the [Danube] between the Aluta and the Shil, thus menacing the communications of the Russian corps at Krajova. But how could the Turks cross the Danube, which is filled with floating masses of ice, at any other point than Kalafat, where alone they were prepared for such an emergency?

\textsuperscript{a} Nicholas I.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Here and below the facts are cited according to \textit{The Times}, No. 21639, January 16, 1854.—\textit{Ed.}
The defeats the Russians met with at Kalafat are perhaps more important in a political than a military view. Coupled with the entrance of the united fleets into the Black Sea, they cut off the last probability of the Czar’s yielding to the humble supplication for peace forwarded by the courier of the Vienna Conference to St. Petersburg. On the other hand they must produce the immediate effect on neighboring Servia of strengthening the National party and intimidating the Russian one, who have lately been lifting up their heads with amazing impudence at Belgrade. Prince Alexander, it is true, and the mass of the Servian people, could not be prevailed upon to break the bonds between their country and the Sultan, although a crowd of Russian agents is simultaneously overrunning Servia, carrying on their intrigues in opposite senses—seeking out and applying themselves to the places and persons formerly known for their attachment to the banished family of the Obrenović—speaking to some of the young Prince Michael—to others of his old father Miloš—now making them hope, through the protection of Russia, for the extension of the limits [of] Servia—the formation of a new kingdom of Illyria, which would unite all those who speak the Servian language now under the domination of Turkey and Austria—and now announcing to them, in case of resistance, innumerable armies and utter subjugation. You are aware that Prince Miloš, residing at Vienna, is the old protégé of Metternich, while Michael, his son, is a mere creature of Russia, who in 1842 rendered the principedom vacant by flying from Servia. The Russian defeat at Kalafat will, at the same time, relieve Austria from the fear of a Russian army appearing before Belgrade and evoking among the subjects of Austria, of common origin and faith with herself, the consciousness of their own strength and of the degradation they endure in the domination of the Germans.

As to Austria, I may state en passant, that she has at last renounced the long-cherished hope of raising a new loan. The state of her Exchequer may be inferred from the expedient her Government has recently resorted to, of exacting a discount of 15 per cent. upon its own paper money—a financial maneuver only to be compared with the devises of the swindling ingenuity of the French Rois Faux Monoyeurs, who appreciated the coin when they had to pay, and depreciated it when they had to receive money. According to the German papers, the Austrian budget for 1854

---

^a^ Abdul Mejid.—Ed.

^b^ Royal counterfeiters.—Ed.
will show a deficit of 45,000,000 florins on the ordinary service, and 50,000,000 florins on the extraordinary. Whenever news of warlike character reaches Vienna, people throng to the banking-houses, in order to change paper currency for silver coin.

France, too, it is known, has long been moving for a loan of 200,000,000 francs (£8,000,000 sterling), but the dearth of food, the failure of the wine and silk crops, the prevailing commercial and industrial distress, the great apprehensions entertained about the payments to be made at the end of February, the downward tendency of the public funds and railway shares, all these circumstances have by no means tended to facilitate such a transaction. Bonaparte could not succeed in finding takers at the Bourse for the new loan. There remained no resource save that recurred to on the eve of the coup d’état—sending Persigny to the Bank of France, forcing out of it 50,000,000 francs ($10,000,000), and leaving in their place that amount of treasury bonds, under the head of “securities.” This was actually done on New-Year’s day. The fall of the funds to 69 hailed this financial coup d’état. The Government will, as we are now officially informed, obtain a loan from the Bank of France of 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 francs, against treasury bonds. Those not acquainted with what passed on New-Year’s day in the parlor of the Bank of France, will be at a loss to understand how the Bank has been prevailed upon to accept a loan rejected at the Bourse.

As to Persia the news continues to be contradictory. According to one report the Persian army is marching upon Erzerum and Bagdad; according to another the Russian intrigue has been baffled by the British Chargé d’Affaires, Mr. Thompson, who menaced withdrawal from Teheran, by the dread of an immediate explosion of the dislike of the Persian people for Russia, and by the arrival of an Afghan Embassy, threatening, if Persia formed an alliance with Russia, an invasion of the Persian territory by the Afghans.

According to private correspondence from Constantinople, published in the Patrie, the Divan has resolved to fortify Constantinople on the land side. A mixed commission, consisting of European and Ottoman officers, is said to have already commenced the preparatory survey of the localities. The fortification of Constantinople would altogether change the character of Russo-Turkish warfare, and prove the heaviest blow ever dealt to the eternal dreams of the self-styled heir of the Byzantine Emperors.

The rumor of Austria’s concentrating a corps d’armée in the Banat, to be placed under the command of Gen. Count Schlick, is contradicted by the German Press.
The Correspondent of Berlin, states that general orders have been given to the authorities to hold themselves prepared, in case of a mobilization of the Landwehr.\textsuperscript{394}

Overtures have been made from St. Petersburg to the Cabinet of Copenhagen for the cession of the Island of Bornholm to Russia.

"Bornholm," as it is justly remarked by The Daily News,\textsuperscript{a} "might be a Malta or Gibraltar of the Baltic. It is within a day's sail of the Sound and Copenhagen, and [...] placed by nature at the very throat of the Baltic."

In the message sent by Lord Redcliffe to the Governor of Sebastopol, and intimating to him the appearance of the united squadron in the Black Sea, the only object of the movement is stated to be "the protection of the Ottoman territory from all aggression or hostile act,"\textsuperscript{b} no mention being made of the protection of the Ottoman flag.

As all the accounts received from Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Constantinople and St. Petersburg, indicate the prospect of war, prices have generally declined in all stock markets on both sides of the Channel.

Written on January 20, 1854

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3997, February 8, 1854

Signed: Karl Marx

\textsuperscript{a} Issue No. 2391, January 18, 1854.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Redcliffe, Baraguay d'Hilliers, "To the Governor of Sebastopol", The Daily News, No. 2390, January 17, 1854.—\textit{Ed.}
London, Tuesday, Jan. 24, 1854

The attempts of the Russian army to cross the Danube simultaneously on the whole line of operations—at Matchin, Giurgevo and Kalafat—are to be considered as reconnoitering maneuvers rather than as serious attacks, which can hardly be ventured upon with the present forces Gen. Gorchakoff has to dispose of.

Last Saturday's Press—the Disraeli paper—published a note of a conversation very recently held at Gatchina between the Czar and a "distinguished" Englishman. Almost the whole of the daily London press has reprinted this note, which, besides the known and worn-out commonplaces of Russian diplomacy, contains some interesting statements.

The Czar “distinctly stated that the ultimatum of Menchikoff had not been disapproved of in London, but that the English Ministry, having been informed that it would probably be accepted by the Porte, had recognized it as a satisfactory settlement.”

This would only prove that poor John Russell was falsely informed by Baron de Brunnow as to the “probable” intentions of the Sublime Porte, and that the Porte’s refusing to yield to the Menchikoff ultimatum at once, was by no means the fault of the Coalition Cabinet. The Czar goes on informing “the individual of distinction” that

“when the news of the victory of Sinope arrived, General Castelbajac” (the French Ambassador) “addressed him a letter beginning something in this way: ‘As a Christian and as a soldier, permit me […] to congratulate your Imperial Majesty on the glorious victory obtained by your Majesty’s fleet.’”

Let me remark that Gen. Castelbajac, an old Legitimist and a relative of La Rochejaquelein’s, gained his generalship, not by
services in the camp, but by less dangerous service in the ante-chambers of the Court, and the ardent confession of exalted royalist principles. Bonaparte appointed him as Ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg, with a view to give the Czar a proof of deference to his personal wishes, although he was fully aware that Castelbajac was to conspire with the Czar for the restoration of the Bourbons rather than further the interests of his nominal master. This Castelbajac, then, is the very man to have congratulated the Czar “as a soldier and a Christian” on the resultless butchery of Sinope.

“He did not believe,” the Czar is stated to have said, “that England, with a Bourgeois Parliament, could carry on a war with glory.”

There is no doubt that the Czar knows his Cobdens and his Brights, and estimates at its just value the mean and abject spirit of the European middle classes. Finally, the Czar is quite right in stating that, on the one hand, he had not been prepared for war—fully convinced as he was that he should obtain all he cared for by the simple act of bullying—and that, on the other hand, if war were brought about, it would be the “war of incapacities,” making it inevitable by their anxious efforts to prevent it, and plunging into it finally in order to cover their blunders and save their places.

“Public opinion is half-inclined to sacrifice Prince Albert at the shrine of rumor. A whisper, which was first insinuated for party uses, has grown into a roar, and a constructive hint has swelled into a positive and monstrous fiction. That those who seek the presence of the Queen a should find Prince Albert with her Majesty, is a fact which rather won the sympathy and esteem of the English public; but then it was said that he attended meetings of the Queen with her Ministers; next, that Ministers were made aware of his presence—that, however reluctant to proceed with business before a third party, they found it necessary to do so—that it even became necessary to defend their opinions before the Prince—that the Prince, in fact, interfered with their counsel to their Sovereign—that he not only influenced the Royal mind, but possessing the power of free communication with foreign Courts, he constituted an unlicensed channel for information between the confidential council of the Queen and the Cabinets of foreign potentates, perhaps of the enemies of England—that in short, Prince Albert was a traitor to his Queen, that he had been impeached for high treason, and finally, that on a charge of high treason he had been arrested and committed to the Tower. This was the story not only told in all parts of England a day or two back, but by some believed.”

I quote the above passage from The Spectator, in order to show your readers how public rumor has been induced by the

---

a Victoria.—Ed.
Palmerstonian press to make a poor stupid young man the scapegoat of the responsible Ministers. Prince Albert is a German Prince, connected with most of the absolute and despotic Governments of the Continent. Raised to the rank of Prince-Consort in Great Britain, he has devoted his time partly to fattening pigs, to inventing ridiculous hats for the army, to planning model lodging houses of a peculiarly transparent and uncomfortable kind, to the Hyde Park Exhibition, and to amateur soldiery. He has been considered amiable and harmless, in point of intellect below the general average of human beings, a prolific father and an obsequious husband. Of late, however, he has been deliberately magnified into the most influential man and the most dangerous character of the United Kingdom, said to dispose of the whole State machinery at the secret dictation of Russia. Now there can exist but little doubt that the Prince exercises a direct influence in Court affairs, and, of course, in the interest of despotism. The Prince cannot but act a Prince's part, and who was ever silly enough to suppose he would not? But I need not inform your readers of the utter impotency to which British Royalty itself has been reduced by the British oligarchy, so that, for instance, King William IV, a decided foe to Russia, was forced by his Foreign Minister—a member of the Whig oligarchy—to act as a foe to Turkey. How preposterous, then, to suppose Prince Albert to be able to carry one single point in defiance of the Ministry, except so far as little Court affairs, a dirty riband, or a tinsel star, are concerned! Use is made of his absolutist penchant to blind the people's eyes as to the plots and treacheries of the responsible Ministers. If the outcry and attack means anything it means an attack on royalist institutions. If there were no Queen there would be no Prince—if there were no throne there would be no Court influences. Princes would lose their power if thrones were not there to back them, and for them to lean upon. But, now mark! the papers which go the farthest in their "fearful boldness," which cry the loudest and try to make a sort of political capital out of Prince Albert, are the most eager in their assertions of loyalty to the throne and in fulsome adulation of the Queen. As to the Tory papers this proposition is self-evident. As to the radical Morning Advertiser, it is the same journal which hailed Bonaparte's coup d'état, and recently attacked an Irish paper for having dared to find fault with the Queen, on the occasion of her presence at Dublin, which reproaches the French Revolutionists with profess-

a Palmerston.—Ed.
ing Republicanism, and continues to designate Lord Palmerston as the savior of England. The whole is a Palmerstonian trick. Palmerston, by the revelations of his Russianism and his opposition to the new Reform Bill, has become unpopular. The latter act has taken the liberal gilding off his musty gingerbread. Nevertheless, he wants popularity in order to become Premier, or at least Foreign Minister. What an admirable opportunity to stamp himself a Liberal again and to play the part of Brutus, persecuted by secret Court influences. Attack a Prince-Consort—how taking for the people. He’ll be the most popular statesman of the age. What an admirable opportunity of casting obloquy on his present colleagues, of stigmatizing them as the tools of Prince Albert, and of convincing the Court that Palmerston must be accepted on his own terms. The Tories, of course, join in the cry, for church and crown are little to them compared with pounds and acres, and these the cotton-lords are winning from them fast. And if the Tories, in the name of “constitution” and “liberty” talk daggers against a Prince, what enlightened Liberal would not throw himself worshipping at their feet!

At the annual meeting of the Manchester Commercial Association the President, Mr. Aspinall Turner, declared with regard to the strikes and lock-outs and the general agitation of the workingmen, which he justly described as “the civil war going on between masters and operatives in Lancashire”—that, “as Manchester had put down royal tyranny and aristocratic tyranny, so it would also deal with the tyranny of Democracy.”

“Here we have,” exclaims The Press, “an involuntary avowal of the policy of the Manchester school. The crown is in England supreme—then diminish the royal power. The aristocracy stands before us—sweep it from our path. Workingmen agitate—crush them to the earth.”

Written on January 24, 1854


Signed: Karl Marx

---

The fortification of Constantinople would be, as I stated in my last letter, the most important step the Turks could take. Constantinople once fortified, with suitable strengthening of the forts on the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, the independence of Turkey, or of any power holding that capital, would require no foreign guarantee. There is no town more easy to be fortified than Constantinople. One single side of the triangle only—the one toward the land—would require a continuous rampart; the second, toward the Sea of Marmora, and the third, toward the Golden Horn, require no fortifications. A line of detached forts, at a convenient distance from the enceinte, and continued eastward so as to protect Pera, Galata and the north-eastern bank of the Golden Horn, would both strengthen the enceinte and prevent an enemy from turning it and carrying on works of siege on the hills commanding the town from behind Pera and Galata.

Such a fortress would be almost impregnable. Its communications cannot be cut off, unless the Dardanelles or the Bosphorus is forced, and if that were the case the City would be at once lost. But two such narrow passages may easily be fortified so strongly that no hostile fleet can pass through. A Russian army coming from the land side would have to rely upon perilous sea communication with Sebastopol and Odessa, and could hardly hold out for the time required to take the town, while its

---

\(a\) See this volume, pp. 587-88.—*Ed.*
continuous falling off in numbers would expose it to defeats from the garrison of the town and the reserves arriving from Asia.

The reply of Russia to the declaration of neutrality on the part of Denmark arrived at Copenhagen on the 20th inst. Russia is stated to refuse to consent to the neutrality, calling on Denmark to take one side or the other. Immediately after this notification, the Ambassadors of France, England and Russia, are said to have had a conference with the Danish Ministers. Now, I am informed from a very trustworthy source, although I can, of course, not vouch for the correctness of the information, that the protest is but a feint on the part of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg calculated to drive the other powers the faster into a formal acknowledgment of the terms on which the Danish neutrality is proposed. I am assured that recent negotiations were going on between Denmark on the one side, and France and England on the other, according to which, in the case of war, England was to occupy the Sound with her men-of-war, and France the Duchy of Schleswig, with a corps d'armée. To thwart this combination, communicated to Nesselrode by the Minister Oersted, Russia is said to have intimated to the Copenhagen Cabinet to propose the declaration of neutrality. She now feigns to oppose, and which, if adhered to by France and England, will not only break up their original plan, but also, by exempting from the laws of war, goods carried in neutral vessels, will secure the export of Russian merchandise by the Baltic.

The Czar's protest against the purchase, on the part of Prussia, of an Oldenburg port in the North Sea, is a bona fide protest, astonished as the Berlin public is said to have been at this other symptom of the ubiquitous intermeddling of Timur Tamerlane's successor.

The great "Manchester Reform meeting" has "come off, and a great piece of humbug it was," as The Englishman justly remarks. The Aberdeen policy extolled, Turkey insulted, Russia glorified, all interference between foreign states disclaimed—these few topics which, as far as foreign policy is concerned, form the regular stock-in-trade of the Manchester School—have again been expatiated on by Messrs. Cobden, Bright and the other "'umble and 'omely men," who want to have a "man of peace" at the Horse Guards, and a "lock-out" at the House of Lords to sell the English and to undersell all other nations.

---

a A. Dotézac, A. Buchanan and Baron Ungern-Sternberg.—Ed.
b A. Richards.—Ed.
Mr. Cobden's speech was a mere repetition, and a disingenuous one too, of the speech he made at the closing of Parliament. The only luxury of novelty he indulged in consisted of two arguments—the one directed against France, the other against America. It looks rather suspicious that the same man who took so prominent a part in bringing about the alliance with France at the time when the exploits of the Decembrists had aroused a cry of indignation in England, is now busied in undoing his own work by sneering at that alliance, and denouncing it as "inconsiderate" and "untimely."

As to America, Mr. Cobden declares that it is from the growth of its manufactures and commerce, and not from the warlike policy of Russia, that England may fear to see endangered the grandeur of her commercial and national prosperity. How does this tally with his professional free trade cant, according to which the commercial prosperity of one people depends on the growth of the commerce and industry of all other peoples, the notion of any dangerous rivalry between two industrial peoples being disclaimed as a fallacy of protectionist "quacks"? How does this tally with "England's, by the magic of her machinery, having united forever two remote hemispheres in the bonds of peace, by placing Europe and America in absolute and inextricable dependence on each other"?

It is not the first time that Mr. Cobden, in order to divert from Russia the suspicions and the animosity of the English people, is anxious to turn them against the United States of America. In 1836, the seizure of an English vessel on the Circassian coast by a Russian man-of-war, and the fiscal regulations of the St. Petersburg Cabinet with regard to the navigation of the Danube, together with the revelations published in The Portfolio, having evoked the wrath of the English people, and, above all, the commercial classes, against Russia,—Mr. Cobden, at that epoch yet "an infant in literary life and unlearned in public speaking," published a small anonymous pamphlet, entitled Russia: A Cure for Russophobia. By a Manchester Manufacturer. In this pamphlet it is argued that "in less than twenty years this [namely, the fear of the growth of American prosperity, and not of Russian aggrandizement] will be the sentiment of the people of England generally; and the same convictions will be forced upon the Government of the country." In the same pamphlet he professed that,

"in examining the various grounds upon which those who discuss the subject take up their hostile attitude towards the Russian nation, we have discovered, with
infinite surprise and a deep conviction of the truth, that a century of *aristocratic* Government in England has impregnated all classes with the haughty and arrogant spirit of their rulers" (against meek Russia); that “if the Government of St. Petersburg were transferred to the shores of the Bosphorus, a splendid and substantial European city would, in less than twenty years, spring up in the place of those huts which now constitute the capital of Turkey; [...] noble buildings would arise, learned societies flourish, and the arts prosper. [...] If Russia’s Government should attain to that actual power, she would cease the wars of the sword and begin the battle with the wilderness, by constructing railroads, building bridges, [...] by fostering the accumulation of capital, *the growth of cities, and the increase of civilization and freedom*.... The slavery which pollutes Constantinople [...] would instantly disappear, and commerce [...] and laws protecting life and property”—(as now exemplified in Moldo-Wallachia)—“take its place.”

As a proof of Russia’s civilization and consequently her right to appropriate Turkey, Mr. Cobden told his astonished readers that the Russian merchant possessed of 10,000-15,000 roubles, not only engages in foreign commerce, but is “*exempt from corporal punishment, and qualified to drive about in a carriage and pair*.” Are we then to be astonished at the Russian Emperor’s recently expressed conviction that “England, with a Bourgeois Parliament, could not carry on a war with glory”? So deeply imbued was Mr. Cobden in 1836 with the “wickedness of the public writers and speakers,” who ventured to find fault with the Autocrat of all the Russias, that he wound up his pamphlet with the question:

“And who and what are those writers and speakers? How long shall political quacks be permitted without fear of punishment, [...] to inflame the minds and disorder the understandings of a whole nation?”

Those “public writers and speakers,” we presume, who possess 10,000 to 15,000 roubles and are able to drive about in a carriage and pair, to be exempted at least from “corporal punishment.” Till now, Mr. Cobden’s Philo-Russian mania had been considered, by some, as one of the multifarious crotchets he uses to trade in, by others as the necessary offspring of his peace doctrine. Of late, however, the public has been informed by one who justly describes himself as the “literary horse, or ass if you like,” of the late Anti-Corn Law League, that when Mr. Cobden wrote his first pamphlet, “he had been to Russia on a commercial errand of his own in 1834-35, and was successful,” that his “heart and calico were both in Russia in 1836,” and that his anger at the “English

---

" The Press, No. 38, January 21, 1854 (see this volume, p. 590).—Ed.

A. Somerville.—Ed.
writers, speakers, authors and reviewers," originated from their criticising his new customer, Nicholas of Russia.

As the House of Commons is to reassemble in a few days, it seems proper to give, in a condensed form, the statistics of British representation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Percentage of the actual representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Irish Peers in the House of Commons\(^{400}\) are: Viscount Palmerston, for Tiverton; Viscount Barrington, for Berkshire; Earl Annesley, for Grimsby; Viscount Monck, for Portsmouth; Viscount Galway, for Retford; and Lord Hotham, for East Yorkshire. The men of literature and science are: Benjamin Disraeli, for Buckinghamshire; Thomas Macaulay, the historian, for Edinburgh; MacGregor, the commercial statistic, for Glasgow; William Stirling, author of *Annals of the Artists of Spain, etc.*, for Perthshire; W. Gladstone, author of *The State in its Relations with the Church*, and other works, for Oxford University; Dr. Austen H. Layard, author of *Nineveh and Its Remains, etc.*, for Aylesbury; James Wilson, the editor of *The Economist*, for Westbury; Sir William Molesworth, the Editor of Hobbes' works, etc., for Southwark; Sir E. L. Bulwer-Lytton, poet, dramatist, novelist, for Hertfordshire; William Johnson Fox, Anti-Corn-Law-League writer, for Oldham; W. A. Mackinnon, author of a (very pitiful) *History of Civilization, etc.*, for Rye; R. Monckton Milnes, author of *Memorials of Travel, etc.*, and Benjamin Oliveira, author of a *Tour in the East*, both for Pontefract; Edward Miall, author of several theological and political works, for Rochdale; William Mure, author of a *History of Grecian Literature*, for Renfrewshire, Scotland; W. P. Urquhart, author of *The Life of Francesco Sforza*, for Westmeath County, Ireland; Robert Stephenson, the celebrated railway engineer,
for Whitby; William Michell, physician, for Bodmin; John Brady, surgeon, for Leitrim. Whether Lord John Russell may be safely classed under the head of literary gentlemen I dare not decide.

There are, at least, 100 seats, the representatives of which are nominally elected by the constituencies, but really appointed by Dukes, Earls, Marquises, ladies and other persons, who turn their local influence to political account. The Marquis of Westminster, for instance, disposes of two seats for Chester, a town mustering 2,524 electors; the Duke of Norfolk of one seat for Arundel; the Duke of Sutherland of two seats for Newcastle-under-Lyne; the Marquis of Lansdowne of one seat for Calne; the Earl Fitzwilliam of two seats for Malton; the Duke of Richmond of two seats for Chichester; Miss Pierse of one seat for Northallerton, &c.

The disproportion on one side of the electoral body, and on the other of the representatives, when compared with the entire population, may be shown by some few instances:

In Berkshire the entire population amounts to 170,065, and the number of electors to 7,980. It chooses nine representatives for the House, while Leicestershire, with an entire population of 230,308, and a constituency of 13,081 disposes of six seats only; Lincolnshire, with a population of 407,222, and 24,782 electors, disposes of thirteen seats in the House, while Middlesex, with an entire population of 1,886,576, and a constituency of 113,490 elects only fourteen members. Lancashire, with a population of 2,031,236, has a constituency of only 81,786 electors, and disposes of but twenty-six seats in the House, while Buckinghamshire, with an entire population of 163,723, and with 8,125 electors, is represented by eleven members. Sussex, with an entire population of 336,844, and with 18,054 electors, elects eighteen members, while Staffordshire, with a population of 608,716, and with 29,607 electors elects only seventeen.

The relation of the Electoral body to the population is:

In England one County Elector represents 20.7 persons of the County population.

In Wales one County Elector represents 20.0 persons of the County population.

In Scotland one County Elector represents 34.4 persons of the County population.

In England one Borough Elector represents 18.0 persons of the borough population.

In Wales one Borough Elector represents 24.4 persons of the borough population.
In Scotland one Borough Elector represents 23.3 persons of the borough population.

The data for Ireland are not so complete as for England and Scotland; but the following may be taken as a fair approximation for the same period, 1851-52.

One Elector in an Irish County represents 36 persons of the County population.

One Elector in an Irish borough represents 23 persons of the borough population.

The general deficiency of the European Grain markets may be stated as follows: the deficiency of grain in France in place of being ten millions of hectolitres, as stated by the Moniteur, to calm the alarm, greatly exceeds twenty millions, that is, more than eight million quarters of English measure; and the deficiency of potatoes is not less than one-fourth of the average of the last five years, while the deficiency in wine, oil and chestnuts is yet greater. The deficiency in the produce of corn in Belgium and Holland is about four millions of hectolitres; that of the Rhine Provinces, Prussia and Switzerland, at a moderate estimate, is taken to exceed ten million hectolitres. The estimated deficiency in Italy is known to be very great, but there is greater difficulty in arriving at even a proximate result. The lowest estimate, however, gives ten millions of hectolitres of grain, or a deficiency throughout the great grain-producing districts of Western Europe of not less than forty-four millions of hectolitres (seventeen million quarters). The deficiency in England is known to exceed five million quarters of grain, and calculations worthy of grave consideration give that amount as the deficiency in wheat alone. Thus there is a fatal deficiency in the last harvest in Western Europe alone of no less than twenty-two million quarters, without taking into account the great inferiority and shortcoming of other cereals, and the general prevalence of the potato-rot—a deficiency which, if valued in wheat, must be equal to at least five million quarters, or a grand total of twenty-seven million quarters of grain.

As to the supplies that may be expected from foreign markets, it is asserted by very competent commercial authority:

"In Poland the crops have been very short; in Russia, deficient, as seen by the high prices asked for grain at the Baltic ports before our deficiencies were known. And though in the Danubian provinces the harvest has not failed, yet the stocks there, as well as at Odessa, are greatly lessened by the immense exportations to the
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a "Paris, le 16 novembre", Le Moniteur universel, No. 321, November 17, 1853.—Ed.
Mediterranean and to France. As to America, it is unable to supply two million of quarters. All the ships of the world are inadequate to the supply of a quantity near, or even approaching a moiety of the deficiency, which at present is known to all England to exist."

Written on January 26-27, 1854


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
London, Friday, Feb. 3, 1854

I was able to see the State procession of the Queen\(^a\) to open Parliament, as it passed the Horse Guards. The Turkish Ambassador was received with loud cheers and hurrahs. Prince Albert, whose countenance was deadly pale, was furiously hissed by the crowds on both sides of the streets, while the Queen was sparing of her usual salutes and morbidly smiled at the unwonted manifestations of popular discontent. In a previous letter I have reduced the anti-Albert movement to its true dimensions, proving it to be a mere party trick.\(^b\) The public demonstration is, nevertheless, of a very grave character, as it proves the ostensible loyalty of the British people to be a mere conventional formality, a ceremonious affectation which cannot withstand the slightest shock. Probably it may induce the Crown to dismiss a Ministry, the anti-national policy of which threatens to endanger its own security.

When the recent mission of Count Orloff to the Vienna Cabinet\(^c\) became known The Times informed its credulous readers that Orloff was the very man the Czar used to employ on pacific errands.\(^d\) Now I need not inform you that this same Orloff appeared in the spring of 1833 at Constantinople to squeeze out of the Porte the Treaty of Unkia-Skelessi.\(^e\) What he now asks from the Cabinet at Vienna is the permission to send a Russian corps from Warsaw, by way of Hungary, to the Danubian seat of

---
\(^a\) Victoria.— Ed.
\(^b\) See this volume, pp. 589-92.— Ed.
\(^c\) *The Times*, No. 21650, January 28, 1854.— Ed.
war. It may be considered as the first result of his presence at Vienna, that Austria now insists upon the Porte’s dismissing its present commanders on the Danube—Selim Pasha, Ismail Pasha and Omer Pasha—on the plea that they are renegades and revolutionists. Every one acquainted with the past history of Turkey knows that from the beginning of the Osman power all her great generals, admirals, diplomatists and ministers have always been Christian renegades, Serbs, Greeks, Albanians, etc. Why not ask Russia to dismiss the forty or fifty men she has bought from all parts of Europe, and who constitute her whole stock of diplomatic ingenuity, political intelligence and military ability? In the meantime Austria has concentrated 80,000 men on the Turkish frontiers in Transylvania and Hungary, and ordered a Bohemian corps mustering some 30,000 men to join them. The Prussian Government on its part is stated to have declined to comply with the command of the Czar ordering Frederick William IV to send a corps of 100,000 men to occupy Poland in the name and interest of Russia, and thus set the garrisons there at liberty to march to the south for the prosecution of the campaign in the Principalities.

In a previous letter I called your attention to the recent financial expedient resorted to by the Austrian Government of exacting a discount of 15 per cent. upon their own paper money, when paid for taxes. This ingenious “tax upon the payment of taxes” is now extended to Italy also. The Milan Gazette of the 22d inst. publishes a decree from the Austrian Minister of Finance, announcing that

“in consequence of the fall in the value of paper money it will not be received at the custom-house unless at a discount of 17 per cent.”

As to the Russian Exchequer, I had on a previous occasion, at the beginning of what is called the Eastern complication, to warn your readers against the industriously circulated statement of the “hidden” treasures slumbering in the vaults of the Bank of St. Petersburg, and the ridiculous exaggeration of the vast monetary power that Russia can wield at a given moment. My views are fully confirmed by what has happened since. Not only has the Czar been forced to withdraw his metallic deposits from the banks of England and France, but, moreover, to commit an act of fraudulent confiscation. Prince Paskiewich has informed the War-
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a See this volume, pp. 586-87.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 117.—Ed.
saw mortgage or discount Bank that its capital will be taken as a forced loan, although the statutes of that bank forbid its advancing money upon any security but landed property. We are also informed that the Russian Government intends issuing a sum of 60,000,000 roubles in inconvertible paper, to defray the expenses of the war. This contrivance is no new one on the part of the Petersburg Cabinet. At the close of 1768, Catherine II, in order to meet the expenses of the war with Turkey, founded a bank of assignats, ostensibly instituted on the principle of issuing convertible notes payable to the bearer. But by a well-managed oversight, she forgot to tell the public in what sort of money these notes were to be payable, and some months later the payments were only made in copper coin. By another untoward "accident" it happened that these copper coins were overvalued by 50 per cent. when compared with the uncoined metal, and only circulated at their nominal value in consequence of their great scarcity and the want of small money for retail purposes. The convertibility of the notes was, therefore, a mere trick. In the first instance Catherine limited the whole issue to 40,000,000 roubles, in 25 rouble notes, the rouble representing a silver coin varying from 38 to 40d. British money, according to the rate of exchange, being equivalent to somewhat above 100 copper copeks. At the death of Catherine, in 1796, the mass of this paper money had risen to 157,000,000, nearly four times its original amount. The exchange in London had come down from 41d. in 1787 to 31d. in 1796. During the two subsequent governments, a rapid increase of issues having taken place, in 1810 the paper circulation reached 577,000,000, and the paper rouble was only worth 25\ 2/5 copeks, i.e., one-quarter of its value in 1788; and exchange in London, in the autumn of 1810, sunk to 11\ 1/2d. the rouble, instead of representing 38-40d. In 1817 the amount of notes in circulation was 836,000,000, according to the statement of Count Gurieff. As the custom-house duties and other taxes were calculated in silver roubles, the Government now declared these assignats to be receivable in the proportion of 4 to 1, thus avowing a depreciation of 75 per cent. During the progress of the depreciation, the prices of commodities rose proportionally, subject to very great fluctuations, which commenced troubling the Cabinet itself, and forced it to contract foreign loans in order to withdraw from circulation a portion of the notes. On the 1st of January, 1821, their amount was announced to have been reduced to 640,000,000. The subsequent wars with Turkey, Persia, Poland, Khiva, etc., again swelled the mass of the bank assignats, lowered the exchanges
anew, and subjected all commodities to extensive and irregular oscillations of prices. It was not till the 1st July, 1839, that, the rate of exchange being ameliorated in consequence of an enormous export of grain to England, the Czar issued a manifesto, according to which, from the 1st of July, 1840, the huge mass of bank assignats was to be converted into bank notes payable on demand in silver roubles at the full amount of 38d. The Czar Alexander had declared the assignats to be receivable, on the part of the tax-gatherer, at the proportion of 4 to 1; but the Czar Nicholas is said to have restored them, by his conversion, to their full original value again. There was, however, a curious little clause annexed, ordering that for every one of such new notes three and a half of the old ones should be delivered up. The old note was not declared to be depreciated to 28 per cent. of its original amount, but $3\frac{1}{2}$ of the old notes were declared to be equivalent to a full new note. Hence we may infer, on the one hand, that the Russian Cabinet is as conscientious and punctilious in financial as in diplomatic distinctions; and on the other, that the mere danger of an approaching war suffices to throw it back into all the monetary difficulties which Nicholas has tried for about twenty years to emerge from.

One of the European Governments after the other comes forward appealing to the pockets of its beloved subjects. Even the King of sober-minded Holland demand of the States General 600,000 rix-dollars for works of fortification and defense, adding “that circumstances may determine him to mobilize a portion of the army and to send out his fleets.”

If it were possible to meet real wants and to fill the general vacuum of money chests by any ingenious art of book-keeping, the contriver of the French budget, as published some days ago in the Moniteur, would have done the thing; but there is not the smallest shopkeeper at Paris unaware of the fact that, by the most skilful grouping of figures, one cannot get out of the books of his creditor, and that the hero of the 2d of December, deeming the public pocket to be inexhaustible, has recklessly run into the nation’s debt.

There can be imagined nothing more naïf than the announcement of the Danish Ministry at the sitting of the Folketing, on the
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a William III.—Ed.
b Bineau, “Rapport à l’Empereur”. Le Moniteur universel, No. 27, January 27, 1854.—Ed.
c Napoleon III.—Ed.
17th inst., that the Government intended postponing to a more expedient season the proposition to change the fundamental institutions of Denmark, and introduce their much cherished Whole State Constitution (Gesammtstaatsverfassung). Written on February 3, 1854


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
The “Rights and Privileges of the Greek and Latin Churches,” as the ministerial blue book on the Eastern question has been ingeniously baptized, have been subjected by me to a scrutinizing perusal, and I intend shortly to give your readers a condensed survey of this diplomatic labyrinth. For the present, I content myself with the simple assurance that a more monstrous monument of Governmental infamies and imbecility has, perhaps, never been bequeathed to history. And let us remember, what Mr. Baillie said in the House of Commons on the value of these blue books:

“As for information, they had quite as much on this subject as they required—not, he admitted, official information—but [...] quite as much as they were likely to receive from a blue book that had been carefully prepared, and had concealed all that a Government might desire. [...] He spoke from experience ['hear, hear,' and laughter from the ministerial benches], from a knowledge of how blue books relating to foreign affairs had been prepared for this House.”

I know very well that Lord Palmerston, when once accused of having perverted the documents relating to the Afghan war, of having suppressed most important passages in dispatches, and even of having deliberately falsified others, made the following ingenious reply:

“Sir, if any such thing had been done, what was to prevent the two adverse Governments, who succeeded us in power, one of which endured for five years—from proclaiming the fact and producing the real documents?”

---

^a See this volume, pp. 615-16.—Ed.
^b On January 31, 1854.—Ed.
^c Quoted from Palmerston’s speech in the House of Commons on March 1, 1848.—Ed.
But I know equally well that the secret of these blue-book dodges is the very secret of the alternate Whig and Tory succession in government, each party having a greater interest to maintain the capability of its opponent for succession, than by ruining their mutual political "honor" to compromise the government of the ruling classes altogether. This is what the British are pleased to call the operation of their glorious constitution.

Lord Clanricarde had given notice that he would move a discussion of the Eastern question in the House of Lords, yesterday. Consequently, great expectations were entertained, and the House almost crowded. Mr. Urquhart did not hesitate even to designate, in yesterday's *Morning Advertiser*, Lord Clanricarde as the future leader of the national party," remembering that he was the only man who opposed, in 1829, the Russians in crossing the Balkan, but forgetting, no doubt, that the same noble Marquis was, during the momentous epoch of 1839-40, Lord Palmerston's Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, and his chief instrument in bringing about the separate-treaty of 1840 and the rupture with France.\(^{408}\)

The public has been decidedly disappointed by the debates, as the Marquis of Clanricarde, inferring from the reports in the public papers, that "there appeared to be something of the semblance of negotiations still going on at Vienna, was extremely sorry to occasion any discussion which might prevent a peaceful termination to those negotiations."\(^{b}\) Accordingly, he gave notice of his intention to bring forward a motion on the same subject this day week. The noble Marquis contented himself with asking Lord Clarendon "whether any answer had yet been received from the Emperor of Russia to the Vienna proposals?" and "what instructions had been given to the British Minister at St. Petersburg?" Lord Clarendon's reply was, "that he had only received this afternoon an official statement of the facts from Vienna." The Emperor of Russia had rejected the Vienna note, and offered, in its stead, a counter project. On the 2d inst. the Conference had been called together, and had rejected on its part the counter project.

"The new proposals put forward by Russia were wholly unacceptable—they could not be transmitted to Constantinople, and, therefore, there was an end of

\(^{a}\) D. Urquhart, "How Our Negotiations with Russia Will Conduct Us into a War with France", Letter III, *The Morning Advertiser*, No. 19540, February 6, 1854.—*Ed.*

\(^{b}\) Marx quotes from Clanricarde's speech, as well as from those of other members of the House of Lords and of the House of Commons, according to *The Times*, No. 21658, February 7, 1854.—*Ed.*
them. He had no reason to think that fresh negotiations on the subject would be renewed. As to the preservation of peace, he held out no such expectation at all."

With regard to the other question put by Lord Clanricarde, he stated that

"on Saturday evening Baron Brunnow called on him at the Foreign Office and placed in his hands a note, in which he announced that the answer he had received from him to the inquiry he was instructed to make by his Government, was not of a kind that permitted him to continue diplomatic relations, and that, therefore, diplomatic relations between Russia and England were suspended. Baron Brunnow had taken leave of him on Saturday evening, but it was then too late to depart from London, and he understood that he was to leave early this morning."

M. de Kisseleff, we are informed by telegraph, left Paris yesterday and is gone to Brussels. The official or Government journals state that all the Embassy at London would be broken up, and every Russian leave England. But I happen to know, from an excellent source, that, on the contrary, the number of Russians in England will only be diminished by the person of the Ambassador, and that the whole personnel remains at London under the superintendence of M. de Berg, First Secretary of the Embassy. As to the position of the British Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, Lord Clarendon declared that

"as it was half past 6 o'clock on Saturday when Baron Brunnow called upon him, and as it was necessary [...] to have previous communication with the French Government, it was not possible at the moment to send instructions to the British Minister at St. Petersburg, but they had already held communication with the French Ambassador on the subject, and instructions would be sent to Sir G. Seymour and Gen. de Castelbajac tomorrow, which would place them on exactly the same footing as the Russian Ambassador here, and diplomatic relations between the two countries and Russia would be suspended."

Lord John Russell repeated in the House of Commons the declaration of Lord Clarendon in the Upper House, and Lord Palmerston announced that

"he would bring forward a measure to consolidate the militia laws, in which it was his intention that a militia force should be organized for Scotland and Ireland, the period of enrollment depending upon the votes of the House."

The English army is to be augmented immediately by 11,000 men; 1,500 coast guards are also to be embarked forthwith, intended to form a stock for the crews of the newly commissioned ships. A royal proclamation has been issued forbidding the exportation of any vessels of war, military stores and ammunition to Russia. Embargo has been laid by the naval authorities visiting the private dockyards on the Thames on two vessels in course of
construction for Russian account. A contract, on behalf of the British Government, for coal sufficient for steamers of the aggregate amount of 11,000 horse-power, has been concluded at Copenhagen. Admiral Sir Charles Napier is to have command of the Baltic fleet about to be formed.

The official *Wiener Zeitung* announces that

"the Government has received notice that Russia has expressly declared to the four Powers that she regards herself as released from the promise made at Olmütz to remain on the defensive in the Principalities."

Concerning the object of the mission of Count Orloff at Vienna a number of conflicting rumors are afloat; the most credible of which appears to be contained in the Berlin correspondence of to-day's *Times*.

"Russia," says this correspondent, "invites Austria and Prussia to enter with her into a treaty of neutrality for all contingencies; suggests to them to make the declaration of their neutrality the common expression of the neutrality of the German Bund; undertakes to come to the assistance of the Bund should any of its members be attacked; and binds herself, in the case of any territorial changes having to be arranged at the end of the war, to conclude no peace without having due consideration for the interests of the German Powers in such territorial changes. In this proposal for a treaty of neutrality distinct reference is made to the principles and provisions of the Holy Alliance of 1815."

As to the decision probably come to by Austria and Prussia, I can only repeat the convictions already recorded by me on this question. Austria will endeavor by every means to maintain her position of neutrality as long as she will be permitted to do so, and will declare for Russia when the proper time has arrived. Prussia, on the other hand, is likely again to miss the proper time for abandoning her neutrality and will end by calling upon herself the fate of another Jena.409

We learn from Constantinople that the combined fleet have returned to their anchorage at Beikoz, notwithstanding the following order, sent out to them, on behalf of the Ambassadors, by the *Samson*:

"The Ambassadors are surprised at the sudden resolution of the Admirals, more particularly at the present moment, when a Turkish steam-flotilla is on the point of starting with ammunition and other stores for the army of Anatolia. The orders of the French and British Governments [...] were formal and precise [they were indeed, but not the original orders with which the Admirals were dispatched, but only those just received], respecting the protection to be afforded by the combined fleets to the Ottoman flag and territory, and the attention of both Admirals is again called to
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a See this volume, pp. 554-55.—Ed.
the stringent nature of these instructions which had been duly notified to them. The Admirals, it would appear, consider that the measures entrusted to their execution may be equally well effected, whether the force under their command be stationed at Beikoz or Sinope. [In this case, it would appear to others, that the same instructions might have been carried out by the fleets quietly remaining at Malta and Toulon.] This is a matter which must entirely depend upon their [...] judgment, and on them the responsibility will rest."

The Russian fleet is known to be at Kaffa, near the Strait of Yenikale,¹ whence the distance to Batum is only one-third of the distance between Batum and Beikoz. Will the Admirals be able to prevent a Sinope at Batum, "whether they be stationed at Beikoz or elsewhere?"

You will remember that the Czar's first proclamation accused the Sultan of enlisting under his banner the revolutionary dregs of all Europe. Now, while Lord Stratford de Redcliffe declares to Lord Dudley Stuart that he could not assist him in organizing any of those dregs as a voluntary legion, the Czar has himself been the first to establish a revolutionary corps, the so-called Greco-Slavonian Legion, with the direct intention of provoking the Sultan's subjects to revolt. The corps is being organized in Wallachia and numbers already, according to Russian statements, above 3,000 men, not to be paid in bons à perpétuité,² as the Wallachians themselves, colonels being promised 5 ducats per day; majors 3 ducats; captains 2; subaltern officers 1, and soldiers 2 zwanzigers, the arms to be supplied by Russia.

Meanwhile the armaments of France seem no longer to be intended to remain on paper. As you know, the reserves of 1851 have been called out and in the last few days immense military stores have been sent from Arras to Metz and Strasbourg. General Pélissier has left for Algiers with orders to select the different corps which are to form the expedition to Constantinople, for which Sir J. Burgoyne and Colonel Ardant have gone to prepare quarters.

The rumored passage of Omer Pasha at the head of a large army, though if attempted it could hardly be executed at a more opportune moment, since the Russians are known to be concentrated at Krajova, between Bucharest and Kalafat, yet needs confirmation.

To return to the doings of the British Parliament, there is, of course, not much to be mentioned, with the exception of the

---

¹ The Kerch Strait.— Ed.
² Obligation for all eternity.— Ed.
proposition of a bill for throwing open the coast-trade to foreign vessels, a proposition which has not met with a single protest. Protestation must be decidedly dead, since it shows no capacity to make the slightest stand against the universal invasion of the modern principle of commerce: to buy in the cheapest market whatever you require. How far the cheapest crew is qualified to protect life and property, the late catastrophe of the *Tayleur* has shown.410

Mr. I. Butt, in yesterday’s sitting of the Commons, gave notice

“that to-morrow he should move that there should be read by the Clerk, at the table of the House, an article published in *The Times* of to-day, and the previous statements of *The Dublin Freeman’s Journal*, imputing to the” (Irish) “members of the House a trafficking in places for money. He should also move for a Select Committee to inquire into the allegations of such trafficking as contained in these publications.”

Why Mr. Butt is indignant only at the trafficking for money will be understood by those who remember that the legality of any other mode of trafficking was settled during last session. Since 1830 Downing-st. has been placed at the mercy of the Irish Brigade.411 It is the Irish members who have created and kept in place the Ministers to their mind. In 1834 they drove from the Cabinet Sir J. Graham and Lord Stanley. In 1835 they compelled William IV to dismiss the Peel Ministry and to restore the Melbourne Administration. From the general election of 1837 down to that of 1841, while there was a British majority in the Lower House opposed to that Administration, the votes of the Irish Brigade were strong enough to turn the scale and keep it in office. It was the Irish Brigade again who installed the Coalition Cabinet. With all this power of Cabinet-making, the Brigade have never prevented any infamies against their own country nor any injustice to the English people. The period of their greatest power was at the time of O’Connell, from 1834-1841. To what account was it turned? The Irish agitation was never anything but a cry for the Whigs against the Tories, in order to extort places from the Whigs. Nobody who knows anything about the so-called Litchfield-house contract,412 will differ from this opinion—that contract by which O’Connell was to vote for, but licensed to spout against, the Whigs on condition that he should nominate his own Magistrates in Ireland. It is time for the Irish Brigade to put off their patriotic airs. It is time for the Irish people to put off their dumb hatred of the English and call their own representatives to an account for their wrongs.
The “Society of Arts”\textsuperscript{413} and tricks have lately ventured on an escamotage of the Labor Parliament by a countermove intended to “settle” the still enduring struggle between the capitalists and workingmen of England. The meeting was presided over by a noble Lord, and delegates from both parties had been invited to discuss their grievances after the fashion of the Luxembourg conferences of M. Louis Blanc.\textsuperscript{414} The humbug was protested against by Mr. Ernest Jones, in the name of the working classes, and old Robert Owen told these enlightened gentlemen that no arbitration, nor device, nor art of any kind, could ever fill the gulf dividing the two great fundamental classes of this or any country. It is superfluous to add that the meeting dissolved under an ample cover of ridicule. The Chartists of London and the Provincial Delegates held a public meeting on the following day, when the proposal of the Labor Parliament was unanimously approved, and the 11th March named for its opening at Manchester.

Written on February 7, 1854


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the \textit{New-York Daily Tribune}
Karl Marx

[RUSSIAN DIPLOMACY.—
THE BLUE BOOK ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.—
MONTENEGRO] 415

London, Friday, Feb. 10, 1854

At the time when the treaty of neutrality was concluded between Denmark and Sweden, I stated my conviction, contrary to the current opinion in England and France, that it was not by any means to be looked upon as a triumph of the Western Powers, and that the pretended protest of Russia against that treaty was nothing but a feint. The Scandinavian papers, and The Times' correspondent, quoting from them, are now unanimous in recording the same opinion, declaring the whole treaty to be the work of Russia.

The propositions submitted by Count Orloff to the Vienna Conference, and rejected by them, were as follows:

1. Renewal of the old treaties.
2. Protectorate of Russia over the Greek Christians of Turkey.
3. Expulsion of all political refugees from the Ottoman Empire.
4. Refusal to admit the mediation of any other Power, and to negotiate otherwise than directly with a Turkish Envoy, to be sent to St. Petersburg.

On the latter point Count Orloff declared his readiness to compromise, but the Conference refused. Why did the Conference refuse? Or why did the Emperor of Russia refuse the last terms of the Conference? The propositions are the same on both sides. The renewal of the old treaties had been stipulated, the Russian Protectorate admitted with only a modification in the form; and, as the last point had been abandoned by Russia herself, the

---

a See this volume, p. 594.—Ed.
Austrian demand for the expulsion of the refugees\(^4\) could not have been the cause of a rupture between Russia and the West. It is evident, then, that the position of the Emperor of Russia is now such as to prevent him from accepting any terms at the hands of England and France, and that he must bring Turkey to his feet either with or without the chance of a European war.

In military circles the latter is now regarded as inevitable, and the preparations for it are going on in every quarter. Admiral Bruat has already left Brest for Algiers, where he is to embark 10,000 men, and sixteen English regiments stationed in Ireland are ordered to hold themselves ready to go to Constantinople. The expedition can only have a twofold object: either to coerce the Turks into submission to Russia, as Mr. Urquhart announces, or to carry on the war against Russia, in real earnest. In both cases the fate of the Turks is equally certain. Once more handed over to Russia, not indeed directly, but to her dissolving agencies, the power of the Ottoman Empire would soon be reduced, like that of the Lower Empire, to the precincts of the capital. Taken under the absolute tutorship of France and England the sovereignty of the Ottomans over their European estates would be no less at an end.

If we are to take the war into our hands, observes *The Times*, we must have the control over all the operations.

In this case, then, the Turkish Ministry would be placed under the direct administration of the Western Ambassadors, the Turkish War Office under the War Offices of England and France, and the Turkish armies under the command of French and English Generals. The Turkish Empire, in its ancient conditions of existence, has ceased to be.

After his complete "failure" at Vienna, Count Orloff is now gone back to St. Petersburg—"with the assurance of the Austrian and Prussian neutrality, under all circumstances." On the other hand, the telegraph reports from Vienna that a change has taken place in the Turkish Ministry, the Seraskier and Kapudan Pasha\(^a\) having resigned. *The Times* cannot understand how the war party could have been defeated at the very time that France and England were going to war. For my part, if the news be true, I can very well understand the "god-sent" occurrence as the work of the

---

\(^a\) The War Minister and the Minister for the Navy.—*Ed.*
English Coalition representative at Constantinople, whom we find so repeatedly regretting, in his blue-book dispatches, that

"he could hardly yet go so far in his pressure on the Turkish Cabinet as it might be desirable."

The blue books begin with dispatches relating to the demands put forward on the part of France with respect to the Holy Shrines—demands not wholly borne out by the ancient capitulations, and ostensibly made with the view to enforce the supremacy of the Latin over the Greek Church. I am far from participating in the opinion of Mr. Urquhart, according to which the Czar had, by secret influences at Paris, seduced Bonaparte to rush into this quarrel in order to afford Russia a pretext for interfering herself in behalf of the privileges of the Greek Catholics. It is well known that Bonaparte wanted to buy, à tout prix, the support of the Catholic party, which he regarded from the very first as the main condition for the success of his usurpation. Bonaparte was fully aware of the ascendancy of the Catholic Church over the peasant population of France, and the peasantry were to make him Emperor in spite of the bourgeoisie and in spite of the proletariat. M. de Falloux, the Jesuit, was the most influential member of the first ministry he formed, and of which Odilon Barrot, the soi-disant Voltairean, was the nominal head. The first resolution adopted by this ministry, on the very day after the inauguration of Bonaparte as President, was the famous expedition against the Roman Republic. M. de Montalembert, the chief of the Jesuit party, was his most active tool in preparing the overthrow of the parliamentary régime and the coup d’état of the 2d December. In 1850, the Univers, the official organ of the Jesuit party, called day after day on the French Government to take active steps for the protection of the interests of the Latin Church in the East. Anxious to cajole and win over the Pope, and to be crowned by him, Bonaparte had reasons to accept the challenge and make himself appear the “most Catholic” Emperor of France. The Bonapartist usurpation, therefore, is the true origin of the present Eastern complication. It is true that Bonaparte wisely withdrew his pretensions as soon as he perceived the Emperor Nicholas ready to make them the pretext for excluding him from the conclave of Europe, and Russia was, as
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a At all costs.— Ed.
b Pius IX.— Ed.
usual, eager to utilise the events which she had not the power to create, as Mr. Urquhart imagines. But it remains a most curious phenomenon in history, that the present crisis of the Ottoman Empire has been produced by the same conflict between the Latin and Greek Churches which once gave rise to the foundation of that Empire in Europe.

It is not my intention to investigate the whole contents of the “Rights and Privileges of the Latin and Greek Churches,” before having considered a most important incident entirely suppressed in these blue books, viz.: The Austro-Turkish quarrel about Montenegro. The necessity to previously treat this affair is the more urgent, as it will establish the existence of a concerted plan between Russia and Austria for the subversion and division of the Turkish Empire, and as the very fact of England’s putting the subsequent negotiations between the Court of St. Petersburg and the Porte into the hands of Austria, cannot fail to throw a most curious light on the conduct of the English Cabinet throughout this Eastern question. In the absence of any official documents on the Montenegro affair, I refer to a book, which has only just been published on this subject, and is entitled the Handbook of the Eastern Question, by L.F. Simpson.

The Turkish fortress of Zabljak (on the frontiers of Montenegro and Albania) was stormed by a band of Montenegrins in December, 1852. It is remembered that Omer Pasha was ordered by the Porte to repel the aggressors. The Sublime Porte declared the whole coast of Albania in a state of blockade, a measure which apparently could be directed only against Austria and her navy, and which indicated the conviction of the Turkish Ministry that Austria had provoked the Montenegrin revolt.

The following article, under date of Vienna, Dec. 29, 1852, appeared then in the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung:

“If Austria wished to assist the Montenegrins, the blockade could not prevent it. If the Montenegrins descended from their mountains, Austria could provide them with arms and ammunition by Cattaro, in spite of the presence of the Turkish fleet in the Adriatic. Austria does not approve either of the present incursion of the Montenegrins, nor of the revolution which is on the eve of breaking out in Herzegovina and Bosnia among the Christians. She has constantly protested against the persecutions of the Christians, and that in the name of humanity; Austria is obliged

---

a L.F. Simpson, The Eastern Question: a Connected Narrative of Events from the Missions of Count Leiningen and Prince Menschikoff to Constantinople, to the Present Day. Marx quotes below passages from this book (pp. 3-6 and 8-10).—Ed.
to observe neutrality toward the Eastern Church. The last news from Jerusalem will have shown how fiercely religious hatred burned there. The agents of Austria must, therefore, exert all their efforts to maintain peace between the Greek Christians and the Latin Christians of the Empire."

From this article we glean, firstly, that coming revolutions of the Turkish Christians were anticipated as certain, that the way for the Russian complaints concerning the oppression of the Greek Church was paved by Austria, and that the religious complication about the Holy Shrines was expected to give occasion for Austria’s "neutrality."

In the same month a note was addressed to the Porte by Russia, who offered her mediation in Montenegro, which was declined on the ground that the Sultan—a was able himself to uphold his own rights. Here we see Russia operating exactly as she did at the time of the Greek revolution—first offering to protect the Sultan against his subjects, with the view of protecting afterward his subjects against the Sultan, if her assistance should not be accepted.

The fact that there existed a concert between Russia and Austria for the occupation of the Principalities, even at this early time, may be gleaned from another extract from the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, of 30th December, 1852:

"Russia, which has only recently acknowledged the independence of Montenegro, can scarcely remain an idle spectator of events. Moreover, commercial letters and travelers from Moldavia and Wallachia, mention that from Volhynia down to the mouth of the Pruth, the country swarms with Russian troops, and that reenforcements are continually arriving."

Simultaneously the Vienna journals announced that an Austrian army of observation was assembling on the Austro-Turkish frontiers.

On Dec. 6, 1852, Lord Stanley interpellated Lord Malmesbury with respect to the affairs of Montenegro, and Bonaparte's noble friend made the following declaration:

"The noble lord intimated his desire to ask whether any change had recently taken place in the political relations of that wild country bordering on Albania, called Montenegro. I believe that no change whatever has taken place with respect to its political relations. The chief of that country bears a double title; he is head of the Greek Church in that country, and he is also the temporal sovereign. But with respect to his ecclesiastical position he is under the jurisdiction of the Emperor of Russia, who is considered to be the head of the whole Greek Church. The chief of

---

a Abdul Mejid.— Ed.
b Danilo I Petrović Njegoš.— Ed.
Montenegro has been” (as I believe all his ancestors were before him) “accustomed to receive from the sanction and recognition of the Emperor his Episcopal jurisdiction and titles. With respect to the independence of that country, whatever the opinion of different persons may be as to the advantage of such a position, the fact is that Montenegro has been an independent country for something like 150 years, and though various attempts have been made by the Porte to bring it into subjection, those attempts have failed one after another, and the country is in the same position now that it was some 200 years ago.”

In this speech Lord Malmesbury, the then Tory Secretary for Foreign Affairs, quietly dissects the Ottoman Empire by separating from it a country that had ever belonged to it, recognising at the same time the Emperor of Russia’s spiritual pretensions over subjects of the Porte. What are we to say of these two sets of Oligarchs, except that they rival each other in imbecility?

The Porte was, of course, seriously alarmed at this speech of a British Minister, and there appeared, shortly afterward, in an English newspaper the following letter from Constantinople, dated Jan. 5, 1853:

“The Porte has experienced the greatest irritation owing to Lord Malmesbury’s declaration in the House of Lords that Montenegro was independent. He thus played into the hands of Russia and Austria, by which England will lose that influence and confidence which she has hitherto enjoyed. In the first article of the treaty of Sistova, concluded between the Porte and Austria in 1791 (to which treaty England, Holland, and Russia were mediating parties), it is expressly stipulated that an amnesty should be granted to the subjects of both Powers who had taken part against their rightful sovereigns, viz.: the Servians, Montenegrins, Moldavians and Wallachians, named as rebel subjects of the Porte. The Montenegrins who reside in Constantinople, of whom there are 2,000 to 3,000, pay the haratch or capitation-tax, and in judicial procedure with subjects of other Powers at Constantinople, the Montenegrins are always considered and treated as Turkish subjects without objection.”

In the beginning of January, 1853, the Austrian Government sent Baron Kellner von Köllenstein, an aide-de-camp of the Emperor, to Cattaro to watch the course of events, while Mr. d'Ozeroff, the Russian Envoy at Constantinople, handed in a protest to the Divan against the concessions made to the Latins in the question of the Holy Shrines. At the end of January, Count Leiningen arrived at Constantinople, and was admitted on the 3d February, to a private audience with the Sultan, to whom he delivered a letter from the Austrian Emperor. The Porte refused

---

Footnote:

a Francis Joseph I.—Ed.
to comply with his demands, and Count Leiningen thereupon gave in an *ultimatum*, allowing the Porte four days to answer. The Porte immediately placed itself under the protection of England and France, which did not protect her, while Count Leiningen refused their mediation. On Feb. 15, he had obtained everything he had asked for (with the exception of Art. III) and his ultimatum was accepted. It contained the following articles:

"I. Immediate evacuation of Montenegro and the establishment of the *status quo ante bellum*.

"II. A declaration by which the Porte is to engage herself to maintain the *status quo* of the territories of Kleck and Suttorina, and to recognize the *mare clausum* in favor of Austria.

"III. A strict inquiry to take place concerning the acts of Mussulman fanaticism committed against the Christians of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

"IV. Removal of all the political refugees and renegades at present in the provinces adjoining the Austrian frontiers.

"V. Indemnity of 200,000 florins to certain Austrian merchants, whose contracts had been arbitrarily annulled, and the maintenance of those contracts for all the time they were agreed on.

"VI. Indemnity of 56,000 florins to a merchant whose ship and cargo had been unjustly confiscated.

"VII. Establishment of numerous consulates in Bosnia, Servia, Herzegovina and all over Rumelia.

"VIII. Disavowal of the conduct maintained in 1850, in the affair of the refugees."

Before acceding to this ultimatum, the Ottoman Porte, as Mr. Simpson states, addressed a note to the Ambassadors of England and France, demanding a promise from them of positive assistance in the event of a war with Austria. "The two Ministers not being able to pledge themselves in a definite manner," the Turkish Government yielded to the energetic proceedings of Count Leiningen.

On February 28th, Count Leiningen arrived at Vienna, and Prince Menchikoff at Constantinople. On the 3d of March, Lord John Russell had the impudence to declare, in answer to an interpellation of Lord Dudley Stuart, that

"In answer to representations made to the Austrian Government, assurances had been given that the latter held the same views as the English Government on the subject; and, though he could not state the precise terms of the arrangement that had been made, the intervention of France and England had been *successful*, and he trusted the late differences were now over. The course adopted by England had been to give Turkey such advice as would maintain her honor and her independence.... For his own part, he thought that on grounds of right, of
international law, of faith toward our ally, and also on grounds of general policy and expediency, the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Turkey was a great and ruling point of the foreign policy of England."

Written on February 10, 1854
Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
APPENDIX
The “uneducated” public having ceased to pass judgment on it, the Neu-England-Zeitung of Boston has, with commendable modesty and anticipating the significance of its insipid Grenzboten radicalism, reached the conclusion that it is the “best newspaper”. For some time now, that newspaper has performed some grotesque antics. It resembles an overladen and frail little craft that has put out from the coast of the old world on a voyage of discovery. Suddenly the vessel finds itself out on the high seas and, would you credit it, they have forgotten to bring a compass, a pilot and a captain who can navigate! They are now at the mercy of the winds and the waves. At this juncture a worthy old gentleman tries to lecture the unthinking crew on the seriousness of the situation; but he is still sermonising when a laughing nymph appears in the distance to chaff at him, and she disturbs the edifying devotions by delighting in the confused doings of those trusty gentlemen.

One man after another goes onto the after-deck from amongst this motley rabble, and keeps turning the wheel and trimming the sails. The general confusion is only made worse by the contradictory but always well-intentioned instructions of the pseudo-captain, calling for the squaring of the circle, “higher unity”, the true, correct course to Canaan, the milk-and-honey world of the future—and this after he had, down in his cabin, just seen himself, and felt like, a second Jean Paul.

Today, as in a final burst of energy, as in death-throes, new and larger sails are suddenly hoisted, while tomorrow fatigue sets in as after the agitation of a consuming fever. Overworked and on the verge of collapse, the crew reef the sails again. They try to put the disorderliness of the chaos from their minds by conjuring up “interesting” family quarrels. Seeking to conceal the contradictions of reality, in the midst of which they feel helpless, they allow that much-vaunted “higher unity” of ideal, free communal activity to go to pieces by decreeing differences between the European and the American outlook. The Athenian citizen, whose threadbare probity and woollen rags thrown proudly over his shoulder one has just admired as he delivered his sermon on freedom, steps into the background, and new actors come forward. Can one expect them to understand

---

a An allusion to the German liberal journal Grenzboten.—Ed.
b An allusion to Wilhelm Weitling, an editor of the Neu-England-Zeitung, the author of Das Evangelium eines armen Sünder.—Ed.
c An allusion to Eduard Schläger, the publisher of the Neu-England-Zeitung.—Ed.
that modern bourgeoisie civilisation is based on the slavery of wage-labour, after one of the family had in his stupor completely failed to see yesterday that ancient civilisation was founded on absolute slavery? Most certainly not.

In the struggle between the “European and the American outlook” the spokesman for Europe is “Leonidas”-Confucius\(^a\)-Ruge, the Pomeranian aurora borealis, representing half a dozen Southern German dictators groping around in a half-light. Everyone knows that he preaches something he has christened humanism, and that occasionally he has someone sound his praises to John Bull as the third great German philosopher alongside Strauss and Feuerbach. Ruge’s “outlook” can be summed up briefly. In the writings of the philosopher Kant he discerns a system of limited freedom, in those of Fichte the principle of absolute freedom, and in those of Hegel the principle and system of absolute freedom through the medium of dialectics. Herr Ruge has always displayed an instinctive aversion to dialectics and he has always taken up its easier aspect, that of becoming entangled in contradictions, but not that of mastering them. It is therefore natural that he should constantly malign dialectics as being sophistry, as, for example, in the works of Marx. Ruge describes his humanism as the introduction in society of the principle and system of absolute freedom. So far as we are able to understand it, this humanism of Herr Ruge, his unity of practice and theory, consists in passing off his de facto clumsiness as theory to the men of practice and his peculiar and feeble thinking as practice to the theoreticians. Ever since Feuerbach, Bauer, Strauss and others successively dispatched one another from the scene, and no prince of science existed any longer, and since even the materialists pushed their noses in, a state of mind has occurred in old Ruge infected with which, quoting silly Gretchen, his translator into German-American said:

> And all this does my brain impair,
> As if a mill-wheel were turning there.\(^b\)

For Ruge was in the habit of singing the praises of the reigning prince of science to the public as loudly as possible, in order to win renown himself. Out of all that has come an \textit{olla podrida}\(^c\) of contradictions, which, in the absence of dialectics, has very recently had a democratic gravy poured over it, and, in the form of a box\(^d\) of humanism, appearing not, it is true, in the world theatre but in Janus, blissfully introduced itself to a “very select” public, which unfortunately had almost completely dispersed before the box was constructed.\(^{422}\)

Of the European press Herr Ruge had in the last few years thrust himself on The Leader, edited in London by his friend Thornton Hunt who, logically, was extolled in Janus as the “most outstanding writer among the English socialists”. This uncouth coward had preached communism in order to divert attention from Chartism,\(^e\) and we denounced him in the American press for it at that time. Today

\(^a\) A pun on “Confucius” and the German word \textit{Konfusius} (muddler). It was also used, with reference to Ruge, in Marx’s letter to Weydemeyer of January 23, 1852, and in the pamphlet \textit{The Great Men of the Exile}, written jointly by Marx and Engels (see present edition, Vols. 39 and 11 resp.).—Ed.

\(^b\) Goethe, \textit{Faust}, Part I, Scene 4, Faust’s study (a remark of Faust’s famulus).—Ed.

\(^c\) A Spanish dish, a stew made of one or more meats and several vegetables; figuratively, hodge-podge.—Ed.

\(^d\) Marx uses the word \textit{Loge} which means both a lodge in Freemasonry and a box in the theatre.—Ed.

\(^e\) An allusion to Hunt’s efforts, in \textit{The Northern Star}, No. 734, November 29, 1851, to pass himself off as a champion of the people and Communist.—Ed.
that charge is justified before our party. Hunt had forced his way into the Chartists' Executive \(^{225}\) with the intention of delivering the Chartists into the hands of the finance-reformers (the industrial bourgeoisie). In order to trap Ernest Jones he preached physical force and talked of nothing but rifles, at a time of the most splendid prosperity and in the most unfavourable of circumstances. In recognition of his efforts he was thrown out of the official position he held with the workers. Good! Nowadays the scoundrel has thrown off his mask. He has become one of the most respectable gossips of the middle class, and he declares Bright, that ideal of the modern English bourgeois, to be a genuine "old Englishman"\(^{a}\) and the most disinterested of humanitarian enthusiasts with regard to the unfortunate Indian people, and stated recently that he would even prefer despotism to a "raving republic". That is the sort of pitiable figure that the puffed-up "higher unity" cuts. Behind it, whenever real conflicts arise, we see bragging arrogance in all its superficiality!

[Die Reform, No. 49, September 17, 1853]

Let us now turn to the "American outlook" which represents the counterpart to the family row in the Neu-England-Zeitung. For the most part this outlook consists of trivialities and latterly of sententious ideas taken from street ballads which, apparently strung together in public houses under the influence of Philadelphian lager, provide the sort of material to fill a cess-pit whose outer walls are cemented with untruths, dirty tricks and platitudes. A few Philadelphian Romans,\(^{b}\) notably a certain Herr Fösche, currently busy earning his spurs as a cheer-leader for Cushing in Pierre's glorious army of place-hunters, are flourishing as matadors of this school.\(^{224}\) A bourgeois conservative economic theory, of the kind that socialists of all parties are busy fighting—that propounded by the American Carey and the Frenchman Bastiat—is being trotted out to the credulous public* as the latest German-American discovery, the "higher unity" of political economy. We shall see that wherever this grand higher unity ventures into contact with real life, it becomes a willing tool in the hands of the powers that be. The editors of the Neu-England-Zeitung appear not yet to have stained their chaste convictions with studies of such a demanding material nature as those that political economy involves; for we see daily that [...]\(^{c}\) discussion of social questions [...]\(^{c}\) everyone who feels like voiding his bowels. The said doctrine was last demolished, together with M. Bastiat, before the socialist tribunals of Europe in 1849, in the course of a discussion in Proudhon's Voix du peuple.\(^{d}\) As far as European society is concerned, historical

* Judging by the continuing cry of distress from the Neu-England-Zeitung and the rumours that are going round, the public would appear, incidentally, to have become something of a rash hypothesis.—A. C.
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\(^{a}\) Marx uses the English words "old Englishman".—Ed.


\(^{c}\) The text is indecipherable here.—Ed.

\(^{d}\) Published in 1850 as a book, Fr. Bastiat, Gratuité du crédit. Discussion entre M. Fr. Bastiat et M. Proudhon, Paris. For Marx's critical analysis of the points of view of the two participants in the discussion see present edition, Vol. 29.—Ed.
developments have long since cut the ground from under that particular theoretical representation of a specific historical epoch.

In America, where today the social contradictions are much less sharp than in radically undermined Europe, this theory found its champion in the economist Carey. Its conservative-bourgeois opponent (taking the view of the more recent English school) has already appeared in the person of Professor Wayland. His *Principles of Political Economy* has been introduced as a textbook at most of the academies of New England, much to the annoyance of Carey's adherents.

Let us summarise briefly the main points of the doctrine which is compiled by Bastiat in his *Social Harmonies* with grace and in easily comprehensible form, but propagated by Carey without any talent for presentation or for summing up and precision. One cannot deny C.H. Carey a certain amount of positive knowledge and even some original and attractive ideas.\(^a\)

His chief merit is that he has indeed cultivated a native product, grown directly from American soil without any foreign admixtures. His science is of anything but universal character, it is pure *Yankee science*. It attempts to demonstrate that the *economic* conditions of bourgeois society, instead of being conditions for struggle and antagonism, are rather conditions for partnership and harmony. (Very fine in theory, but modern industrial towns demonstrate how things work out in practice!) Those economic conditions can be broken down as follows:

1) *Rent*, the share of the landowner,
2) *Profit*, the share of the capitalist,
3) *Wages*, the share of the worker in the value of the finished product.

We can see that Carey is much too experienced to link the existence of classes with the existence of *political* privileges and monopolies, as for instance the newly-fledged Roman youths at Philadelphia would, or before them s. v.\(^b\) Heinzen, and thus to see social harmony as being unconditionally invented and patented for all time with the great French Revolution.\(^425\) Carey seeks rather for economic reasons behind economic facts, though in so doing he fails to transcend the as yet indistinct, hazy and fluid class relations of America. He therefore only proves that he regards a *point of transition* in the development of society as the *normal condition* of its life. Most characteristic is the argument of Carey's school

\(^{a}\) For Marx's assessment of Bastiat and Carey see present edition, Vol. 29.—*Ed.*

\(^{b}\) *Salva venia*—if you please.—*Ed.*
against the English economists. It attacks Ricardo, classical champion of the bourgeoisie and most stoic opponent of the proletariat, describing him as a man whose works provide an arsenal for anarchists, socialists, in brief for all "enemies of the bourgeois order". With fanaticism it attacks not only Ricardo but all other leading economists of modern bourgeois Europe, and reproaches these economic heralds of the bourgeoisie with having split society and with forging weapons for civil war by cynically providing the proof that the economic foundations of the various classes are bound to give rise to an inevitable and constantly growing antagonism between them.

The Frenchman Bastiat is an unqualified Free Trader; the Philadelphian Roman youths parrot his views about the "blessings of free trade" with naive credulity. Carey himself began his economic career as a Free Trader, and at the time he would come up with some good jokes, for example that one should couple bourgeois France with China on account of her preference for protective tariffs. As is usually the case with advocates of free trade, he blamed all the discord in society on improper interference by the state in ventures which were the prerogative of private industry and the like. This was all Yankee, Yankee from head to foot. Nowadays Mr. Carey has become sour, he sighs and complains together with the Frenchman Sismondi about the destructive effects seen in the centralising big industry of England, which for him engenders the "evil principle" in society.

He would be highly surprised if he knew how German greenhorns saw the avalanche-like growth of the power of big capital as the formation of so many snowballs full of "Anglo-Saxon" enthusiasm for decentralisation and individualism.

Apart from the fact that Carey totally overlooks the transforming, revolutionary element in the destructive effects of industry, he is nevertheless again too much of a Yankee to make industry as such responsible, yet that would be the only logical conclusion to be drawn from his argument. He makes the English personally responsible for the effects of their industry, not to mention the fact that Ricardo is in his turn made responsible for England. Caught in this contradiction, he must necessarily burrow himself deeper and deeper in the petty-bourgeois element, advocating the long since discarded patriarchal association between agriculture and manufacturing.

But the mark of the Yankee with Carey and his adherents is this: under the pretext and, we ought to admit it, with good will and with the conviction of speaking for the "most numerous and the poorest class," they throw down the gauntlet to the English bourgeoisie. Sismondi did that by condemning modern industry and expressing his longing to return to the old method of manufacture; nowadays, however, they do it by preaching protective tariffs. Accordingly all they are really aiming at with all their philanthropic talk is artificially accelerating the English development of the industrial bourgeoisie in America. This is a philanthropic and utopian gesture in the competitive struggle between England and America, this most interesting of phenomena confronting present-day bourgeois economists. The ingenious aspect of economics is revealed here in all its glory.

As this is completely overlooked even by Carey's school, it would of course be unfair of us to assume even an inkling of all this in the thinking of a "State-haemorrhoidarius" and the newly-fledged political economists of the Neu-England-Zeitung, since they are stuck in the bourgeois mire right up to their ears and are not even remotely aware of the historical significance of the school of thinking which they themselves have learned by heart.

[Die Reform, No. 50, September 21, 1853]

In the competitive struggle between America and England we see the latter pushed increasingly into the position of Venice, Genoa and Holland, which were all forced to lend their capital on interest after the monopoly of their trading power had been broken. Genoa and Venice helped Holland to emerge, Holland provided England with capital, and now England is obliged to do the same for the United States of America. Only today all the conditions in this process are of a much larger scale than they were at that time. England's position differs from that of those countries in that the main factor for them was a monopoly of trade, which is easy to break, whilst she possesses a monopoly of industry as well, which by its very nature is tougher. On the other hand the English bourgeoisie's surfeit of capital is all the more colossal, so that it is obliged to build railways in both continents, and to invest capital in gas-lighting in Berlin, in the vineyards of Bordeaux, and in Russian factories and American steamers. All this provides one with material to support the most interesting observation that the attraction which English central capital exerts necessarily has its complement in a centrifugal force which

---

* A phrase coined by Henri Saint-Simon.—*Ed.*
pours it out again into all the corners of the world. If there were to be a revolution, then the English would have furnished the European continent with all those lines of communication and all that production machinery for nothing. America is not waiting for revolutions. It is settling its accounts in a conservative bourgeois fashion by from time to time liquidating its business with England through bankruptcies. This is one of the secrets of its rapid rise, a regular phenomenon just like railway accidents and shipwrecks. That same lack of concern, that same mad frenzy of production which makes it possible for tens of thousands to be brought into the world who under different circumstances would never see the light of day, cold-bloodedly sends hundreds upon hundreds, propelled by steam, to an early death. The one is simply the complement of the other. The unscrupulous multiplying of the wealth of capitalist companies accompanied by complete disregard for human life! That is how the commentary reads on the “victory of individuality amongst the Anglo-Saxons”!

All these are facts which are naturally incomprehensible to the “sober non-violence and homely good sense” of Philadelphian Roman youths who have ingeniously managed to find out from some conservative review or other that the women workers of Lowell today are three times better off as regards their earnings than they were thirty years ago. According to that clever conclusion those women workers of years ago must have eaten only four and a half days a week and must have covered their nakedness with nothing more than a fig-leaf. That Lowell should only have come into existence during the last thirty years, or should have worked its way up from a quietly vegetating population of 200 souls to an industrial town of 36,000 souls; that today approximately a third of that population should consist of women workers* who are living from hand to mouth on an average wage of three dollars a week, that is to say that their wages fluctuate to such an extent above and below this average that they can put a few coppers into the savings bank when times are good, only to use them up again when business stagnates completely or they are laid off for half the week; that these women workers should for the most part be condemned to celibacy, not by democratic decree but through pressure of circumstances—these are all things which a “democratic” candidate for high office must not see, even if one wanted to assume that he had the necessary powers of vision.

It is true that here in America we cannot deny the existence of that “equality of opportunity for the individual, which is the highest goal one (i.e. the Philadelphian Romans) can perceive”. Yellow fever has for long enough been acting as a delegate of the Roman democrats and has demonstrated that principle in New Orleans. However, the possibility of equality, young Sir, lies beyond the range of vision of the bourgeoisie, and only the reformer* who has perceived the

* Five-eighths of the population of Lowell is estimated to be women, and only three-eighths men. We believe that in fact the disproportion is much more glaring.—A. C.

*a An allusion to Karl Marx.—Ed.
full implications of the present conditions of workers has the requisite wider horizon, not hedged round by any kind of prejudice, to include it.

Having now sketched the heroes of both worlds, but, where the hero of the New World was concerned, having preferred to discuss political economy in the original\textsuperscript{a} rather than the dull and bloodless imitation which he is always repeating (and we have done this in order to be able to observe the decorum which we owe to the public, and to interrupt the personification of boredom in all its monotony and trite learning in all its gloom), we must add that each of the two parties is accusing the other of gross ignorance in matters of world history (a fact which we simply register), and that the editors occasionally christen these touching, "interesting" scenes a "struggle between materialism and idealism", with Heinzen appearing as godfather in the old disguise of Orlando Furioso.

The feud had become very vehement, and it seemed that the interplay of opposing arguments would end in a brawl rather than resolving itself in that "higher unity" which everyone had so hoped for. They therefore improvised a plan to produce unity through arbitration, a \textit{deus ex machina},\textsuperscript{b} summoned in the person of an "earnest" man,\textsuperscript{c} a former diplomat and envoy of some petty republic, unless the solemn protestations of the political sages and grandees of international law are totally deceiving us, betraying to us with their carefully restrained judgments, as they do at every turn, the man who is already groaning under the burden of some future government office. He settles the "struggle" to the satisfaction of both sides, for both parties are adjudged to be at fault, and therefore neither has to make a more dishonourable retreat than the other. Though occasionally still grunting bad-temperedly, "Leonidas" walks peaceably along with his opponents, the "unknown Greeks", whose rôle in the comedy had been taken by the Philadelphian Roman youths. Moved, the choir of the priests of humanism sings "These sacred halls know not what vengeance is!" The curtain falls, but there is no Bengal flame to cast a red light on the patriotic tableau. The final scene is yet to come.

[\textit{Die Reform}, No. 51, September 24, 1853]

Thanks to his manner of a whimpering Heraclitus, the "earnest" arbitrator had gained universal sympathy, extravagantly bestowed upon him by all the treasure-hunters who subscribe to the "science of the future", who were whimpering before him, and who, on their own admission, cast their pearls before the public as Californian gold-diggers would, still rough and unpolished. And lo, full of good cheer and with a happy heart a guest suddenly arrives on the scene, all the more worthy for being uninvited,\textsuperscript{d} who chooses, in the rôle of Democritus, to make fun of everything that is funny, and thinks all the evidence indicates that throughout the whole struggle there has been much ado about nothing. He scoffed at the whole fantastic notion of a special democratic mentality, which cannot conceive of

---

\textsuperscript{a} As presented by Carey and Bastiat, "hero of the New World" is an allusion to Eduard Schläger.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Literally "a god from a machine"—a person or thing that appears or is introduced (as into a story) suddenly and unexpectedly and provides an artificial or contrived solution to an apparently insoluble difficulty.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Karl Blind. In the original the form \textit{ernscht}e is used ironically instead of \textit{ernste} (serious).—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{d} Evidently an allusion to the diplomatic mission which Blind carried out in Paris on instructions of the Provisional Government of Baden during the campaign for an imperial constitution in 1849.—\textit{Ed.}
the revolution as anything other than the "fiery hell-hounds" of the wire-pulling European Central Committee. He pacifies their lordships, saying they need have no fear of Bashkirs, and the Prussians and the Bavarians are not so bad either. He explains to them how, without the princehood of its princes, without the customary collection of youths in spiked helmets, with or without monkey-tail cockades, Germany might have stood a chance of Bashkirs. He chuckles at the tender "revolutionary" concern for the national independence of the thirty-six sovereigns, of the Prussian, Bückeburg, Darmstadt or Baden governments, and at the way imperial troops—imperial troops for the "German nation"—are preferred to Bashkirs. He laughs at people's dread of the impending floods of Bashkirs, at the festive bluster, at all the rubbish of political wisdom, the moralising national manifestos addressed to the Prusso-Baden princebings, at the way they are urged faithfully to protect the thirty-six mother-countries with their half-and-half despotism from the Bashkirs, so as to prevent at all costs the premature outbreak of the great conflict, which the democrats do not expect to occur until fifty years after Napoleon's prophecy a but which must not occur during their lifetimes. He laughs at the feeble and absurd efforts of democratic sects to reduce all the existing convulsions of European society, the whole enormous historical crisis, and the thousands of difficulties, complications and class problems to a superficial and insipid difference between Cossacks and republicans, and to treat the overthrow of a whole system of production with all the shocks for the world market, with all the class struggles and upheavals in industry that this inevitably entails as if it were just the plainest of pot-house fare, like some fraternal luncheon that has yet to be arranged. He laughs at the barbaric somersaults of Menchikoff, at the diplomatic absurdities of his superiors, Nesselrode-Libinsky, b at the top-booted Don Quixote of the European counter-revolution, the mighty and formidable recruiter of Jews Nicholas, and at the "helpless voice" of his politically skilled opponents together with their high-ranking judge. He offers his congratulations on the final extinguishing of the "tiny spark [of revolution] flickering on", and on the final decaying of the whole theatrical apparatus of official democracy, but on the other hand whispers into the ears of the jousters, numb with astonishment at the proletarian audacity they have witnessed, that the material revolution without hollow-sounding words is for that very reason more inevitable today than ever, and that it was Russia's equal opponent.

Whispering is heard everywhere, and "righteous indignation" manifests itself amongst the democratic notabilities. The agitation grows and nobody notices that, having ended his scornful reprimand, the proletarian rogue has silently turned his back on the sacred halls of "higher unity". People clear their throats. Misunderstood and foundering, political wisdom fires a distress signal, which fades away in melancholy, and there appears the now inevitable factotum of governmental power in partibus. c Slowly and discreetly, and with earnest, ominous demeanour and thoughtfully folded arms, the latter shakes off the fiercely snapping cluster of talents. Resplendent under his arms is the testament of Peter the Great, d a history of Russia, bound in pigskin, is borne in and opened at his behest, and bundles of treaties on parchment are piled up round him. He begins to speak. Svyatoslav, Ivan

a The reference is to Napoleon's statement: "In fifty years Europe will be either republican or a Cossack one" (see this volume, p. 541).—Ed.
b The reference is to K. K. Labensky.—Ed.
c K. Blind. In partibus or in partibus infidelium—outside the real world, abroad. The phrase means literally "in the country of infidels" and was added to the title of Catholic bishops who were appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries.—Ed.
Vasilyevich, Peter I, Catherine II and Nicholas file past, a series of irrefutable signposts pushed successively forward from Moscow to the Danube. What is the direction in which they point? To Constantinople, the fateful city of the Tsar. Is that understood? Tremble Byzantium! Who will save you? And who will save the world from the Cossack flood? Democracy? "It alone speaks out* and vainly raises its helpless voice against Russia; the democratic party has got into disrepute in the City, at Westminster Hall and St. James's aliké" — thus speaks the factotum himself. The German princes? They are themselves nothing more than the princelings of the Cossacks. Boustrapa? He wants to parade as a Cossack on the Rhine himself. Aberdeen? Has he not once already allowed the Cossacks to get as far as Adrianople?

Who then is left? The Slav revolution? A miserable Montenegrin "Hölper-lips". The pessimistic political sages no longer think much of that. There then? There is nothing, nothing else, nowhere is there salvation! Let us cover our heads and hide our tallow candles — l'Europe sera cosaque. But wait! Here comes the revolution, the great "mighty people's revolution", the "fourth estate" is on its way, the "estate" which has no more to do than to "launch itself against the Tartar flood of tsarist despotism" if it wishes later to see the "knife and fork question" resolved, an issue which has of course long since been resolved for the people of other estates. Indeed, forward with the "fourth estate", forward with the "people's revolution", forward into battle against Russia! Russia is the seat of "Europe's order based on sceptre, cross, sabre and money"!

The speaker has finished, his "helpless voice" falls silent. He throws back his head, looks about him, triumphant, "earnest", serenely cool.

Where is that other horseman,
His mount has left the stable?

Dumbfounded, they cast an eye round the trusty company. "Thalberg not here?" No answer. The speaker's mournful gaze strays involuntarily out to the blue-vaulted sky. "Paradoxes," he stammers. In resignation he lowers his gaze, and on the street it lights up upon the missing intruder, who is playing with a box of matches and laughing away.

Written in September 1853
First published in Die Reform Nos. 48, 49, 50 and 51, September 14, 17, 21 and 24, 1853
Signed: Ad. Cluss

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the German
Published in English for the first time

* Is the "democratic party" suddenly counting old Aunt Voss and Herr Brüggemann of the Kölnische Zeitung amongst its number? For during the most recent complications the latter alone has gathered at least three score very patriotic, very nationalistic and strongly anti-Russian supporters. Equally all the respectable German press, with the exception of the Kreuz, the Ostsee, the Augsburger and the Oberpostamts-Zeitung. The "watchful eye and admonishing words" of these "disreputable people" do then still have sympathisers.—A. C.

a Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen.—Ed.
b A nickname of Louis Bonaparte, composed of the first syllables of Boulogne and Strasbourg (centres of Bonapartist putsches of 1836 and 1840), and Paris, where the Bonapartist coup d'état came off on December 2, 1851.—Ed.
c An expression used in 1838 by Parson J. R. Stephens, a prominent Chartist. It became a symbol of Chartist aspirations.—Ed.
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This article is the first in a series on the Eastern question by Marx and Engels published in the New-York Daily Tribune. The increase in tension between Russia and the Western Powers in the Near East and the Balkans in 1853 eventually led to the Crimean war. At Marx's request Engels wrote a number of articles from mid-March to early April on the basis of a brief plan suggested to him by Marx in his letter of March 10, 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 39). Marx soon joined in with articles of his own.

Like most articles by Marx and Engels in the New-York Daily Tribune, this one was not republished in their lifetime. The section “Turkey”, together with the other articles on the Eastern question, was included in a collection compiled by Eleanor Marx and Edward Aveling: The Eastern Question. A Reprint of Letters written 1853-1856 dealing with the events of the Crimean War, London, 1897. The collection gave Marx as the author of all the articles, since they had been published in the New-York Daily Tribune either anonymously, as editorials, or signed by Marx. Only in 1913, after the publication of the correspondence between Marx and Engels, it was discovered that many articles which Marx had sent to the newspaper were written wholly or in part by Engels.

In this article Marx is the author of the sections “British Politics.—Disraeli.—The Refugees.—Mazzini in London”, and Engels of the section “Turkey”.

In a leader for the issue that carried this article the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune wrote: “In this connection we may properly pay a tribute to the remarkable ability of the correspondent by whom this interesting piece of intelligence is furnished. Mr. Marx has very decided opinions of his own, with some of which we are far from agreeing, but those who do not read his letters neglect one of the most instructive sources of information on the great questions of current European politics.”

The New-York Daily Tribune was an American newspaper founded in 1841 by Horace Greeley, journalist and politician, and published until 1924. Until the mid-1850s it was a Left-wing Whig paper and after that the organ of the Republican Party. In the forties and the fifties it took a strong stand against slavery. Among its contributors were prominent American writers and journalists. Charles Dana, who was strongly influenced by the ideas of utopian socialism, was one of its editors from the late 1840s. Marx began to write for
the newspaper in August 1851 and continued to contribute to it until March 1862. The articles Marx and Engels wrote dealt with key issues of foreign and domestic policy, the working-class movement, the economic development of European countries, colonial expansion, the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries, etc. During the period of reaction in Europe Marx and Engels made use of this widely-read American newspaper to expose the evils of capitalist society, its irreconcilable contradictions and the limitations of bourgeois democracy.

The New-York Daily Tribune editors took on occasion considerable liberties with the articles contributed by Marx and Engels, publishing some of them unsigned in the form of editorials or making additions which often contradicted the main text. Marx protested against this repeatedly. In the autumn of 1857, when the economic crisis in the USA affected the finances of the newspaper, Marx was compelled to reduce the number of his articles. His association with the newspaper ceased entirely during the American Civil War, when advocates of a compromise with the slave-owning South gained control over it.

2 In March 1853 Disraeli, leader of the Tories since 1848, was replaced in this post by Lord Pakington. This was the result of disagreements between Disraeli, who supported certain concessions to the free-trade industrial bourgeoisie, and the Tory advocates of protectionism. The latter won the day, but subsequently the Disraeli line prevailed, reflecting the gradual changing of the old aristocratic Tory Party into a party of the conservative sections of the British bourgeoisie.

3 At the sitting of the House of Commons on March 1, 1853, Palmerston formally declared that if the continental powers demanded that Britain should expel political refugees, Britain would decline. However, the statement of the Prime Minister, Lord Aberdeen, in the House of Lords on March 4 contained a promise of concessions on this question. Marx had dealt with this subject in a number of his previous reports to the New-York Daily Tribune. See also an article on this subject, “The Refugees and the London Police”, in The People’s Paper, No. 47, March 26, 1853.

4 The treaties of Tilsit—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France and the members of the fourth anti-French coalition, Russia and Prussia, which were defeated in the campaigns of 1806 and 1807. In an attempt to split the defeated powers, Napoleon made no territorial claims on Russia and even succeeded in transferring part of the Prussian monarchy’s eastern lands to Russia. He established an alliance with Alexander I when the two emperors met in Erfurt in the autumn of 1808. The treaties imposed harsh terms on Prussia, which lost nearly half its territory to the German states dependent on France, was made to pay indemnities, and had its army reduced. However, Russia, like Prussia, had to break the alliance with Britain and join Napoleon’s Continental System, which was to its disadvantage. Napoleon formed the vassal Duchy of Warsaw on Polish territory seized by Prussia during the partitions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century, and planned to use the duchy as a springboard in the event of war with Russia.

In Tilsit Alexander I pledged, with France acting as a mediator, to start peace negotiations with Turkey with which Russia had been at war since 1806. In August 1807 Russia and Turkey signed an armistice, but a peace treaty was not concluded and military operations were resumed in 1809. The war ended with the defeat of Turkey in 1812.
Increasingly strained relations between France and Russia led to Napoleon's campaign against Russia in 1812.

At the Congress of the Holy Alliance (an alliance of European monarchs founded on September 26, 1815 on the initiative of the Russian Emperor Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich), which began in Troppau in October 1820 and ended in Laibach in May 1821, the principle of intervention in the internal affairs of other states was officially proclaimed. Accordingly, the Laibach Congress decided to send Austrian troops to Italy to crush the revolutionary and national liberation movement there. French intervention in Spain with similar aims was decided on at the Congress of Verona in 1822.

The aggravation of the Eastern question in the early 1840s was caused by the Turko-Egyptian war of 1839-41. In 1839 the Turkish army invaded Syria, which had been conquered in 1831-33 by the Egyptian ruler Mehmet Ali, but it was defeated. Fearing Russian intervention, the Western powers decided to send a joint Note to the Turkish Sultan offering their assistance. However, as a result of the struggle between Britain and France over spheres of influence in the Near East, the London Convention on military assistance to the Sultan was signed on July 15, 1840 by Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia, without France. The latter was counting on Mehmet Ali, but was soon compelled to abandon him to his fate. After the military intervention of Britain and Austria, Mehmet Ali was forced to renounce all his possessions outside Egypt and submit to the supreme power of the Turkish Sultan.

The principle of legitimacy was proclaimed by Talleyrand at the Vienna Congress of European monarchs and their Ministers held in 1814-15. It actually meant the restoration of the "legitimate" dynasties and monarchies overthrown during the French revolution of 1789-94 and the Napoleonic wars, and was made the cornerstone of the treaties of Vienna. However, in recarving the map of Europe, the governments which had defeated Napoleonic France were prompted more by their own, frequently conflicting, interests than by the claims of the "legitimate" monarchs who were being restored.

Turkish armies laid siege to Vienna in 1529 and 1683 but in both cases failed to take it. In 1683 it was saved by the army of the Polish King John Sobieski. The battle of Kulevcha (Bulgaria) took place on May 30, 1829, during the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. The Turkish army was defeated.

The word "race" is used here in accordance with its meaning at the time: it meant both "races of the second order" (groups within the main races) and linguistic and ethnic groups.

Transylvania became part of Hungary under the Austrian rule of the Habsburgs in the late seventeenth century. During the 1848-49 revolution the Hungarian revolutionary Government refused to recognise the right of the Transylvanian Wallachians to national independence. As a result, the Austrian counter-revolutionary forces were able to draw the insurgent army of Transylvanian Wallachians into the struggle against the Hungarian revolutionary army. The defeat of the Hungarian bourgeois revolution had deplorable consequences for the people of Transylvania, where the rule of the Hungarian magnates was restored.
The Ruthenians—the name given in nineteenth-century West-European ethnographical and historical works to the Ukrainian population of Galicia and Bukovina, which was separated at the time from the rest of the Ukrainian people. During the national liberation uprising in Cracow in 1846 the Austrian authorities provoked clashes between Ukrainian peasants and insurgent Polish detachments. However, after the suppression of the uprising, the participants in the peasant movement in Galicia were subjected to brutal reprisals. p. 9

In the summer of 1848, the anti-feudal movement and the struggle for complete liberation from the rule of the Turkish Sultan gained strength in the Danubian Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, which formally remained autonomous possessions of Turkey. The movement in Wallachia grew into a bourgeois revolution. In June 1848, a Constitution was proclaimed, a liberal Provisional Government was formed and George Bibesco, the ruler of Wallachia, abdicated and fled the country.

On June 28, 1848, 12,000 Russian soldiers entered Moldavia and in July Turkish troops invaded the country. The Russian and Turkish intervention helped restore feudal rule, and the subsequent entry of Turkish troops into Wallachia with the consent of the Tsarist Government brought about the defeat of the bourgeois revolution there. p. 9

The Cyrillic alphabet, one of the two ancient Slav alphabets (the other is called the Glagolitic alphabet), is named after Cyril, a missionary monk of the mid-ninth century, who, together with his brother Methodius, translated several religious texts from Greek into Slavonic. The Russian, Bulgarian and many other Slavonic languages use a modified form of the Cyrillic alphabet. p. 10

A reference to the reactionary bourgeois and landowner elements of the national movement in Croatia and Bohemia, who during the 1848-49 revolution opposed the revolutionary-democratic solution of the national question and advocated uniting the oppressed Slav peoples within the framework of the Habsburg Empire. This standpoint was reflected in the decisions of the Croatian Sâbors held in 1848 in Agram (Zagreb), and in the efforts of the moderately liberal wing of the 1848 Slav Congress in Prague (Palacký, Šaťář) to maintain and strengthen the Habsburg monarchy. The Left, radical wing (Sabina, Frič, Libelt and others), on the other hand, wanted to act in alliance with the revolutionary-democratic movement in Germany and Hungary. p. 11

The New-York Daily Tribune has: "the Russian war of 1809". The reference is to the Russo-Turkish war of 1806-12, which ended in the defeat of Turkey and the signing in May 1812 of the Bucharest peace treaty, according to which Bessarabia was joined to Russia. The treaty provided for Serbian autonomy in domestic affairs, thus laying the foundation for Serbia's future independence (see Note 26). In 1807 Russia and Turkey concluded an armistice with the mediation of France, but the peace negotiations were interrupted and military operations resumed in 1809. p. 11

The anti-Russian party in Serbia, headed by Garašanin, sought support from the Western powers. In response to a demand from the Russian Ambassador Extraordinary to Constantinople, Prince Menshikov, Prince Alexander of Serbia dismissed Garašanin from the post of the head of government and Foreign
Minister. The struggle between the different parties led to an aggravation of the political situation in Serbia in 1853.

This article was published in the collection: Karl Marx, *The Eastern Question*, London, 1897. The collection gave Marx as the author of the article. However, it was later discovered that this article, as well as "The Turkish Question" and "What Is to Become of Turkey in Europe?", were written by Engels. This is confirmed by Engels' letter to Marx of March 11, 1853, in which he agreed, in response to Marx's request, to write a series of articles on the subject, and also by his letter to Marx of May 1, 1854, in which he referred to these articles in connection with future plans for writing on the Eastern question for the press (see present edition, Vol. 39).

The first Anglo-Afghan War of 1838-42, started by the British with the aim of seizing Afghanistan, ended in total failure for the British colonialists.

In 1843 the British colonialists seized Sind, a region in the north-western part of India bordering on Afghanistan. During the Anglo-Afghan war the East India Company resorted to threats and violence to obtain the consent of the feudal rulers of Sind to the passage of British troops across their territory. Taking advantage of this, the British demanded in 1843 that the local feudal princes proclaim themselves vassals of the Company. After crushing the rebel Baluch tribes (the natives of Sind), the annexation of the entire region by British India was announced.

The *Punjab* (North-West India) was conquered in British campaigns against the Sikhs in 1845-46 and 1848-49. In the sixteenth century, the Sikhs were a religious sect in the Punjab. Their teaching of equality became the ideology of the peasants and lower urban strata who fought against the Empire of the Great Moguls and the Afghan invaders in the late seventeenth century. Subsequently a local aristocracy emerged among the Sikhs, whose representatives ruled the Sikh state established in the latter half of the eighteenth century. In 1845, the British authorities in India provoked an armed conflict with the Sikhs and in 1846 succeeded in turning the Sikh state into a vassal. In 1848 the Sikhs revolted, but were totally subjugated in 1849. The conquest of the Punjab turned all India into a British colony.

A reference to the Milan insurrection started on February 6, 1853 by the followers of the Italian revolutionary Mazzini and supported by Hungarian revolutionary refugees. The aim of the insurgents, who were mostly Italian workers, was to overthrow Austrian rule, but their conspiratorial tactics led them to failure. Marx analysed it in a number of articles (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 508-09, 513-16 and 535-37).

This article was published in *The Eastern Question*.

A reference to a coin with an imprint of the Egyptian sacred bull Apis; such coins with imprints of animals were used in Greece until the fifth century B.C.

A reference to the cordial agreement (*entente cordiale*) between France and England in the early period of the July monarchy (1830-35). The agreement proved ineffectual, however, and was soon followed by increased friction between the two powers.

This article was published in *The Eastern Question* which gave Marx as its author (see Note/17).
The Greek insurrection was prepared by secret societies of Greek patriots (Hetaeria). It was sparked off in spring 1821 by a march of a detachment under Alexander Ypsilanti—a Greek officer in the Russian army and leader of a secret society in Odessa—to the Danubian Principalities across the Pruth in order thence to enter Greece. The campaign was a failure, but it marked the beginning of a mass movement in Greece which soon spread throughout the country. In January 1822 the National Assembly in Epidaurus proclaimed the independence of Greece and adopted a Constitution. Initially the powers of the Holy Alliance strongly opposed the insurrection. However, the great sympathy aroused everywhere for the Greek struggle against Turkish domination, and especially the opportunity of using this struggle to strengthen their influence in the south of the Balkans, caused Britain, Russia and France to recognise Greece as a belligerent and render her armed assistance. Russia's victory in the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 was of major importance in helping Greece to acquire independence. Turkey was compelled to recognise Greece as an independent state. However, the European powers imposed a monarchical form of government on the Greek people.

Fanariote Greeks—inhabitants of Fanar (a district in Constantinople), most of whom were descendants of aristocratic Byzantine families. Owing to their wealth and political connections they held important posts in the administration of the Ottoman Empire.

The Serbian insurrection, which flared up in February 1804 against the arbitrary rule and brutal reprisals of the Turkish janissaries, developed into an armed struggle for the country's independence from Turkey. During the insurrection a national government was set up and Georgi Petrović (Karageorge), the leader of the insurgents, was proclaimed the hereditary supreme ruler of the Serbian people in 1808. The Serbian movement was greatly advanced by the successful operations of the Russian army in the Balkans during the Russo-Turkish war of 1806-12. According to the Bucharest peace treaty of 1812 Turkey was to give Serbia autonomy in domestic affairs. Taking advantage of Napoleon's invasion into Russia, however, the Turkish Sultan organised a punitive expedition to Serbia in 1813 and restored his rule there. As a result of a new insurrection by the Serbs in 1815 and also diplomatic assistance from Russia, Turkish rule was overthrown. After the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29, which ended with the signing of a peace treaty in Adrianople in 1829, Turkey recognised the autonomy, i.e., the virtual independence, of the Serbian Principality in a special order issued by the Sultan in 1830.

The battle of Navarino took place on October 20, 1827. It was fought by the Turko-Egyptian fleet, on the one side, and the allied British, French and Russian fleet commanded by Vice-Admiral Codrington, on the other. The latter was sent by the European powers to Greek waters for the purpose of armed mediation in the war between Turkey and the Greek insurgents. The battle ended in a crushing defeat for the Turko-Egyptian fleet.

Magna Charta (Magna Carta Libertatum)—a charter signed by King John of England on June 15, 1215, under pressure from the rebellious barons, who were supported by the knights and burghers. It restricted the rights of the King, mainly in the interests of the big feudal magnates, and contained some concessions to the knights and burghers.
In 1849 the Russian and Austrian governments demanded that Turkey should extradite Hungarian and Polish refugees who had taken part in the revolution in Hungary. The Turkish Government, which hoped to make use of the refugees in reorganising the army, refused to comply with this demand. The conflict became especially acute after the intervention of the Western powers, which decided to oppose Russia for fear of her growing influence in the Near East and in Central Europe. The British Government sent a squadron to the Dardanelles. Nicholas I was compelled to give way and be content with the Turkish Government's promise to expel the refugees from Turkey. p. 24

The will of Peter the Great—a spurious document circulated by enemies of Russia. The idea of the existence of the “will” was advanced in the West as early as 1797. In 1812 Ch. L. Lesur described the contents of this pseudo-will in his book Des progrès de la puissance russe, depuis son origine jusqu’au commencement du XIXe siècle, and in 1836 it was reproduced as a document in T. F. Gaillardet’s book Mémoires du Chevalier d’Eon. In Marx’s and Engels’ lifetime many people in Western Europe regarded this document as authentic. p. 24

A reference to the three partitions of Poland (1772, 1793 and 1795) by Prussia, Tsarist Russia and Austria (which did not take part in the second one). As a result of the third partition the Polish state ceased to exist. p. 25

A reference to the actions of the Austrian police in connection with the Milan insurrection in February 1853 (see Note 19) and the attempt of the Hungarian tailor János Libényi to assassinate the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph on February 18, 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 513). These events were used by the Austrian authorities as a pretext for mass arrests and trials of persons suspected of conspiracy against the government and participation in the national liberation movement in Hungary and Italy. Marx compares these reprisals with the measures taken by the governments of German states against participants in the opposition movement after the Napoleonic wars, which were carried out on the pretext of fighting against “demagogical machinations”. p. 28

The Cologne communist trial (October 4-November 12, 1852) was a trial of a group of Communist League members charged with “treasonable conspiracy”. The trial was rigged by the Prussian police on the basis of forged documents and fabricated evidence, which were used not only against the accused but also to discredit the whole proletarian organisation. Such evidence included, for instance, the so-called Original Minute-book of the Communist League Central Authority meetings and other documents forged by police agents, but also genuine documents of the Willich-Schapper adventurer faction which was responsible for the split in the Communist League. Seven of the twelve accused were sentenced to imprisonment for terms of three to six years. Marx guided the defence from London by sending material revealing the provocative methods of the prosecution, and after the trial he exposed its organisers (see Engels’ article “The Late Trial at Cologne”, published in the New-York Daily Tribune, and Marx’s pamphlet Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne, present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 388-93 and 395-457). p. 29

Marx is referring to Napoleon III’s claims to the left bank of the Rhine, which representatives of French ruling circles had regarded as France’s “natural border” in the east ever since the seventeenth century. p. 29
The Treaty of Adrianople—a peace treaty signed between Turkey and Russia in September 1829 to end the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. By the treaty Russia obtained the Danube Delta with its islands and a considerable portion of the eastern Black Sea coast south of the Kuban estuary. Turkey was to recognise the autonomy of Moldavia and Wallachia, granting them the right to elect their Hospodars independently; their autonomy was to be guaranteed by Russia. The Turkish Government also pledged to recognise Greece as an independent state, whose only obligation to Turkey was to pay an annual tribute to the Sultan, and to observe the previous treaties with regard to Serbian autonomy, issuing a special order in official recognition of it.

Marx's notebook with excerpts for 1853 contains, on page 18, a passage in French from the Adrianople treaty. The text of the treaty was published in many collections of documents, in works by various authors quoted by Marx, and in periodicals.

Ali Pasha of Janina, who ruled over a vast territory in the south-west of the Balkans (Epirus, Albania, South Macedonia and other lands, with Janina as the centre), had been at war with the Turkish Sultan since 1820, a fact which contributed to the success of the Greek uprising. However, unlike the national liberation movement of the Greeks, this struggle was of a feudal-separatist nature and ended in his defeat in 1822.

For the battle of Navarino see Note 27.

When war broke out between Turkey and Russia in the spring of 1828, French troops under the command of General Maison landed in Morea (the Peloponnesus) in Southern Greece in August and occupied the peninsula. The aim of the expedition, which was organised on the pretext of rendering assistance to the Greeks, was to counteract growing Russian influence in the Balkans and consolidate the position of France in the region.

The London conferences of the representatives of Britain, Russia and France were held in 1827-29 and discussed the Greek question. On July 6, 1827, the three powers signed a Convention which confirmed the Protocol on Greek autonomy signed by Britain and Russia in St. Petersburg on April 4, 1826. Both the Protocol and the Convention contained clauses on the diplomatic recognition of Greece as an independent state and armed mediation in the Turko-Greek conflict. On the basis of this Convention the allied fleet was sent into Greek waters and took part in the battle of Navarino. A number of other documents concerning Greece were also signed, including a Protocol of March 22, 1829, which established the borders of the Greek state and provided for a monarchical form of government in Greece. However, these agreements and the steps taken by Britain and France, who hoped to settle the conflict through diplomacy, without a defeat for Turkey in the Russo-Turkish war, could not make Turkey change her attitude on the Greek question. It was only after the victory of the Russian army under General Diebich in the 1829 campaign that Turkey agreed to make some concessions.

The editors of the New-York Daily Tribune inserted the following passage at the end of the article (which was also reproduced in the New-York Weekly Tribune):

“For the present, the duty of those who would forward the popular cause in Europe is to lend all possible aid to the development of industry, education, obedience to law, and the instinct of freedom and independence in the Christian dependencies of Turkey. The future peace and progress of the world
are concerned in it. If there is to be a harvest, too much care cannot be given to the preparation of the soil and the sowing of the seed.”

40 An allusion to the swing to the right of the liberal bourgeoisie already in the early days of the March 1848 revolution in Prussia. Immediately after the uprising in Berlin (March 18) the bourgeoisie hastily organised a civic militia to counterbalance the revolutionary insurgent workers. Engels described the situation in Prussia at the time in his work *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*, pointing out that “the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the supporters of the overturned system was concluded upon the very barricades of Berlin” (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 36).

41 Clippings from the *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* of April 1, 8, 15 and 22, 1853 containing Hirsch’s article “Die Opfer der Moucharderie” with Marx’s notes and underlinings have been preserved.

42 The books by Adolphe Chenu and Lucien de la Hodde are analysed in a review by Marx and Engels, published in the fourth issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 311-25).

43 A reference to the so-called Original Minute-book of the Communist League Central Authority fabricated by Prussian agent-provocateurs in London and presented at the Cologne trial as official proof of the defendants’ guilt. Concerning this forged document see Marx’s *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 420-24).

44 According to most recent research, Bangya passed on to the Prussian police information he happened to learn from German refugees in France. The police used it to arrest a number of Communist League members in Germany and stage a trial in Cologne. See E. Schraepler, *Handwerkerbände und Arbeitervereine. 1830-1853*, Berlin-New York, 1972, S. 462 et al.

45 This article is the first in a series by Marx on the budget of Aberdeen’s Coalition Ministry, published in the London weekly *The People’s Paper*, the organ of the revolutionary wing of Chartists founded in May 1852. He wrote them at the same time as his articles on the subject for the *New-York Daily Tribune*, and in places the text is almost identical.

Marx contributed his articles to *The People’s Paper* without payment, and frequently assisted with editing articles and helped Ernest Jones, the editor-in-chief, with matters of organisation. He also enlisted his close colleagues, Georg Eccarius, Wilhelm Pieper and Adolph Cluss, to write for the newspaper as permanent contributors. Eccarius, in particular, wrote with Marx’s assistance a review of the literature on the coup d’état in France on December 2 (see present edition, Vol. 11, Appendices). This review was the first in the English press to popularise Marx’s ideas that were set forth in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.

Apart from publishing Marx’s articles, written specially for it, *The People’s Paper* from October 1852 to December 1856 reprinted the most important articles by Marx and Engels from the *New-York Daily Tribune*. In 1856, as a result of Jones’ rapprochement with the bourgeois radicals, Marx and Engels ceased their work for *The People’s Paper* and temporarily broke off relations
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with Jones. In June 1858 the newspaper passed into the hands of bourgeois businessmen.  

46 Following William Cobbett, Marx gives the year 1701 as the beginning of Queen Anne's reign, in accordance with the calendar in operation in England before 1752, when the new year began with March 25. According to the new style, Anne's reign began in 1702.

47 The *South Sea Company* was founded in England about 1712 officially for trade with South America and the Pacific islands, but its real purpose was speculation in state bonds. The government granted several privileges and monopoly rights to the Company, including the right to issue state securities. The Company's large-scale speculation brought it to bankruptcy in 1720 and greatly increased Britain's national debt.

48 A reference to Russell's motion for the "removal of some disabilities of Her Majesty's Jewish subjects", introduced in the House of Commons on February 24, 1853. The motion aimed at granting the Jews the right to be elected to the House of Commons. It passed through the Commons but was turned down by the House of Lords. Marx gave an appraisal of this bill in his article "Parliamentary Debates.—The Clergy Against Socialism.—Starvation" (see present edition, Vol. 11).

The *Canada Clergy Reserves* (1791-1840) consisted of a seventh of the revenue from the sale of lands in Canada and were used chiefly for subsidising the Established and the Presbyterian Churches. In 1853 the British Parliament passed a law authorising the legislative bodies in Canada to distribute the funds independently and grant subsidies to other churches also according to the proportion of the population professing this or that religion. When Peel's Bill, introduced on February 15, 1853, was passing through the House of Commons, the members, on Russell's initiative, voted against the clause on the withdrawal of subsidies to various churches in Canada, which were granted in years when their share of the revenue from the sale of lands was below a fixed sum.

49 See Note 48.

50 In accordance with parliamentary procedure, the House of Commons, when discussing certain important questions, declares itself a Committee of the whole House. The functions of the Chairman of the Committee at such sittings are performed by one of the persons on a list of chairmen who is specially appointed by the Speaker.

51 See Note 47.

52 This refers to the debates on the system of education in the Catholic College in Maynooth (Ireland) in the House of Commons in February and March 1853. The College was founded in 1795 with the support of Pitt the Younger, who secured the granting of considerable subsidies for it by the British Parliament. This policy, pursued in following years also, aimed at winning support for the British Government from the upper strata of the Irish landlords, bourgeoisie and clergy, and thereby causing a split in the Irish national movement.

53 The *Irish Brigade*—the Irish faction in the British Parliament from the 1830s to the 1850s. It was led by Daniel O'Connell until 1847. As neither the Tories nor the Whigs had a decisive majority the Irish Brigade, alongside the Free
Traders, could tip the balance in Parliament and in some cases decide the fate of the government.

In the early 1850s, a number of M.P.s belonging to this faction entered into an alliance with the radical Irish Tenant-Right League and formed the so-called Independent Opposition in the House of Commons. However, the leaders of the Irish Brigade soon concluded an agreement with British ruling circles and refused to support the League's demands, which led to the demoralisation and final dissolution of the Independent Opposition in 1859.  

54 The Manchester School—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. Its supporters, known as Free Traders, advocated removal of protective tariffs and non-intervention by the government in economic life. The centre of the Free Traders' agitation was Manchester, where the movement was headed by two textile manufacturers, Richard Cobden and John Bright, who founded the Anti-Corn Law League in 1838. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were a separate political group, which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party.  

55 The Taxes on Knowledge in Britain were the advertisement duty, the stamp duty on newspapers and the tax on paper.  

56 In a conversation with the French Ambassador, shortly after the Bonapartist coup d'état on December 2, 1851, the British Foreign Secretary Palmerston approved of Louis Bonaparte's usurpation. (Marx calls the latter "the hero of the plain of Satory", referring to a review that he held near Versailles in the autumn of 1850 which was actually a Bonapartist demonstration.) Palmerston did this without consulting the other members of the Ministry, however, which led to his dismissal in December 1851. The British Government was nevertheless the first to recognise Bonaparte.

As Home Secretary in Aberdeen's Coalition Government formed in December 1852, Palmerston instigated police persecutions, harassment in the press and lawsuits against political refugees in Britain. His department communicated information about their activities to the police of Austria and other continental powers. While carrying on this policy, Palmerston professed loyalty to constitutional and democratic principles.  

57 The editors of the New-York Daily Tribune published the following note to this article in the same issue of May 6, 1853: "Our readers will find a masterly exposition of Mr. Gladstone's budget, and of its bearing on the present stated parties in England, in the letter of our London Correspondent, Dr. Marx, published in this morning's Tribune. We have seen nowhere an able criticism on the budget or on its author, and do not expect to see one."  

58 A reference to the London Protocol of May 8, 1852 on the integrity of the Danish monarchy, signed by the representatives of Austria, Denmark, England, France, Prussia, Russia and Sweden. It was based on the Protocol adopted by the above-mentioned countries (except Prussia) at the London Conference on August 2, 1850, which supported the indivisibility of the lands belonging to the Danish Crown, including the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein. The 1852 Protocol mentioned the Russian Emperor (as a descendant of Duke Charles Peter Ulrich of Holstein-Gottorp who reigned in Russia as Peter III) among the lawful claimants to the Danish throne who had waived their rights in favour of Duke Christian of Glücksburg who was proclaimed successor to King Frederick VII.
This provided an opportunity for the Russian Tsar to claim the Danish Crown in the event of the Glücksburg dynasty dying out. p. 67

59 A reference to attempts by the Pope in 1850 to assume the right of appointing Catholic bishops for Britain. This was opposed by the Church of England and the government. A law was passed in 1851 which decreed the Pope’s appointments invalid. p. 67

60 A reference to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (962-1806), which at different periods included the German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Bohemian lands, Switzerland and the Netherlands. It was a motley conglomeration of feudal kingdoms and principalities, church lands and free towns with different political structures, legal standards and customs. p. 67

61 See Note 54. p. 69

62 See Note 53. p. 73

63 In 1845-47 there was famine in Ireland due to the ruin of farms and the pauperisation of the peasants. Although blight had caused a great shortage of potatoes, the principal diet of the Irish peasants, the English landlords continued to export food from the country, condemning the poorest sections of the population to starvation. About a million people starved to death and the new wave of emigration caused by the famine carried away another million. As a result, large areas of Ireland were depopulated and the abandoned land was turned into pastures by the Irish and English landlords. p. 73

64 The Mayfair-men, or Mayfair Radicals—the name given to a group of aristocratic politicians (Molesworth, Bernal Osborne and others), who flirted with democratic circles. Mayfair is an upper-class residential district in London bordering Hyde Park. p. 74

65 An allusion to the attitude of Aberdeen’s Coalition Ministry, especially of Palmerston as Home Secretary, to political refugees in Britain and the services which the Home Office rendered to the police authorities of Austria and other powers in the struggle against the revolutionary-democratic movement (see Note 56). p. 74

66 In accordance with parliamentary procedure, the House of Commons, when discussing important questions concerning the national budget, declares itself a Committee of Ways and Means. This is one of the cases when the House sits as a committee (see Note 50). p. 76

67 A reference to the eighth Kaffir war waged by Britain in 1850-53 against the Xhosa tribes. (The name “Kaffir” is wrongly applied to members of all the tribes inhabiting South-Eastern Africa.) In accordance with the peace treaty of 1853 the Xhosa tribes ceded some of their lands to the British. p. 76

68 See Note 53. p. 80

69 See Note 54. p. 80

70 Marx sent this article to the New-York Daily Tribune together with Engels’ article on Switzerland, written at his request and posted to him from Manchester on
April 26, 1853, as one report. The editors divided the material into two parts and published them as separate articles. (Marx later wrote of this in his letters to Engels of June 2 and 29, 1853.) The first article comprised the text written by Marx after he had received Engels' article and the beginning of Engels' report describing the separatist putsch of clerical and conservative elements in the Freiburg canton in the spring of 1853. The bulk of Engels' report was published as a separate article, signed by Marx; in another issue (see below "Political Position of the Swiss Republic"). In this volume the articles are given as published in the afternoon and evening editions of the *New-York Daily Tribune*.

---

71 This letter has not come to light. It is possible that the words "the substance of which I have already communicated to you" were inserted by the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune*, and refer to some other material, such as the article by A.P.C. (Aurelius Pulszky), "Oriental Affairs.—Austria and Radetzky.—The Gunpowder Plot", in the newspaper issue of May 6, 1853, which mentioned Hale's letter published in *The Daily News* on April 18, 1853. This article said that the letter denied Kossuth's participation in the production of rockets.

---

72 The Sonderbund—a separatist union formed by the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland in 1843 to resist progressive bourgeois reforms and defend the privileges of the Church and the Jesuits. The decree of the Swiss Diet of July 1847 on the dissolution of the Sonderbund served as a pretext for the latter to commence hostilities against the other cantons early in November. On November 23, 1847, the Sonderbund army was defeated by the federal forces. Even after the defeat of the Sonderbund its adherents among the Catholic clergy, the patrician upper strata in the towns, and the conservative section of the peasantry made attempts to seize power in separate cantons.

---

73 This article constitutes the main part of Engels' correspondence included by Marx in their common report (see Note 70). The editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* published the article under the date-line "May 1", but actually it was written not later than April 26 and sent by Marx to New York on the 29th of that month. The article was printed under the heading "Switzerland" and entitled "Political Position of This Republic". In this edition the title of the article has been changed in accordance with its publication in the German and Russian editions of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels.

The article was published in German with slight abridgements, under the title "Switzerland", in the New York newspaper *Die Reform* of June 1 and 4, 1853. The editorial note to the article gave Marx as its author. Following this *Die Reform* began to publish translations or renderings of Marx's articles printed in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. The main part in popularising Marx's articles through *Die Reform* was played by Joseph Weydemeyer and Adolph Cluss, former members of the Communist League.

---

74 A reference to the Vienna Congress (September 1814-June 1815). On March 20, 1815 the main powers participating in the Congress signed a declaration guaranteeing "permanent neutrality" to Switzerland.
Switzerland was drawn into a conflict with France (December 1851-January 1852) over Louis Bonaparte's demand for the expulsion from Switzerland of French republican refugees, opponents of the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851. As in 1836, when the July monarchy staged military demonstrations threatening Switzerland with war for granting asylum to French refugees—Louis Bonaparte among them—the Swiss Government was again compelled to make major concessions to France.

In the eighteenth century the principality of Neuchâtel and Valangin (in German: Neuenburg and Vallendis) was under Prussian rule. It was ceded to France in 1806, during the Napoleonic wars. In 1815, by a decision of the Vienna Congress, it was incorporated into the Swiss Confederation as the 21st canton, while remaining a vassal of Prussia. On February 29, 1848 a bourgeois revolution in Neuchâtel put an end to Prussian rule and a republic was proclaimed. Prussia, however, laid constant claims to Neuchâtel up to 1857, which led to a sharp conflict with the Swiss Republic, and only pressure from France forced her to renounce these claims officially.

In 1853 a dispute arose between Switzerland and Austria over the Italian refugees residing in the Swiss canton of Tessin (Ticino), who had taken part in the national liberation movement in Italy and fled to Switzerland from the Italian provinces under Austrian rule after the unsuccessful uprising in Milan of February 6, 1853 (see Note 19).

From the fifteenth to the mid-nineteenth century the Swiss cantons concluded agreements with the European states for the supply of Swiss mercenaries. The reference here is to agreements signed in 1848 by the canton of Berne and some other cantons with the counter-revolutionary government of Ferdinand II, King of Naples. The use of Swiss troops against the revolutionary movement in Italy aroused profound indignation among the Swiss progressive public, which eventually led to the annulment of these agreements.

A reference to the Constitution of the Swiss Confederation adopted on September 12, 1848. The new Constitution ensured a measure of centralisation, changing a confederation of cantons (the confederation treaty of 1814 sanctioned by the Congress of Vienna greatly restricted the power of central government) into a federative state. In place of the former Swiss Diet a new legislative body, a Federal Assembly (Bundesversammlung) was set up consisting of two chambers—the National Council and the Council of States. Executive power was vested in the Federal Council whose Chairman acted as President of the Republic.

In 1850 popular unrest spread over a number of Southern provinces in China (Kwangsi, etc.), and developed into a powerful peasant war. The insurgents established a state of their own over a considerable part of Chinese territory. The state was called Taiping Tankaui, hence the name of the movement—the Taiping uprising. The leaders of the movement put forward a utopian programme calling for China's feudal social order to be transformed into a semi-military patriarchal system based on the egalitarian principle in the sphere of production and consumption. The movement, which was also directed
against foreign invaders, was weakened by internal strife and the formation of its own feudal top strata in the Taiping state. It was dealt a crushing blow by the armed intervention of Britain, the USA and France, who initially aided the Manchu dynasty under cover of neutrality. The Taiping uprising was put down in 1864.

A reference to the Anglo-Chinese war of 1840-42, known as the First Opium War. It was started over the confiscation of foreign merchants' stocks of opium by the Chinese authorities. As a result of the war, the British imposed the Nanking Treaty on China in 1842, the first of a series of treaties concluded by the Western powers with China, which reduced it to the level of a semi-colony. The Nanking Treaty made China open five of its ports to British commerce—Canton, Shanghai, Amoy, Ningpo, and Foochow, cede the Island of Hongkong to Great Britain "in perpetuity" and pay a large indemnity. In 1843 a supplementary treaty was signed by which extraterritoriality was granted to foreigners in China. Similar treaties with China were also signed by the USA and France in 1844.

Rich deposits of gold were discovered in California in 1848 and in Australia in 1851. These discoveries were of great importance for the development of the European and American states.

Early in the seventeenth century China was threatened by the united Manchu tribes (known together with the Mongols as Tartars, the name of a Mongol tribe in North-Eastern Mongolia and Manchuria at the time of the formation of Genghis Khan's Empire in the early thirteenth century). The invasion by the Manchus led to the rule of the Ch'ing dynasty in the country (1644-1912), which constantly aroused the anger and opposition of the Chinese people.

Hong—a privileged merchants' guild, founded in China in 1721, whose members, on paying a large entrance fee to the treasury, obtained a monopoly of trade with foreigners. After the conclusion of the Nanking Treaty it was dissolved.

This article is the first of a series written by Marx in 1853 dealing with the British conquest of India, Britain's colonial rule in that country, and its consequences for the peoples of Hindustan. The articles were based on detailed study, especially of the history and socio-economic conditions of India and certain other countries in the East. Marx copied a great deal of information on the subject from books and various other sources, which can be found in three of his notebooks with excerpts marked XXI, XXII and XXIII, which also contain passages copied from works on European history and political economy. The material on India and other countries of the East contains passages from parliamentary Blue Books, parliamentary reports, various reference-books on statistics, commerce, railway construction in India, etc., European travellers' notes including those of the French physician and writer François Bernier: Voyages contenant la description des états du Grand Mogol, de l'Indoustan, Paris, 1830, and the Russian traveller A. D. Soltykov: Lettres sur l'Inde, Paris, 1849. Marx paid great attention to the works of English orientalists, among them R. Patton, The Principles of Asiatic Monarchies, London, 1801; M. Wilks, Historical Sketches of the South of
India, London, 1810-17; and Th. S. Raffles, The History of Java, London, 1817. Marx obtained a great deal of information from the series of works (by John Dickinson and other authors) published by the Free Traders' India Reform Association, and also from the books: G. Campbell, Modern India; a Sketch of the System of Civil Government, London, 1852, and A Scheme for the Government of India, London, 1853; J. Chapman, The Cotton and Commerce of India, London, 1851, and others. Some of the works Marx used are cited or mentioned in his articles. In the course of his research Marx frequently discussed his ideas on the subject with Engels, who was also studying Oriental history at the time (see Marx's letters to Engels of June 2 and 14, 1853 and Engels' reply of June 6, 1853 to the first letter). The results of their discussions were also used by Marx for his articles. The text of the last section in the article (“Turkey and Russia”) was published under this title in The Eastern Question. p. 101

85 See Note 58.

86 Marx is referring to a series of articles published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49 in connection with the Danish-German war over Schleswig and Holstein.

By a decision of the Vienna Congress (1815), the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein remained in the possession of the Danish monarchy (the personal union of Schleswig, Holstein and Denmark had existed since 1499), even though the majority of the population in Holstein and in Southern Schleswig were Germans. Under the impact of the March 1848 revolution in Prussia, the national movement among the German population of the duchies grew, and became radical and democratic, forming part of the struggle for the unification of Germany. Volunteers from all over the country rushed to the aid of the local population when it took up arms against Danish rule. Prussia and other states of the German Confederation also sent federal troops to the duchies. However, the Prussian ruling circles, which had declared war against Denmark, fearing a popular upsurge and an intensification of the revolution, sought an agreement with the Danish monarchy at the expense of the common interests of the German states. An armistice between Prussia and Denmark was concluded on August 26, 1848, at Malmö. On March 2, 1849, Prussia resumed hostilities, but under pressure from England and Russia, who supported Denmark, was forced to conclude a peace treaty (July 2, 1850), temporarily relinquishing its claims to Schleswig and Holstein and abandoning them to continue fighting alone. The Schleswig-Holstein troops were defeated and ceased to offer resistance.


87 See Note 47.
88 Downing Street—a side-turning off Whitehall, where the main government buildings in London are situated; it contains the residences of the Prime Minister (at No. 10) and the Chancellor of the Exchequer (at No. 11).

The Presidencies—Bengal, Bombay and Madras, the three divisions of the East India Company's territory which were originally governed by the Presidents of the Company's three factories. The Regulating Act of 1773 raised the Governor of Bengal to the rank of Governor-General of all Britain's possessions in India. He was called Governor-General of Bengal until 1833 and then Governor-General of India.

89 A reference to the India Reform Association, founded by the Free Trader John Dickinson in March 1853.

90 The long-standing dispute between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church over rights to the Christian Holy Places in Palestine was resumed in 1850 on Louis Bonaparte's initiative. It soon developed into a serious diplomatic conflict between Russia, which upheld the privileges of the Greek Orthodox clergy, and France, which supported the Roman Catholics. Both sides made use of this conflict in their struggle for hegemony in the Middle East. The vacillating Turkish Government at first yielded to the French demand but on May 4, 1853, during Menshikov's visit to Turkey, it agreed to guarantee special rights and privileges to the Greek Orthodox Church (a special order to this effect was issued by the Sultan a month later). At the same time the Sultan, supported by the British and French ambassadors, rejected Nicholas I's demand that he should be recognised as the protector of the Orthodox population in the Ottoman Empire.

91 The Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, signed between Russia and Turkey on July 21, 1774, put an end to the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74, in which Turkey was defeated. By that treaty Russia obtained the section of the Black Sea coast between the Southern Bug and the Dnieper, with the fortress of Kinburn, and also Azov, Kerch and Jenikale, and secured independent status for the Crimea facilitating its incorporation into Russia. Russian merchant ships were granted the right of free passage through the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. The Sultan was to grant a number of privileges to the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey, in particular Article 14 of the treaty provided for the construction of an Orthodox church in Constantinople.

For the Treaty of Adrianople see Note 35.

92 For the Laibach and Verona congresses of the Holy Alliance see Note 5.

For the treaties of Tilsit see Note 4.

93 A section of this article was published under the title "The Ultimatum and After" in The Eastern Question.

94 In 1853 Austria broke off diplomatic relations with Piedmont (Sardinia) after the Piedmontese authorities had granted asylum to a number of refugees from Lombardy (which was under Habsburg rule), who had participated in the national liberation movement of 1848-49 in Italy and the Milan insurrection of February 6, 1853.
In addressing Louis Bonaparte, who was proclaimed Emperor of the French in December 1852, Nicholas I, by agreement with the Austrian and Prussian courts, used the expression “Your Majesty and dear friend”, instead of the usual “Your Majesty and dear brother”, and called him “Emperor Louis Napoleon” and not “Emperor Napoleon III”. The Austrian and Prussian courts, however, used the accepted form of address for him, but in referring to the need to observe the Vienna Congress decisions, they also hinted at the illegality of his rule since the Congress had prohibited the Bonaparte dynasty from occupying the French throne.

Bujukdere—a holiday resort on the shore of the Bosporus, near Constantinople, where the Russian embassy in Turkey had its summer residence.

This article was published in *The Eastern Question* under the title “The English and French Fleets.—*The Times*.—Russian Aggrandizement”.

This article was published in *The Eastern Question*.

Marx’s article, to which he refers in citing this fact, has not been discovered in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. Judging by the notes made by Jenny Marx on the dispatch of articles to the newspaper, it was written by Marx on June 3, 1853, but for some reason was not published. The report on the recall of the Prussian officers appeared in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* on June 1, 1853.

The article which Marx intended to write was not published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.

Wesleyans or *Methodists*—a religious sect founded by John Wesley in Britain in the eighteenth century. At the end of the century it split off from the Church of England and also became popular, as a form of Protestantism, in the USA and Canada. Its distinguishing feature was its demand for a strict and methodical adherence to Christian doctrines, concerning which divisions arose between Wesleyan Methodists and “Primitive” Methodists.

For the preparatory materials for Marx’s articles on India see Note 84. In writing this article, Marx made use of some of Engels’ ideas which the latter set forth in his letter to Marx of June 6, 1853.

A reference to the rule in India, mainly in the north, of the Mohammedan invaders who came from Central Asia, Afghanistan and Persia. Early in the thirteenth century the Delhi Sultanate became the bulwark of Moslem domination but at the end of the fourteenth century it declined and was subsequently conquered by the Moguls, new invaders of Turkish descent, who came to India from the east of Central Asia in the early sixteenth century and in 1526 founded the Empire of the Great Moguls (named after the ruling dynasty of the Empire) in Northern India. Contemporaries regarded them as the direct descendants of the
Mongol warriors of Genghis Khan's time, hence the name "Moguls". In the mid-seventeenth century the Mogul Empire included the greater part of India and part of Afghanistan. Later on, however, the Empire began to decline due to peasant rebellions, the growing resistance of the Indian people to the Mohammedan conquerors and increasing separatist tendencies. In the early half of the eighteenth century the Empire of the Great Moguls practically ceased to exist.

Religion of the Lingam—the cult of the God Shiva, particularly widespread among the southern Indian sect of the Lingayat (from the word "linga"—the emblem of Shiva), a Hindu sect which does not recognise distinctions of caste and rejects fasts, sacrifices and pilgrimages.

Juggernaut (Jagannath)—a title of Krishna, the eighth avatar of Vishnu. The cult of Juggernaut was marked by sumptuous ritual and extreme religious fanaticism which manifested itself in the self-torture and suicide of believers. On feast days some believers threw themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the idol of Vishnu-Juggernaut.

Heptarchy (government by seven rulers)—a term used by English historiographers to describe the political system in England from the sixth to eighth centuries, when the country was divided into seven highly unstable Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, which, in their turn, frequently split up and reunited. Marx uses this term by analogy to describe the disunity of the Deccan (Central and South India) before its conquest by the Mohammedans at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

The island of Salsette, north of Bombay, was famous for its 109 Buddhist cave temples.

The text of the section "The Turkish Question" was published in The Eastern Question under the title "Brunnow and Clarendon.—Armenian Proclamation".

The Ten Hours' Bill, which applied to women and children only, was passed by the British Parliament on June 8, 1847. The Truck Act was passed in 1831. However many manufacturers evaded these laws in practice.

In 1824, under mass pressure, the British Parliament lifted the ban on the trade unions. In 1825, however, it passed a Bill on workers' combinations, which, while confirming the raising of the ban on trade unions, greatly restricted their activity. In particular, any agitation for workers to join unions and take part in strikes was regarded as compulsion and violence and punished as a crime.

A reference to the Blackstone-Edge meeting organised by the Chartists on August 2, 1846. The meeting in which Ernest Jones took part was held on June 19, 1853.

The People's Charter, the Chartist programme document, contained a demand for universal suffrage (for men of 21 and over), annual elections to Parliament, secret ballot, equal constituencies, abolition of property qualifications for candidates to Parliament, and salaries for M.P.s.
This article, without the sections “The Budget” and “Tax on Newspaper Supplements”, was published in The Eastern Question under the title “Aberdeen, Clarendon, Brunnow.—Connivance of the Aberdeen Ministry with Russia”. p. 142

A reference to the draft convention between Russia and Turkey which Menshikov laid as an ultimatum before the Porte after the settlement of the question of the Holy Places on May 4, 1853 (see Note 90). The draft provided not only for freedom of religion for Orthodox believers in the Turkish Empire but also for the Russian Tsar's protectorate over them and was rejected by the Sultan (see this volume, pp. 105-06 and 109-11). p. 143

The Bucharest Treaty, concluded between Russia and Turkey in 1812, confirmed certain autonomous rights of Moldavia and Wallachia and the right of Russia, laid down in the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji in 1774, to defend the interests of the Orthodox Christians in the Danubian Principalities against the Porte. Under the Adrianople Treaty of 1829 Moldavia and Wallachia were granted autonomy in domestic affairs and were actually placed under the protectorate of Russia. p. 144

The Balla-Liman Convention was concluded between Russia and Turkey on May 1, 1849, following the occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia by Russian and Turkish troops for the purpose of suppressing the revolutionary movement. According to the Convention the occupation was to continue until the danger of revolution was completely removed (the occupation troops were withdrawn in 1851), the Hospodars were to be appointed temporarily by the Sultan in agreement with the Tsar, and a number of measures, including an occupation, to be taken by Russia and Turkey in the event of a new revolution were laid down. p. 144

The Convention of 1841 on the Black Sea Straits was signed by Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, Russia and Turkey in London on July 13, 1841. According to the Convention the Bosporus and the Dardanelles were to be closed in peacetime to all foreign warships. The Convention said nothing about wartime, leaving Turkey to decide the question at her own discretion. p. 145

An allusion to the recall of Colonel Rose from Constantinople in February 1853, and the appointment of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in his place as British Ambassador to Turkey. p. 145

A reference to Chancellor Nesselrode's letter to the Turkish Foreign Minister Reshid Pasha of May 31, 1853. The letter was written in the form of ultimatum. It laid the responsibility for Menshikov's unsuccessful mission on the Turkish Government and called for acceptance of Russian demands to guarantee the privileges of the Orthodox Christian subjects of the Sultan, which actually meant the establishment of the Tsar's protectorate over them. Nesselrode threatened to resort to military action, i.e., the occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia, if the ultimatum was rejected. Turkey, supported by Britain and France, rejected the demands of the Tsarist Government in Reshid Pasha's letter of June 16, 1853. p. 146

The Bank of England was founded by private persons in 1694. The founders loaned its fixed capital to the government, which explains the origin of the British national debt. The Bank was actually controlled by the government and
functioned as the state bank, e.g. it was entitled to issue money. It remained nominally a private establishment, however, until the end of the Second World War.

121 A reference to the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty and the enthronement of William III of Orange, after which constitutional monarchy was consolidated in England on the basis of a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the financial bourgeoisie.

122 The Seven Years' War (1756-63)—a war between the Anglo-Prussian and the Franco-Russo-Austrian coalitions. One of the chief causes of the war was the colonial and commercial rivalry between England and France. The main theatre of operations in the East was India where the French and their puppets among the local princes were opposed by the British East India Company, which took advantage of the war to seize new Indian territories. The war ended with France losing almost all her possessions in India (except five coastal towns whose fortifications she was compelled to demolish), while England considerably strengthened her colonial might.

123 A reference to the Reform Bill which was passed by Parliament in June 1832. The Bill was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and financial aristocracy and gave representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie access to Parliament. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, the main forces in the struggle for the reform, received no electoral rights.

124 Marx lists a number of wars of conquest waged by the British East India Company. The war in the Carnatic (a principality in South-Eastern India) lasted at intervals from 1746 to 1763. The warring sides—the British and French East India Companies—sought to subjugate the Carnatic under the guise of supporting different local pretenders to the principality. The British, who in January 1761 took possession of Pondichery, the principal French bastion in the south, ultimately won the day.

In 1756, in an effort to avert a British invasion, the Nawab of Bengal started a war, seizing Calcutta, the British base in North-Eastern India. But the armed forces of the British East India Company under Robert Clive's command soon recaptured the city, demolished the Bengal fortifications of the French, who supported the Nawab, and defeated him at Plassey on June 23, 1757. In 1763 they crushed the uprising that broke out in Bengal against British rule. Along with Bengal, the British took possession of Bihar, a region on the Ganges, which was under the rule of the Nawab of Bengal. In 1803, the British completed the conquest of several feudal principalities of Orissa situated south of Bengal.

125 In 1790-92 and 1799 the British East India Company waged wars with Mysore, an independent feudal state in South India. Its ruler Tippoo Saib had taken part in previous Mysore campaigns against the British and was a sworn enemy of the British colonialists. In the first of these wars Mysore lost half of its dominions, which were seized by the East India Company and its allied feudal princes. The second war ended with the total defeat and the death of Tippoo. Mysore became a vassal principality.
The *subsidiary system*, or the system of so-called *subsidiary agreements*—a method of turning the potentates of Indian principalities into vassals of the East India Company. Most widespread were agreements under which the princes had to maintain (subsidise) the Company's troops stationed on their territory and agreements which saddled the princes with loans on exorbitant terms. Failure to fulfil them resulted in the confiscation of their possessions.

See Note 18.

Marx's preparatory materials on India (Notebook XXI) include passages from J. R. MacCulloch's *The Literature of Political Economy*, London, 1845. The book contains extracts from the works of English economists of an earlier period on British trade with India, among them the above-mentioned treatises of J. Child, Th. Mun and J. Pollexfen.

In the first Burmese war of 1824-26 the troops of the East India Company seized the Province of Assam, bordering on Bengal, and the coastal districts of Arakan and Tenasserim. The second Burmese war (1852) resulted in the seizure by the British of the Province of Pegu. Burma did not sign a peace treaty, however, and refused to recognise the seizure of Pegu. In 1853 the British authorities threatened to resume military operations but abstained from this step, largely due to the guerrilla warfare in Pegu against the foreign invaders, which continued until 1860. In the 1860s Britain imposed on Burma a number of unequal treaties and in 1885, as a result of the third Burmese war, annexed the whole territory of Burma.

A reference to the debate in the House of Commons (June 24, 1853) on the Bill on Irish landlords and tenants introduced by the Aberdeen Ministry.

The government hoped to normalise relations between landlords and tenants by granting the latter certain rights and thereby mitigating the agrarian struggle in the country. After more than two years of debates Parliament rejected the Bill.

*Tenancy-at-will*—a form of tenancy, inherited from the Middle Ages, which did not guarantee a definite term of lease for the tenant and under which the contract could be broken or modified by the landlord at any time, depending on his will.

After the Act of Union was passed in 1801, the British Parliament abolished the protective tariffs shielding Ireland's young and weak industry from foreign competition. This resulted in the collapse of local enterprises, which were unable to compete with British industry, and in Ireland's transformation into an agrarian appendage of Britain.

Marx's excerpts from F. W. Newman's *Lectures on Political Economy* and H. Spencer's *Social Statics* are contained in his Notebook XXI.

The title under which the article appeared in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*. The *New-York Daily Tribune* entitled it "Russian Policy Against Turkey", and under this title the first section of the article, bearing on the Russo-Turkish conflict, was published in *The Eastern Question*. 
In his work on this article and other reports dealing with the history of international relations, Marx made use of materials and documents usually translated into English and published in *The Portfolio; or a Collection of State Papers*. His excerpts from this source are contained in Notebook XXII.  

134 "Pacification of Greece"—an expression used in the diplomatic documents of the European powers with reference to their intervention in the Turko-Greek conflict caused by the liberation struggle of the Greek people against Turkish rule in the 1820s.  

135 See Note 38.  

136 A reference to Nesselrode's Note (a circular letter of June 11, 1853) to Russian diplomats abroad. The Note criticised the Porte's actions and gave grounds for presenting a new ultimatum to Turkey demanding that the Russian Tsar be recognised as the protector of the Christian subjects of the Sultan and threatening to resort to "decisive measures" if these demands were rejected. This ultimatum, which Marx calls below an "ultimatisimum", was presented to the Porte on June 16, 1853.  

137 A reference to the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association founded in July 1840. The Association was the first mass workers' party in the history of the working-class movement and had up to 50,000 members at the height of the Chartist movement. However, a lack of ideological and tactical unity and a certain looseness in its organisation affected its activities. After the defeat of the Chartists in 1848 and the ensuing split in their ranks the Association lost its mass character. Nevertheless, under the leadership of Ernest Jones and other revolutionary Chartists it fought for the revival of Chartism on a socialist basis, which found its expression in the programme adopted by the Chartist Convention in 1851. The Association ceased its activities in 1858.  

138 See Note 111.  

139 The first section of this article, entitled "Austria and Russia", was published in *The Eastern Question*. On the use by Marx of facts and materials published in *The Portfolio* for his articles on the history of international relations, see Note 133.  

140 See Note 130.  

141 The *Suttee*—a custom by which a Hindu widow immolates herself on the funeral pyre with her husband's body.  

142 The first section of this article was published in *The Eastern Question* under the title "Layard.—Gladstone.—Aberdeen.—Palmerston".  

143 A reference to the excavations of Nineveh, the capital of ancient Assyria, directed by the English archaeologist Austen Henry Layard in 1845-51.
Under the Poor Law of 1834 the only relief available to the poor who were fit for work was admission to a workhouse. These were dubbed "Poor Law Bastilles".  

A reference to the Bill passed by Parliament on August 5, 1850, in response to workers' protest against the verdict of the Court of Exchequer, which on February 8, 1850 acquitted a group of manufacturers accused of violating the Ten Hours' Bill. This ruling created a precedent and was tantamount to a repeal of the Bill. The workers were also incensed by the relay system practised by British manufacturers. Under the relay system, women and juveniles stayed at work for the full length of the working day for adult men (up to 15 hours), but worked at intervals. The length of their actual work was not outwardly to exceed the legal limit. The manufacturers began to make especially wide use of this system after 1847, in an attempt to circumvent the Ten Hours' Bill. The new Bill prohibited the relay system but fixed a 10½-hour working day for women and juveniles. Marx makes a more detailed analysis of the British workers' struggle for a shorter working day in Volume I of Capital.  

This article, excluding the section "The East India Question", was published in The Eastern Question.  

The Peace Society (the Society for Promoting Permanent and Universal Peace)—a pacifist organisation founded by the Quakers in London in 1816. It was strongly supported by the Free Traders, who believed that, given peace, free trade would enable Britain to make full use of her industrial superiority and thus gain economic and political supremacy.  

An allusion to Palmerston's speech during a parliamentary debate on the Anglo-Greek conflict in June 1850. In January 1850 the British Government presented Greece with an ultimatum and sent ships to blockade Piraeus using as a pretext the burning (in Athens in 1847) of the house of the Portuguese merchant Pacifico, who was a British subject. The real object of the move, however, was to make Greece surrender several strategically important islands in the Aegean Sea. In his speech of June 25, 1850 Palmerston justified Britain's action by the need to safeguard the prestige of British subjects, and drew an analogy between them and Roman citizens. The Latin phrase he cited: "civis Romanus sum" ("I am a Roman citizen"), was used to indicate the high status and privileges afforded by British citizenship.  

A reference to the Smyrna incident caused by the arrest of Martin Koszta, a Hungarian refugee and US subject, by order of the Austrian consul, who had him put on board the Austrian warship Hussar. This led to an armed clash between the refugees and Austrian naval officers. Ingraham, the captain of the American warship Saint Louis, had to intervene and demanded the release of Koszta. Thanks to the mediation of the consuls of other powers an armed conflict was averted. After the negotiations, which lasted for several months, Koszta was released and left for the USA.  

See Note 91.
152 In the spring of 1833 Russian troops were landed in Unkiar-Skelessi, near the Bosporus, to render assistance to the Turkish Sultan against the army of the insurgent Egyptian ruler Mehemet Ali. In May 1833 the Porte, with the mediation of Britain and France, signed a peace treaty with Mehemet Ali, ceding him Syria and Palestine. However, Russian diplomats took advantage of the strained situation and the presence of Russian troops in Turkey and prevailed upon the Porte to sign, on July 8, 1833, the Unkiar-Skelessi Treaty on a defensive alliance with Russia. On the insistence of Russia a secret clause was included in the treaty prohibiting all foreign warships, except those of Russia, to pass through the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. This clause remained in force until the new Egyptian crisis of 1839-41 (see Note 6). In negotiating with Britain and other powers on joint operations against Mehemet Ali, Nicholas I had to comply with their demand that in peacetime the Straits be closed to warships of all foreign states without exception.

155 *Furcae Caudinae*—a gorge near the Roman town of Caudium, where in 321 B.C., during the second Samnite war, the Samnites defeated the Roman legions and made them pass under the “yoke”, which was considered a terrible disgrace to a defeated army. Hence the expression “to pass under furcae Caudinae”, that is to be subjected to extreme humiliation.

154 Until 1872 candidates to the British Parliament were nominated by a show of hands and even persons without the right to vote could take part in the nomination. But only a very small section of the population could take part in the election, the franchise being restricted by a high property qualification, residence qualification, etc. Candidates turned down by open vote could also stand for election. Marx described these features of the British electoral system in his article “The Chartists” (1852), citing as an example the nomination of candidates in Halifax where Ernest Jones’ candidacy was proposed (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 333-41).

156 ‘*Change Alley*’—a street in London containing many banks and usurers’ offices; it was famous for all kinds of financial transactions and speculative deals.

158 *Jagirdars*—representatives of the Moslem feudal gentry in the Great Mogul Empire who received for temporary use large estates (jagirs) in return for which they rendered military service and supplied contingents of troops. When the Empire began to disintegrate the jagirdars became hereditary feudal owners.

159 Babur (1483-1530), the founder of the Great Mogul Empire (see Note 104), was a descendant of Tamerlane, who in his turn considered himself the
successor of Genghis Khan. In the eighteenth century, after the disintegration of the Empire, the Mogul emperors became the puppets of the regional governors and Indian feudal lords. After the seizure of Delhi in 1803 by the British they became figureheads of the East India Company and received pensions from it. In 1858, when India was declared a possession of the British Crown, the last formal vestiges of Mogul power were abolished.  

160 This article, excluding the first section “War in Burma”, was published under the title “The Russian Question.—Curious Diplomatic Correspondence” in The Eastern Question.  

161 See Note 128.  

162 See Note 148.  

163 See Note 22.  

164 See Note 54.  

165 A reference to Nesselrode's circular letter to Russian diplomats abroad of July 2, 1853. (Below Marx cites the date as June 20, 1853, according to the old style accepted in Russia.) The text of it was published in The Times, No. 21418, July 12, 1853. Written in the spirit of the previous Note of June 11, 1853 (see Note 136), it supported the Tsarist Government's demands on Turkey and criticized the policy of the Western powers. In referring to the French Minister's reply to the Note, Marx made a slight error, which was due to the lack of clarity in the text of the telegram from Paris published in The Morning Post. He quoted from Drouyn de Lhuy's reply to Nesselrode's first Note of June 11, 1853, the text of which together with the text of the French Government's reply of June 25, 1853 was published in the official newspaper Le Moniteur universel, No. 195, on July 14, 1853. Nesselrode's Note of July 2 and Drouyn de Lhuys' reply to it of July 15 were published in Le Moniteur universel, No. 198 for July 17, 1853, after Marx had written his article. In the second Note, the French Government likewise expressed its disapproval of the Tsar's position in the Eastern question and professed to stand for a peaceful solution of the conflict.  

166 A reference to the London Convention of July 13, 1841 (see Note 117). The Convention annulled the Treaty of Unk iar-Skelessi (1833), which was advantageous to Russia because it opened the Black Sea Straits to Russian warships. Nevertheless, the Tsarist Government, which had taken part since 1840 in the joint military operations of the four powers (Austria, Britain, Prussia and Russia) against Mehemet Ali, who was supported by France, was compelled to adhere to the principle of neutralising the Straits advanced by the Western powers. Yielding to threats of an anti-French coalition, France abandoned Mehemet Ali and signed the Convention.  

167 Taking advantage of the Turko-Egyptian conflict of 1839 (see Note 6) and increasing tension between Britain and France, the Tsarist Government proposed to Palmerston, in September 1839, the conclusion of an agreement,
which, under the guise of joint assistance to the Sultan, would provide for a division of spheres of influence in the Middle East between the two powers. The British Government, which was striving for complete domination in Turkey, rejected the proposal on the pretext that the Eastern question should be settled by a general agreement of European powers.

The first section of this article was published under the title "Russia and the Western Powers" in The Eastern Question.

Nesselrode’s Note of July 2, 1853 and the reply of the French Foreign Minister Drouyn de Lhuy sent on July 15, 1853 (see Note 165) contained mutual accusations of the French and Russian governments of provoking a conflict. Nesselrode asserted that Britain and France had been the first to demonstrate hostility by sending their squadrons to the Straits before the Russian army entered the Danubian Principalities. Drouyn de Lhuy’s Note laid the whole responsibility for the conflict on Russia.

A reference to the conspiracy against the Sultan Abdul Mejid organised by opponents of the policy of reforms (tanzimat). The foundation of this policy was laid by Abdul Mejid’s rescript of 1839, which proclaimed the introduction of certain changes, e.g. reform of the taxation system, a guarantee of the inviolability of life and property, and some others. Despite the highly limited nature of these reforms, they were violently opposed by reactionaries grouped around the Sultan’s brother Abdul Aziz.

A reference to the proclamation issued by Gorchakov, the commander of the Russian army on the Danube, to the inhabitants of Moldavia and Wallachia in the summer of 1853 and published in The Times, No. 21477, July 11, 1853. The proclamation declared that the object of the Russian army’s entry into the Danubian Principalities was not to change the political institutions and the order guaranteed for the Principalities by former treaties.

The Zemindari and Ryotwari systems—two systems of land taxation introduced by the British colonial authorities. The Zemindari system was introduced in Bengal and then in other provinces in North-Eastern and Central India at the end of the eighteenth century. The Ryotwari system was established in the Madras Presidency (first in two districts in 1792, and then throughout the region in 1818-23) and in the Presidency of Bombay (1818-28). In both cases the colonial power was recognised as the supreme owner of the land. Under the Zemindari system the tax from the agricultural population was collected, in return for a certain share, by zemindars, hereditary tax-collectors, who formed a new stratum of feudal landowners. To help them perform this function they enlisted the services of agricultural middlemen of lower rank. Under the Ryotwari system the Indian peasants, the ryots, were directly dependent on the East India Company, to whom they paid tax. The tax was collected by company officials and its rate depended on the harvest.

Collector—the British chief official of a district in India who acted as a magistrate and collected taxes.
Mahrattas (Marathas)—a people who lived in the North-Western Deccan. In the mid-seventeenth century they began an armed struggle against the Empire of the Great Moguls, thus contributing to its decline. In the course of the struggle the Mahrattas formed an independent state of their own, whose rulers soon embarked on wars of conquest. At the close of the seventeenth century their state was weakened by internal feudal strife, but early in the eighteenth century a powerful confederation of Mahratta principalities was formed under a supreme governor, the peshwa. In 1761 they suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Afghans in the struggle for supremacy in India. Weakened by this struggle and internal feudal strife, the Mahratta principalities fell prey to the East India Company and were subjected by it as a result of the Anglo-Mahratta war of 1803-05. p. 217

See Note 172. p. 218

Jats—a caste group in Northern India which consisted mainly of peasants, but also included the military. In the seventeenth century the Jat peasants repeatedly rose in revolt against the rule of the Mogul feudals. p. 221

Brahmins—one of the four ancient Indian castes which originally consisted mainly of privileged priests; like other Indian castes, it subsequently also contained people of different trades and social standing, including impoverished peasants and artisans. p. 221

Rajah—title of the Indian princes. In the Middle Ages it was given to Hindu feudal lords and in British India to certain big landowners. p. 221

The temple of Juggernaut in Orissa (Eastern India)—the centre of worship of Vishnu-Juggernaut, one of the chief Hindu deities (see Note 105). The priests of the temple, who were under the protection of the East India Company, obtained vast sums of money from mass pilgrimages, while encouraging the temple women to engage in prostitution, and from organising sumptuous festivals which were accompanied by the suicide and self-torture of fanatic believers. p. 222

The final section of this article was published under the title “Traditional Policy of Russia” in The Eastern Question. p. 223

See Note 47. p. 223

Marx ironically compares the adherents of lowering cabmen's payment to sixpence per mile with a leading figure of the English revolution in the seventeenth century, John Hampden, who was tried in 1637 for refusal to pay the King's tax-collectors “ship money”, a tax which had not been authorised by the House of Commons. p. 224

Mons Sacer—a sacred mountain where, as the legend goes, plebeians retired in protest against patrician oppression in 494 B.C. p. 225
Jonathan Swift bequeathed all his fortune for the building of a lunatic asylum in Dublin. The asylum was opened in 1757.

On April 10, 1848, a Chartist demonstration was organised in London to present the Chartist petition to Parliament. The government banned the demonstration and troops and police were brought to London to prevent it. The Chartist leaders, many of whom vacillated, decided to call off the demonstration and persuaded the participants to disperse. This failure was used by reactionary forces to launch an offensive against the workers and repress the Chartists.

A reference to amendments to the Danish Constitution of June 5, 1849 to give more powers to the Crown, drafted in 1853. The new Constitution was promulgated on October 2, 1855.

Lex Regia—the law of Danish succession promulgated on November 14, 1665 by King Frederick III of Denmark extended to women the right of succeeding to the throne. Under the London Protocol of May 8, 1852 (see Note 58) and the new law of succession of July 31, 1853 this right was abolished. Thus, Duke Christian of Glücksburg was proclaimed successor to King Frederick VII as the latter had no heir. The new law indirectly confirmed the right of members of the Russian imperial dynasty to succeed to the Danish throne.

In his “political testament” (1633) Richelieu expounded the principles of the domestic and foreign policy of French absolutism, in an attempt to substantiate its claims for an extension of France's boundaries and French hegemony in Europe.

Capitularies—the name given from the time of Charlemagne (768-814) to the collections of ordinances of the Frankish kings of the Carolingian dynasty; some of them dealt with the administration of the conquered lands.

At the end of the eleventh century a Turkish feudal state sprang up in the east of Asia Minor as a result of its conquest by the Ogyz Turks. Its capital was the town of Iconium (Konia). The Iconian Sultanate under the ruling Seljukian dynasty waged a struggle against Byzantium and the crusaders. In the second half of the thirteenth century under the impact of the Mongolian invaders it disintegrated into independent principalities. One of them, headed by the tribal chief Osman, was situated in the north-west of Anatolia and bordered on Byzantium. It became the nucleus of the newly formed Turkish state—the Ottoman (Osman) Empire. In the fourteenth century the new state included the old possessions of the Iconian sultans and the conquered territories of the neighbouring countries. In 1453 under Mehemed II the Osman Turks captured Constantinople, the last stronghold of the Byzantine emperors, and turned it into the capital of the Ottoman Empire.
The New York Crystal Palace was built for the World Industrial Exhibition of 1853. It was opened on July 15; later it was used to house various exhibitions. It was destroyed by fire in 1856.  

This article, entitled "The Press on Eastern Affairs.—Notes of England and Russia", was published in abridged form in The Eastern Question.  

On July 24, 1853 a conference of the representative of Austria and the ambassadors of Britain, France and Prussia on mediation between Russia and Turkey was opened in Vienna. It drafted a conciliatory Note (the so-called Vienna Note) which laid down that Turkey observe the Kuchuk Kainarji and Adrianople treaties and respect the rights and privileges of the Greek Orthodox Church. The conference ruled that the Note be sent first to the Tsar and, in the event of his approval, to the Sultan.  

Nicholas I approved the Note, but Abdul Mejid made his agreement to sign it conditional on the insertion of a number of amendments and reservations, which the Tsarist Government thought unacceptable.  

Odnodvortsi—a special group of state peasants in the Russian Empire formed from the lower ranks of the servicemen (slushiliye lyudi) who had originally performed the service of guarding the outlying areas of the State of Muscovy, where they settled in separate households and were soldiers and farmers at one and the same time.  

Eidermen or Eider Danes—the Danish liberal party of the middle of the nineteenth century whose members supported the union of Schleswig (up to the River Eider) with Denmark. The party favoured the separation of Denmark and Holstein, where the population consisted mainly of Germans; it shared the Danish bourgeoisie's fear of the competition of Holstein's industry. Therefore the Eider Danes opposed any Danish succession law which applied to all parts of the Kingdom of Denmark.  

A reference to a party which was founded in Denmark in 1846. It demanded the transfer of lands which peasants used as feudal tenants into their private ownership, and also the abolition of feudal obligations and the introduction of universal suffrage and other reforms in the interests of the wealthy peasants.  

This article, excluding the section "Advertise ment Duty", was published under the title “Russian Movements.—Denmark.—United States and Europe” in The Eastern Question.
A reference to the law excluding succession by the female line, which existed in a number of West-European monarchies. This was based on Salic law (Lex Salica), the law of the Salian Franks, which dated back to the sixth century. Chapter LIX of the Lex Salica allowed succession by the male line only.

The Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 ended the European Thirty Years' War (1618-48) in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes fought the Protestant countries of Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and a number of German Protestant states. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Habsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. The treaty as a whole sealed the victory of the anti-Habsburg coalition, promoted the establishment of France's hegemony in Europe and added to the political disunity of Germany. Under the terms of the Treaty of Westphalia the Swiss Confederation was recognised as an independent state.

The first section of the article was published under the title "To Withdraw or Not to Withdraw" in The Eastern Question.

An ironical allusion by Marx to the methods used by Louis Bonaparte and his entourage in preparing the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, when they were trying to win the support of officers and soldiers. During the receptions and after the military parades organised by Louis Bonaparte, then President of the Republic, officers and men were usually treated to sausage-meat, cold fowl, champagne, etc.

Marx is summing up his comments (see pp. 209, 228, 234-35 and 240) on the attempts of the Western powers at mediation in the Turkish conflict at the conference of diplomats in Vienna in the last decade of July 1853 and on its conciliatory Note (see Note 195). However, it is highly probable that this refers to an article mailed to the New-York Daily Tribune between August 5 and 12, 1853, which was either lost on the way to New York or was not published due to reasons unknown.

The Encumbered Estates Act was adopted by the Irish Parliament in 1849 and was later supplemented by the Acts of 1852-53 and others. This Act provided for the sale of mortgaged estates by auction if their owners were proved to be insolvent. It resulted in the lands of ruined landlords passing into the hands of usurers, middlemen and rich tenants.
By a tradition dating back to the Middle Ages the members of the House of Lords are obliged to swear a solemn oath (the oath of allegiance) to the Crown. At the same time the medieval Magna Carta Libertatum (1215) gave English feudal lords the right to revolt against the throne in cases of infringement of their feudal privileges.  

A reference to Britain's support of the Portuguese branch of the Coburg dynasty during the popular uprising of 1846-47. The uprising was brutally suppressed.

This article was published under the same title in *The Eastern Question.*

A reference to Nesselrode's circular letters of June 11 and July 2, 1853 (see Notes 136 and 165).

In 1852 a conflict arose between Turkey and Montenegro, which demanded complete independence of the Sultan, whose vassal it remained nominally. The Porte rejected Russia's mediation on this issue, and at the beginning of 1853 the Turkish army under the command of Omer Pasha invaded Montenegro. The Austrian Government feared that if Russia entered the war to defend the Montenegrins that would cause unrest in the Slav regions of the Habsburg Empire, so it hastily dispatched Count Leiningen on a special mission to Constantinople (Marx mentions this mission below) to demand the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Montenegro and the restoration of the status quo. The concentration of Austrian troops on the Montenegrin border compelled the Porte to accept these demands.

Together with a draft Russo-Turkish agreement which recognised the Tsar as the protector of Orthodox Christians in Turkey, Prince Menshikov proposed that the Turkish Government should sign a secret document on a defence alliance which would provide for Russian military assistance to the Sultan in the event of a third power attempting to violate the above-mentioned agreement on the privileges of the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey. The Turkish Government, supported by the British and French Ambassadors to Constantinople, rejected the draft agreement and the secret defence treaty.

A reference to the reply of the Turkish Foreign Minister Reshid Pasha of June 16, 1853 to Chancellor Nesselrode's letter of May 31, 1853 (see Note 119). In his reply Reshid Pasha rejected Nesselrode's ultimatum. At the same time he wrote that the Porte was willing to send a special mission to St. Petersburg to settle the dispute in such a way that the rights of the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey could be confirmed without damage to the Sultan's sovereignty.

In 1839 the Serbian Prince Miloš Obrenović, whose attempts to establish autocratic rule were firmly opposed by the commercial bourgeoisie, was
compelled to abdicate. However, his successor Mihailo Obrenović strove to continue his father's policy. In August 1842 the so-called defenders of the statute, who supported a moderate Constitution and bourgeois reforms, revolted against him and proclaimed Alexander Karageorgević Prince of Serbia. In effect a regime of the merchant oligarchy was established, the representatives of which (Garašanin and others) made plans for uniting the lands of the Southern Slavs under Serbia.

222 See Note 116.

223 Navigation Acts were passed in Britain to protect British shipping against foreign competition. The best known was that of 1651, directed mainly against the Dutch, who controlled most of the sea trade. It prohibited the importation of any goods not carried by British ships or the ships of the country where the goods were produced, and laid down that British coating trade and commerce with the colonies were to be carried on only by British ships. The Navigation Acts were modified in the early nineteenth century and repealed in 1849 except for a reservation regarding coating trade, which was revoked in 1854.

224 The first section of this article was published under the same title in The Eastern Question.

225 The aristocratic wing of the Polish emigration centred around Prince Adam Czartoryski who resided in the Hôtel Lambert in Paris. Polish aristocratic émigrés also lived in Britain and other countries. Polish patriots organised a national liberation uprising in the Cracow Republic which, by a decision of the Vienna Congress, was controlled jointly by Austria, Russia and Prussia—the countries who had taken part in the partitions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century. On February 22, 1846 the insurgents managed to take power, formed a National Government of the Polish Republic and issued a manifesto on the abolition of feudal obligations. The Cracow uprising was suppressed in early March 1846, and in November 1846 Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a treaty on the annexation of the free city of Cracow to the Austrian Empire. Palmerston, who became Foreign Secretary in July 1846, rejected the French proposal for a collective protest against this action and in a letter of November 23, 1846 notified the Vienna Cabinet that Britain would not defend the Cracow Republic, while hypocritically calling on Austria, Prussia and Russia to renounce their intentions with regard to Cracow.

226 See Note 48.

227 A reference to an agreement reached between the Peelites, the Whigs and the so-called Mayfair Radicals (see Note 64) who met at the private residence of Lord John Russell in Chesham Place, London, in the spring of 1852. The agreement provided for joint opposition to Derby's Tory Cabinet and also the formation of a Coalition Ministry in case of its resignation. It remained in force until December 1852 when the Aberdeen Coalition Ministry was formed. The key posts in the new Ministry were held by the Whig and Peelite leaders, while the
representatives of the Mayfair Radicals were given a number of administrative appointments.

See Note 48.

On August 23, 1853 The Morning Advertiser published a note under the heading "The Russian Agent Bakunin" signed with the initials F. M. (the author was Francis Marx, an English conservative journalist, and supporter of Urquhart); it accused Bakunin of being connected with the Tsarist Government. On the following day, August 24, the paper published a letter by Golovin (the author of the anonymous article on Bakunin in The Morning Advertiser for August 14 which prompted F. M.'s note), Herzen and the Polish refugee Worcell refuting F. M.'s note. On August 27 the latter replied with a statement in which he said that revolutions in Europe were always fomented by Tsarist agents. On August 29 Golovin and Herzen published another letter entitled "Who Is F. M.?" Herzen abstained from further polemic on the subject, which was carried on by Golovin alone.

In the letter of August 24 a "certain German newspaper" was mentioned, in which Bakunin had allegedly been first accused. The authors of the letter hinted at the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. In this connection Marx decided to send his letter to the editor of The Morning Advertiser.

From May 3 to 9, 1849 Dresden, the capital of Saxony, was the scene of an armed uprising caused by the refusal of the King of Saxony to approve the Imperial Constitution drafted by the Frankfurt National Assembly. The insurgents, among whom the workers played a prominent part in barricade fighting, gained control of a considerable section of the town and formed a provisional government headed by the radical democrat Samuel Tschirner. An active part in the uprising was played by Mikhail Bakunin, the Russian revolutionary, Stephan Born, a workers' leader, and Richard Wagner, the composer. The uprising was suppressed by Saxon and Prussian troops.

In all probability the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune omitted the part of the article concerning the Russo-Turkish conflict. In his next newspaper report of September 9, 1853, Marx refers to the passage in his article written on August 30, 1853 (i.e., this article) in which he wrote about the actual rejection of the Vienna Note; this passage is not given in the text included in the present publication. The comparatively short length of the article testifies to the fact that it was abridged. The editors may have had other material at hand on the subject (Ferenc Pulszky's article) ready for publication in the same number (September 15, 1853). It is also possible that the omitted part was used by the editors for the leader which read, in part, as follows: "The news from Europe would seem to leave the Eastern question as far from actual settlement as ever. The Czar had accepted the Vienna propositions on the express condition that the Sultan should make no modification in them, and without any stipulation as to the withdrawal of his troops from the Turkish dominions. The Porte has, however, made some modifications in these proposals, and one or two of them are sufficiently shrewd and important, as our reader may see by reference to another column. Now it remains to be seen whether the Czar will allow these changes, or will go to war. To us it is by no means certain that he will not, after sufficient time for consideration, and after the season for naval operations has fully passed, reply that he can submit to no such indignities, and that he will now proceed to take further guarantees by
annexing as much of Turkey as he may judge proper. We are no believers in a long maintenance of peace, and shall admit there has been a settlement of the Turkish question only when the papers have been signed on both sides, and the Russian army marched back to its own side of the Pruth" (*New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3873, September 15, 1853).

232 See Note 223.

233 The text of the declaration of the Seamen's United Friendly Association, which may have been quoted by Marx from a leaflet, was published later in *The People's Paper*, No. 80, November 12, 1853.

234 Marx’s statement to the editor of *The People's Paper* was written in connection with the anonymous article (by Golovin) “How to Write History”, published in *The Morning Advertiser* on September 3, 1853. This article, which attacked Marx, was a reply to Marx’s letter to the editor of *The Morning Advertiser* of August 30, 1853 (see this volume, pp. 284-86).

On August 31 *The Morning Advertiser* published Arnold Ruge's letter in which Marx and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* were openly accused of slandering Bakunin. In his reply to Golovin Marx also exposed Ruge’s false arguments. Details connected with this statement are given by Marx in his letter to Engels of September 3, 1853, in which he also includes the first draft of his reply. On September 7, 1853 Marx wrote to Engels that he had sent his reply to *The People’s Paper* because the editors of *The Morning Advertiser* had refused to publish it.

In October the editors of *The Morning Advertiser* announced that the matter was closed.

235 A reference to the Convention decrees adopted in 1793 (spring-autumn) at the height of the struggle against counter-revolutionary conspiracies and revolts. The law on suspects (*lois des suspects*), promulgated on September 17, 1793, provided for the arrest of all persons “who by their conduct or their connections, their talks or writings proved to be adherents of tyranny”.

236 This article was published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* unsigned and without a title. In selecting a title for it the editors of the present edition had regard to the entry “9. September. Kritik des Peel acts etc. Schumla Briefe” in Marx’s notebook.

The first two sections of this article were published under the title “The Vienna Note” in *The Eastern Question*.

237 This part of the article mentioned was omitted by the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* (see Note 231).

238 The Bank Act of 1844 passed by Peel’s government established the maximum quantity of bank-notes in circulation guaranteed by definite reserve funds of gold and silver. The additional issue of bank-notes was allowed only if precious metal reserves were increased proportionally. The Act was violated several times by the government itself, in particular, during the monetary crises of 1847 and 1857. Besides this article, Marx gave an analysis of the meaning and significance of the

See Note 165.  

A reference to the closure of the Capuchin monastery in Locarno in the autumn of 1852 and the expulsion of 22 Italian-born Capuchins from Ticino to Lombardy. The actions of the Swiss authorities against the Capuchin Order, which enjoyed Austrian protection, aggravated Austro-Swiss relations, which were further strained by the fact that participants in the Italian national liberation movement resided on Swiss territory.  

See Note 19.  


The first section of this article concerning the Russo-Turkish conflict was published under the title “The Vienna Note (continued)” in The Eastern Question.  

A reference to the London Convention of July 15, 1840 signed by Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia on support to the Turkish Sultan against the Egyptian ruler Mehemet Ali, and also to the London Convention of 1841 (see Note 117) and the Balta-Liman Convention of 1849 (see Note 116). France, which supported Mehemet Ali, did not sign the first Convention, but the threat of an anti-French coalition made it deny its support to the Egyptian ruler and take part in the drawing up of the London Convention of 1841. Besides the clauses on armed intervention in the Turko-Egyptian conflict and an ultimatum to Mehemet Ali to give up all his possessions except Egypt to the Sultan, the 1840 Convention had a clause on the joint protection of the Straits, which served as a prerequisite for the stipulation in the 1841 Convention that the Straits should be closed to men-of-war of all states.  

In response to Marx's request Engels sent him material on the economic situation in Lancashire and other industrial regions of England which Marx used in this and the following article. Marx wrote about it in his letter to Engels of September 28, 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 39).  

The first section of this article was published under the title “The English Ministry Outwitted.—Panic” in The Eastern Question.  

The ulema (ulama)—a body of the theologians and legalists of Islam; it provided teachers for the mosques and schools, supervised law and the courts and had a great influence on the political life of the Turkish Empire.  

A reference to a strike of engineering workers that started in late December 1851 and involved several towns in South-East and Central England. The strike was organised by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers with the aim of abolishing overtime and improving working conditions. The employers responded with a
lockout. After three months' struggle the workers lost and were compelled to resume work on former terms. The employers suffered considerable material losses, however, as a result of the strike and lockout. 

248 On the use of Engels' material in this article see Note 245.

In selecting a title for the article the editors of the present edition made use of the entry in Marx's notebook: "Dienstag. 27. September. Turkey. Strikes. Manchester Geschichte." An abridged translation into German was published in Die Reform under the title "Der Stand der Arbeiterbewegung in England".

An excerpt from the first section of the article together with the beginning of the following article: "The Russians in Turkey", was published under the title "The English Ministry Outwitted.—Panic" in The Eastern Question. p. 329

249 In the latter period Marx and Engels substituted the more precise terms "value of labour power" and "price of labour power" for "value of labour" and "price of labour" as Marx concluded that the worker sells the capitalist his labour power and not his labour (see F. Engels, Introduction to a separate edition of Marx's "Wage Labour and Capital" of 1891, present edition, Vol. 28). p. 333

250 This article was the first in a series in the New-York Daily Tribune on the preparation and course of the Crimean war. (Turkey declared war on Russia at the beginning of October 1853.) The articles were written by Engels, who gave a systematic account of the campaign drawing on available information, mostly from the West-European press. Many articles were published unsigned by the newspaper editors, as leaders.

The beginning of this article was combined with part of the first section of the article "Panic on the London Stock Exchange.—Strikes" and published under the title "The English Ministry Outwitted.—Panic" in The Eastern Question. p. 335

251 A reference to the leader "Russian Designs in Turkey" published in the New-York Daily Tribune on September 17, 1853. The reference would appear to have been inserted by the newspaper editors. p. 336

252 A reference to the Turkish military expedition under Omer Pasha to Kurdistan in 1846 to suppress an uprising against the Sultan. On the expedition of Omer Pasha to Montenegro see Note 217. p. 336

253 See Note 8. p. 338

254 Alexander Suvorov took part in the siege of Ochakov but not in the storming of it on December 17, 1788 due to a wound received during the siege and also to disagreement with the commander-in-chief of the Russian army, Prince Potemkin, as to the conduct of the siege. On December 22, 1790 the Russian army commanded by Suvorov took the Turkish fortress of Izmail by storm and this contributed greatly to the victory of the Russians in the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91. p. 339

255 The capture of Warsaw by Russian troops on September 8, 1831 was one of the
The pamphlet *Lord Palmerston* was planned by Marx as a series of articles for the *New-York Daily Tribune*. When he started working on it in early October 1853 Marx gave his consent to its simultaneous publication in the Chartist *People's Paper*. However, whereas the Chartist paper started publishing Marx's articles as a series entitled "Lord Palmerston" and prefaced each article with the editorial note: "Written for the *New-York Tribune* by Dr. Marx, and communicated by him to us", the editors of the *Tribune* published the first article as a leader without mentioning the author's name. This determined the subsequent publication of the work as articles outwardly not connected with each other. Eight articles appeared in *The People's Paper* between October 22 and December 24, 1853, and the last, like the preceding ones, ended with the words: "To be continued". As can be seen from Marx's letter to Engels of December 14, 1853, Marx intended to write additional articles on Palmerston's policy in 1840-41, when the London Conventions were concluded, and also to analyse Palmerston's stand during the 1848-49 revolutions. However, these plans were not realised.

The *New-York Daily Tribune* did not publish all of Marx's articles and its final publication was at the beginning of 1854, although Marx dispatched the last article to New York as early as December 6, 1853. In all, the newspaper published four articles as leaders and under different titles. On October 19, 1853, the *Tribune* published the leader "Palmerston" which corresponded to the first and second articles published in *The People's Paper*; on November 4, 1853, the leader "Palmerston and Russia" corresponding to the third article of the series; on November 21, 1853, the leader "A Chapter of Modern History" corresponding to the fourth and fifth articles; and on January 11, 1854, the leader "England and Russia" corresponding to the seventh article. The first three leaders were also reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune* on October 22, November 12 and December 3, 1853. The sixth and eighth articles of the series were never published by the *Tribune* and in its special issues. The texts of the articles in *The People's Paper* and the *New-York Daily Tribune* are not identical. When Marx sent his articles to the *Tribune* and *The People's Paper* he evidently modified them in accordance with the different form of publication in these newspapers. There are also signs that the *Tribune* editors altered Marx's text.

The pamphlet against Palmerston was widely circulated. On November 26, 1853, the *Glasgow Sentinel* reprinted from the *Tribune* the article "Palmerston and Russia" (the third of the *People's Paper* series). In December 1853 the London publisher Tucker published this article under the same title in pamphlet form. (Marx mentions this edition in his article "Palmerston's Resignation", see this volume, p. 546). At the beginning of February 1854 a second edition of this pamphlet was put out with Marx's participation: Marx made some amendments and additions on the basis of the *People's Paper* publication.

Shortly afterwards Tucker published another pamphlet, *Palmerston and the Treaty of Unkias Skeylessi* (the title-page bearing the title: "Palmerston, What Has He Done?"); with slight amendments the pamphlet reproduced the text of the fourth (excluding the first four paragraphs) and the fifth articles of the *People's Paper*
series. Both pamphlets were included as Nos. 1 and 2 in the *Political Fly-Sheets* series published by Tucker, and in the first half of 1855 they were again reprinted together with pamphlets by other authors. Tucker mentioned Marx's name in the preface to that edition as the author of pamphlets Nos. 1 and 2 (in the table of contents pamphlet No. 1 was entitled differently: "Palmerston and Poland"). Marx himself prevented the rest of his articles from being published in Tucker's edition because Urquhart's articles had also been published in the *Political Fly-Sheets* series. On this score Marx wrote to Lassalle on June 1, 1854: "I have no desire to be numbered among the associates of this gentleman; the estimation of Palmerston is the only point we have in common. In the rest I have a diametrically opposite point of view. This became evident during our first meeting."

On November 17, 1855 and January 5, 1856, the Urquhart *Sheffield Free Press*, which was in opposition to Palmerston, published two of Marx's articles (the third and the sixth from the *People's Paper* publication). The first of them was also reprinted as No. 4a of *The Free Press Serials* published in Sheffield. Almost simultaneously all eight articles of the series appeared in the five issues (Nos. 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19 of December 29, 1855, January 5 and 12 and February 9 and 16, 1856) of the London Urquhart *Free Press* and were published as No. 5 of *The Free Press Serials* entitled "The Story of the Life of Lord Palmerston". The author's name was mentioned in the editorial introduction to this edition.

An abridged translation of the *Tribune* text into German by Adolph Cluss was printed in New York in *Die Reform* as early as November 2, 1853. The publishers' note to it stated the following: "The great interest aroused by Palmerston's name at the present time has induced us to print this rendering from the *Tribune*. The essay reveals a more than average knowledge of British affairs by the author, and though it bears no signature it is easy to tell who the author is." The article "Palmerston", published in instalments in *Die Reform* on November 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9, corresponds to the first and second articles in the *People's Paper* series. In February 1855 Marx published two articles entitled "Lord Palmerston" in the Breslau (Wroclaw) *Neue Oder-Zeitung* which were in the main a summary of the *People's Paper* and the *Tribune* publications. Excerpts from Marx's pamphlet (his name was mentioned in the editors' note) were published in Berlin in 1859-60 by the German journalist E. Fischel in *Das Neue Portfolio. Eine Sammlung wichtiger Dokumente und Aktenstücke zur Zeitgeschichte*, Hefte 1-2, under the title "Der 'wahrhaft' englische Minister und Russland am Bosporus. Lord Palmerston und die polnische Insurrection 1831".

In 1893, after Marx's death, the third article of the series appeared in Polish in the seventh issue of the journal *Przedświt*, published in London by Polish socialists connected with Engels. The seventh article was reprinted from the *Tribune* under the same title, "England and Russia", in the collection: Karl Marx, *The Eastern Question*, London, 1897. In 1899 a separate edition of all the articles of the series: Karl Marx, *The Story of the Life of Lord Palmerston*, was published in London. It was prepared by Eleanor Marx and reproduced the London *Free Press* series.

In his work on the pamphlet Marx used a great deal of material, in particular, the Blue Books, periodical publications of British parliamentary and Foreign Office documents. In addition he drew on parliamentary reports, various collections of international treaties and diplomatic documents, satirical pamphlets and the press. Several notebooks with excerpts made by Marx from various books are extant. These books include: *The Russians in Moldavia and Wallachia*, London, 1849; Heinrich Brandt, *Russlands Politik und Heer in den letzten Jahren*, Berlin, 1852; *The Greek and Eastern Churches. Their History, Faith, and Worship*, London, 1852; J. M. Neale, *Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church*, London,
In the course of the parliamentary debates in June 1850 on the Anglo-Greek conflict connected with the Pacifico incident (see Note 148) the government's foreign policy was approved by the House of Commons; the House of Lords, however, rejected by a majority of 37 the stand taken by the Foreign Secretary Palmerston on this issue. France and Russia also disapproved of this stand; as a sign of protest the French Ambassador left London and the Russian Ambassador refused Palmerston's invitation to dinner.

Carbonari—members of bourgeois and aristocratic revolutionary secret societies which appeared in Italy in the early nineteenth century. They fought for national independence and unification of Italy and at the same time demanded liberal-constitutional reforms. The Carbonari played an important role in the revolutionary developments in the kingdoms of Naples and Sardinia early in the 1820s and also during the revolutionary struggle in Italy against Austrian rule and local feudal monarchies in the 1830s.

In 1815 a law was passed prohibiting grain imports when grain prices in England fell below 80 shillings per quarter. In 1822 the law was modified slightly and in 1828 a sliding scale was introduced—a system of raising or lowering tariffs in proportion to the fall or rise of grain prices on the home market. The Corn Laws were introduced by Tory cabinets in the interests of the big landowners. The industrial bourgeoisie who opposed the Corn Laws under the slogan of free trade secured their repeal in 1846.

Marx has in mind the presence of foreign mercenaries in Britain, who were recruited by the British army during the Napoleonic wars mostly from small German states, in particular Hanover, the ancestral land of the British kings of the Hanover dynasty.

A reference to the bombardment of Copenhagen by the British in September 1807 with the aim of preventing Denmark from joining the continental blockade inaugurated by Napoleon, which forbade the countries of the Continent to trade with Britain.

A Mutiny Act was passed annually by Parliament from 1689 to 1881. By this Act the Crown was invested with the authority to have a standing army and navy of
a certain strength, to introduce rules and regulations in the army and navy, to
court-martial and establish a system of punishment for mutiny, disobedience of
orders, breach of discipline, etc.  

263 Under the *Corporation Act* passed by the British Parliament in 1661 persons
who held elected posts (this applied mainly to municipal administration) were
required to accept the dogmas of the Church of England.

The *Test Act* of 1673 required the same of all persons holding government
posts.

264 *Dissenters*—members of Protestant sects and trends which departed from the
dogmas of the official Church of England; in a broader sense those who
disagree with any opinion.

265 *Catholic Emancipation*—the abolition by the British Parliament in 1829 as a
result of the mass movement in Ireland of restrictions on the political rights of
Catholics. Catholics were granted the right to stand for election to Parliament
and to hold certain government offices. Simultaneously, the property qualifica-
tion was raised fivefold. The British ruling classes hoped that this manoeuvre
would bring the élite of the Irish bourgeoisie and Catholic landowners to their
side and cause a split in the Irish national movement.

266 *Absentees*—landlords who owned estates in Ireland but lived permanently in
England. Their estates were managed by realty agents who robbed the Irish
peasants, or were leased to speculator-middlemen, who subleased small plots to
the peasants.

267 A reference to the broad campaign for a Reform Bill (see Note 123) which
started some years before the Bill was passed in 1832.

268 See Note 5.

269 See Note 27.

270 A reference to the London Convention of July 6, 1827 (see Note 38).

271 The *Treaty of Turkmanchai*, which ended the Russo-Persian war of 1826-28, was
signed on February 22, 1828. Under this treaty Russia received the territories
of the Yerevan and Nakhichevan khanates (Eastern Armenia), and Russia's
exclusive right to have a navy in the Caspian Sea was confirmed. Persia was to
pay war indemnities of 20 million rubles. At the same time the treaty marked a
turning point in the destiny of the Armenian people who were suffering from
Persian and Turkish despotism. The Persian Government was required to let
Armenians leave the country freely and soon more than 40,000 people moved
to the Armenian region which was joined to Russia, and to other Russian
Transcaucasian territories. Turkish Armenians also moved to the region.
One of the points at issue in the conflict over the “Holy Places” (see Note 90) which France and Russia used as a pretext in the struggle for hegemony in the Middle East, was the question of whether the Catholic or Orthodox Church should have the keys to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the right to take care of its dome. p. 356

The Treaty of Akkerman was signed by Russia and Turkey on October 7, 1826. Under this treaty the Turkish Government was to observe the former treaties signed with Russia, the Russian merchant fleet obtained the right to sail in Turkish waters and Russian merchants to trade throughout the whole of Turkey. The treaty confirmed the recognition of Serbian autonomy by the Sultan and provided for the election of Hospodars in Moldavia and Wallachia from the local Boyards. The Akkerman Treaty did not touch upon the Greek question. In this connection on the eve of the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 Turkish official circles violated the treaty and asserted that by it Russia had pledged non-interference in Greek affairs and broken this pledge by her assistance to the Greeks. However, in fact the Tsarist Government’s declaration of its “disinterestedness in Greek affairs” was made several months before it signed the treaty. p. 356

See Note 35. p. 357

In the New-York Daily Tribune of October 19, 1853 this article was concluded with the following words, evidently added by the editors: “This was a plain way of saying he was not the representative of liberty, or honesty, or what makes the best character of England. Such as the noble lord was then, and in the earlier part of his career which we have reviewed, he is at this, and none who know him can expect at his hands any but false service to the cause of justice and human rights in the present momentous crisis. What remains of his public history we leave for another day; we are sorry to say that is not the better half.” p. 358

The refusal of the Milanese to pay homage to Frederick I Barbarossa took place in 1159 and was prompted by Frederick’s attempts to abolish the free towns in Northern Italy and subjugate them to his rule. The prolonged struggle that ensued culminated in the victory of the towns although the city of Milan was destroyed in 1162. p. 359

A reference to the London Convention of July 15, 1840 (see Note 244). p. 365

For the Cracow insurrection see Note 225; for the developments in Galicia mentioned below see Note 11. p. 366

In 1846 the Guizot Government managed to arrange the marriage of the Spanish infanta Maria Luisa Fernanda to Louis Philippe’s youngest son, the Duke of Montpensier, and thwart Britain’s plans to marry Leopold of Coburg to Isabella II of Spain. The tension between the British and French
governments became very acute and after the failure of British diplomacy Palmerston sought a pretext to take revenge. 

The Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 was one of a series of peace treaties concluding the war of the Spanish succession which began in 1701 between France and Spain, on the one hand, and the countries of the anti-French coalition—Britain, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Savoy and Habsburg Austria—on the other; Austria did not sign the treaty and made peace with France at Rastatt in 1714. Under the terms of the treaty, Philip V, the Bourbon King of Spain and Louis XIV's grandson, kept Spain. The King of France was to renounce his right and that of his successors from the Bourbon dynasty to the Spanish Crown. Several French and Spanish possessions in the West Indies and North America, as well as Gibraltar, were obtained by Britain.

When he accused France in 1846 of violating the Treaty of Utrecht, Palmerston had in mind Louis Philippe's plans to unite the two monarchies through the marriage of his youngest son and the Spanish infanta.

Under the pretext of protecting French subjects in Mexico a French squadron started to blockade the Mexican ports on April 16, 1838; after the bombardment, the port of Vera Cruz was occupied on November 27-28. On March 9, 1839 Mexico was compelled to sign a treaty and an agreement with France.

The blockade of Buenos Aires and the littoral territory by the Anglo-French fleet (1845-50) was aimed at making the Argentine Government open the Paraná and Uruguay to foreign ships (they had been closed since 1841 as a result of the war between Argentina and Uruguay) and recognise Uruguay's independence. In 1850-51 these demands were accepted.

The relations established between Britain and France after the July revolution of 1830 and known in history as the entente cordiale were not confirmed by treaty until April 1834, when the so-called Quadruple Alliance was concluded between Britain, France, Spain and Portugal. But when this treaty was being concluded disagreements between Britain and France became apparent and they subsequently led to the aggravation of relations between the two countries. Formally directed against the absolutist "northern states" (Russia, Austria and Prussia), the treaty in fact allowed Britain to strengthen her position in Spain and Portugal under the pretext of rendering armed assistance to both governments in their struggle against pretenders to the throne (Don Carlos in Spain and Dom Miguel in Portugal).

A reference to the battle of Beilan (Syria) which took place at the end of July 1832. Egyptian troops commanded by Ibrahim Pasha defeated the Sultan's army and drove it out of Syria. The subsequent entry of Egyptian troops into Asia Minor and the defeat of the Turkish army in December 1832 at Konia (the battle is mentioned several times above) led to the victory of Egypt in the Turko-Egyptian war of 1831-33. In April 1833 under a treaty signed at Kutaiah the Egyptian Pasha Mehemet Ali was recognised as independent ruler of Egypt and Syria.
The Organic Statute of the Kingdom of Poland of 1832 was introduced by the Tsarist Government after the suppression of the Polish national liberation insurrection of 1830-31. The statute abolished the remnants of national autonomy of the Polish lands which were under Tsarist Russia's rule. It also abolished the 1815 Constitution, the Polish Diet and the Polish army; the Russian system of administration was extended to the kingdom.

A reference to the Russo-Turkish Treaty of January 29, 1834 which amended certain articles of the 1829 Treaty of Adrianople. The annual payments of indemnities by Turkey under the Adrianople Treaty were curtailed, the total sum of indemnities being reduced by two million ducats.

In the New-York Daily Tribune of January 11, 1854 the article began as follows: "Lord Palmerston's resignation seems to be working in England all the marvels he could have hoped from it. While the public indignation is becoming more and more active against the Cabinet he has abandoned, and whose policy he had on all occasions, up to the last moment of his connection with them, emphatically endorsed, the very parties loudest in their denunciations of the Coalition, vie with each other in the praise of Palmerston. And while they call for energetic and honorable resistance to the encroachments of Russia, on the one hand, they seem to desire nothing so much as the restoration of their favorite statesman to high office on the other. Thus this accomplished and relentless actor deludes the world. It would be an amusing spectacle were the interests involved less momentous. How deep is the delusion we have already had occasion to show, and now add below a new demonstration of the truth that, for some reason or other, Lord Palmerston has steadily labored for the advancement of Russia, and has used England for that purpose. Those who seek to look behind the scenes of current history and to judge events and men at their real value will, we think, find our exposure instructive."

These words could not be by Marx, as the last articles of the series "Lord Palmerston" were sent by him to the New-York Daily Tribune not later than December 6, 1853, not less than ten days prior to Palmerston's resignation (December 16, 1853). The editors of the Tribune delayed publication of this article until January 11, 1854, and the passage which they inserted in it may have been borrowed from another article by Marx, which he sent later (Marx's notebook gives the date December 20, 1853), on English press comments on Palmerston's resignation. The article of December 20, 1853 has not been discovered in the New-York Daily Tribune and the manuscript is not extant.

Britain and Russia, who signed the Protocol, tried to conceal the real aims of their intervention in the Greco-Turkish conflict on the side of Greece and declared that they had no intention of expanding their territory at Turkey's expense, or of seeking exceptional influence or special commercial privileges in the Sultan's possessions. Similar declarations were made when Britain, Russia and France signed the London Convention of July 6, 1827.
This article has not been discovered in the *New-York Daily Tribune* although, according to Marx's notebook, it was posted by Marx to New York on December 6, 1853. *The People's Paper* published it on December 24, 1853 as the eighth in the "Lord Palmerston" series.

Marx is alluding to the so-called Potemkin villages—an expression which symbolises sham prosperity. It was said that the Empress Catherine II's favourite, Prince Potemkin, who was Governor-General of the southern provinces of Russia, built sham villages on Catherine's route to the south in 1787 to convince her that the territory entrusted to him was flourishing.

Lloyd's—a company founded in London in the seventeenth century specialising in marine insurance and shipping information.

A reference to the war of the mountain-dwellers of the Northern Caucasus against Tsarist Russia which began at the end of the 1820s. It was caused by the Tsarist colonisation policy and the oppressive rule of local feudal lords who were supported by the Tsarist Government. This movement was led mainly by the adherents of Muridism—a fanatical and militant trend in Islam. Using the support of the Moslem clergy and the discontent of the mountain-dwellers they were able to muster considerable forces and to set up a religious-military state headed by Shamyl in Dagestan and Chechnya in the 1830s. The war waged by Tsarist troops against Shamyl, who had captured the mountain fortresses, was very arduous and continued for decades. The Russian troops won decisive victories over Shamyl's forces after the end of the Crimean war; in 1859 Gunib, the last stronghold of the mountain-dwellers, fell. Shamyl's defeat was also due to the fact that the peasants oppressed by the local nobility which consisted of the upper stratum of Murids, deserted the movement.

On November 3, 1853 the *New-York Daily Tribune* (No. 3915) published a comment from Buffalo on this article. It was written in the form of a letter to the editors, entitled "Workmen's Strike in England" and signed "An Old English Factory Clerk". The writer of the letter stressed, in particular, that "every word of 'Karl Marx's' letter of the 7th inst., is true, touching the intentions of bad men, to provoke the operatives to overt acts". In their note the editors argued the importance of strikes in the struggle for the workers' economic interests, advising the latter to fight for protectionist tariffs, and concluded with "but let every one act as to him shall seem advisable".

The article, entitled "Die Lage England", was published in an abridged form in the New York newspaper *Die Reform*.

The first section of this article was published under the title "The War Question" in *The Eastern Question*.

A reference to Reshid Pasha's Note of August 19, 1853 to the representatives of Britain, France and Prussia, which stated that the Turkish Government would accept the Vienna Note (see Note 195) only if certain amendments and reservations were made in it, and if the Russian troops withdrew from the Danubian Principalities.
In September 1853 a meeting between Nicholas I and the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph took place in Olmütz as a result of which the Austrian Government made an unsuccessful attempt to encourage the Western powers to take a new step towards settling the Russo-Turkish conflict on the basis of unconditional acceptance of the Vienna Note by the Sultan. During the talks Nicholas I sought to convince Francis Joseph that the operations of Russian troops in the Danubian Principalities would be limited to defence of the left bank of the Danube.

A reference to an anonymous political pamphlet published in France in 1594. It was written by supporters of religious peace closely associated with King Henry IV (Jacques Gillot, Florent Chrestien, P. Le Roy and others). The pamphlet was directed against the Catholic League (which was founded in 1576 during the Huguenot wars and operated with intervals up to 1596), whose aristocratic leaders strove to reduce the power of the monarchy and gain unrestricted privileges for the Catholic feudal nobility. The title of the pamphlet was borrowed from the Roman author Varro (1st century B.C.) who wrote his Menippean Satires in imitation of the Greek philosopher Menippus.

A description follows of the initial stages of the major social clash between workers and employers which is known in the history of the working-class movement as the Preston strike. The weavers and spinners of the textile mills in and around Preston went on strike in August 1853 demanding a ten per cent wage rise; they were supported by workers of other trades. In September of the same year the Manufacturers' Association responded with a lockout. Twenty-five thousand workers out of thirty thousand were without work. The lockout lasted until February 1854, but the strike continued after that date. To break the strike the Manufacturers' Association started bringing workers to Preston from Ireland and English workhouses. In March 1854 the leaders of the strike were arrested, and as funds were low the workers were compelled to return to work. The strike ended in May.

In his reports to the New-York Daily Tribune Marx wrote about different episodes of the strike; at the end of March 1854 he devoted a whole article to this event, “British Finances.—The Troubles at Preston” (see present edition, Vol. 13).

A reference to the heroic uprising of the Paris workers in June 1848. The uprising was the first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in history.

The first section of this article was published under the title “The Turkish Manifesto” in The Eastern Question.

Crank—a revolving disc which criminals sentenced to hard labour are required to turn a certain number of times each day.

A section of this article was published under the title “The Northern Powers” in The Eastern Question.

The so-called trial of Risquons-Tout which was held from August 9 to 30, 1848 in Antwerp was rigged by the government of the Belgian King Leopold against the
democrats. The pretext for it was a clash which took place not far from the French border near the village of Risquons-Tout on March 29, 1848, between a Belgian republican legion which was on its way home from France and a detachment of soldiers. The principal among the accused (Mellinet, Ballin, Tedesco) were sentenced to death, later commuted to thirty years imprisonment; subsequently they were pardoned.

Delescluze was at that time government commissioner of the Département du Nord, bordering on Belgium, through which the Belgian legion passed. p. 421

Among the entries in Marx's notebook made on October 19, 1853 there is a passage in German from the draft Constitution of Schleswig and in French from an article on the draft Constitution of Denmark published in *L'Indépendance*. p. 421

A reference to the fortified lines near the town of Torres Vedras (Portugal) built in 1810 on Wellington's orders to protect Lisbon from the French troops. p. 426

During the 1815 campaign in Belgium Napoleon hoped by defeating the Prussians at Ligny on June 16 to isolate them from Wellington's Anglo-Dutch army and rout the allied armies separately. However, when the French attacked Wellington's army and tried to outflank it at Waterloo on June 18, 1815, Prussian troops commanded by Blücher, who had evaded pursuit, joined in the battle and decided the outcome in favour of the allies. p. 427

This article was published under the same title in *The Eastern Question*. p. 430

The beginning of this article was published under the title "War" in *The Eastern Question*. p. 435

On October 23, 1853, during the transfer of part of the Russian Danubian fleet from Izmail to the region of Bräila and Galatz, Russian ships and gunboats passing the fort of Isakchea exchanged artillery fire with the Turkish garrison there. The garrison suffered heavy losses as a result. p. 435

A reference to the Committee at rue de Poitiers—the leading body of the so-called Party of Order which was a coalition of two monarchist factions in France: the Legitimists (supporters of the Bourbon dynasty) and the Orleanists (those of the Orleans dynasty). This party of the wealthy conservative bourgeoisie, formed in 1848, held key posts in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic from 1849 until the coup d'état of December 2, 1851. The failure of its policy was used by supporters of Louis Bonaparte in the Bonapartist interests. General Baraguay d'Hilliers, who supported the Committee during the Republic, sided with the Bonapartists on the eve of the coup. p. 435

In October 1853 a strike began in Wigan in which several thousand factory workers and miners took part. The employers responded with a lockout. At their meeting on October 28 the mine and factory owners decided to resume work on October 31 using as strikebreakers workers they had brought from Wales. On learning of this a thousand-strong crowd of strikers stoned the premises of the
meeting, the Chamber of Commerce and the houses of some employers. The workers were dispersed by troops summoned for the purpose. On October 31, the day when the mines were opened, disturbances broke out again in Wigan, with clashes between strikers and strikebreakers. The military opened fire, and some strikers were killed. p. 436

311 In August 1842, at a time of economic crisis and growing poverty, workers' strikes and disturbances started in several industrial regions of England. In Lancashire, large areas of Cheshire, Yorkshire and other counties the strikes grew into spontaneous uprisings. The government responded with mass reprisals and severe court sentences for the Chartist leaders. The bourgeoisie who shared the Free Traders' views tried to use the workers' movement to bring pressure to bear on the government to repeal the Corn Laws. In many instances they incited the workers to action. However, the bourgeoisie became alarmed at the scope of the strikes and disturbances and, convinced that the workers were pursuing their own ends, supported the brutal reprisals against them. For details see Engels' work *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* and his article “History of the English Corn Laws” (present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 520-23 and 656-61). p. 436

312 A reference to the speeches by Bright and Cobden at the conference in Edinburgh organised by the Peace Society (see Note 147). p. 437

313 The part of the article published in *Die Reform* was entitled “Persien, Russland und Dänemark (Tribune-Korrespondenz von Karl Marx)”. The text of the first two sections was published under the title “Persia.—Denmark” in *The Eastern Question*. p. 444

314 Persian ruling circles made several attempts to annex Herat, a trade-route junction. Afghanistan and Persia fought incessant wars for possession of the town. The capture of Herat by Persian troops in October 1856 was used by Britain to unleash war against Persia, as a result of which the Shah had to evacuate Herat. In 1863 Herat was annexed by the Afghan Emir.

In 1853 the Tsarist Government organised a military expedition to Kazakhstan up the Syr Darya. It was led by the Orenburg Governor-General V. A. Perovsky (his unsuccessful Khivan expedition of 1839-40 is mentioned below). The expedition was sent against the Kokand Khanate which had captured Kazakh lands (Marx's article mistakenly gives "Khiva"). This led to the setting up of the Syr Darya military line by the Russians, which served as a bridgehead for a subsequent offensive against the Kokand, Bukhara and Khiva khanates. p. 444

315 See Note 187. p. 444

316 See Note 198. p. 445

317 A reference to the Danish Government formed on March 22, 1848 as a result of the revolutionary upsurge in the country which found expression in mass demonstrations in the Copenhagen theatre Casino. As well as conservatives, the new government included representatives of the liberal party of Eidermen (or Eider Danes) (see Note 197). The Government took a chauvinist stand on the
national liberation movement in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein and fought against the unification of these German regions with Germany. On the war for Schleswig-Holstein in 1848-50 see Note 86.

p. 445

318 The Anti-Corn Law League was founded in 1838 by the Manchester factory owners Richard Cobden and John Bright. The League demanded unrestricted free trade and fought for abolition of the Corn Laws, which placed high tariffs on imported agricultural produce. In this way, the League sought to weaken the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy, as well as to cut workers' wages.

The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws culminated in their repeal in 1846 (see Note 259).

p. 448

319 In the battle of Jena on October 14, 1806 the Prussian troops were defeated by Napoleon's army. This resulted in Prussia's capitulation.

p. 452

320 On September 25-26, 1799 the French Army commanded by Masséna defeated the Russian corps under General Rimsky-Korsakov at Zurich. This defeat put the Russian troops commanded by Suvorov which were marching from Northern Italy to join Rimsky-Korsakov's corps in a very difficult position. However, despite the considerable numerical superiority of the enemy troops, Suvorov's army succeeded in dealing them several blows and reached the Upper Rhine region. In his work "Po and Rhine" written in 1859 Engels calls Suvorov's march over the Alps during this campaign "the most remarkable of all the Alpine crossings" (see this edition, Vol. 16).

p. 455

321 This article by Engels, as can be seen from the entry in Marx's notebook, was dispatched to the New-York Daily Tribune together with Marx's article "The Labor Question" (see this volume, pp. 460-63) as a single report. However, the newspaper editors divided it in two parts and published Engels' text as a leader and the text written by Marx as a separate article under his signature in the issue of November 28.

From Engels' article it is evident that he had at his disposal inaccurate information on the balance of forces on the Danube during the battles of Kalafat and Oltenitz and some other facts; the Russian troops at Oltenitz were commanded by Dannenberg, not Pavlov; General Guyon and Ismail Pasha are two different people and not the same person as is stated in the article. Later when he obtained more reliable information Engels reassessed the balance of forces and also the qualities of the Turkish military command and the results of the battles of Kalafat and Oltenitz (see this volume, pp. 471-76 and 516-22).

p. 457

322 On March 23, 1849 the Austrian army commanded by Radetzky inflicted a decisive defeat upon the Piedmontese army at Novara, which led to the restoration of Austrian rule in Northern Italy. In the course of the campaign the Austrian commander-in-chief made use of the dispersal of Piedmontese forces under the command of General Ramorino.

p. 459
684

Notes

323 See Note 321.

The fact that Marx used the material published in *The People's Paper* for November 12, 1853 in his article datelined November 11, 1853 shows that either this issue of the newspaper appeared earlier than the date which it bears or, which is more likely, Marx had access to this and other material in advance. p. 460

324 *Comité du Salut Public* (The Committee of Public Safety)—the central body of the revolutionary government in France during the Jacobin dictatorship (June 2, 1793- July 27, 1794). p. 468

325 In connection with an upsurge in the strike movement in 1853 a group of Chartist leaders headed by Ernest Jones proposed the setting up of a broad workers' organisation "The Mass Movement" which was to unite trade unionists and unorganised workers with the primary aim of co-ordinating strikes in various parts of the country. The organisation was to be headed by a regularly convened Labour Parliament consisting of delegates elected at meetings of unorganised workers and at trade union meetings. The Labour Parliament assembled in Manchester on March 6, 1854 and was in session until March 18. It discussed and adopted the programme of the Mass Movement and set up an Executive of five members. Marx, who was elected an honorary delegate to the Parliament, sent it a letter (see this edition, Vol. 13) in which he formulated the task of creating an independent political party of the proletariat. Marx saw the convocation of the Labour Parliament as an attempt to lead the labour movement out of narrow trade unionism and to unite the economic and political struggle. Most of the trade union leaders, however, did not support the idea of creating a single mass workers' organisation. The abatement of the strike movement by the summer of 1854 also affected the campaign. The Labour Parliament was never convened after March 1854. p. 470

326 See Note 186. p. 470

327 This article published by Adolph Cluss in the New York newspaper *Die Reform* is a reproduction of Marx's comments on Urquhart that he made in the non-extant part of his letter to Cluss written in mid-November. In his letter to Joseph Weydemeyer of December 7, 1853, in which he quotes part of the above-mentioned letter (see present edition, Vol. 39), Cluss wrote: "Marx added some notes on Urquhart because Jones, in a paper I am to receive, characterises him in a tactless way as a Russian ally. Marx writes that he gave Jones a dressing down for this. I have made up a short article out of the 'Urquhartiad'." When the article was being prepared for the press Cluss evidently changed the opening sentence. The rest of Marx's text appears not to be touched by him and is authentic or nearly authentic. For his criticism of Urquhart's views Marx draws from the book: D. Urquhart, *Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South*, London, 1853. As far back as June 1853 he planned to write a special article for the *New-York Daily Tribune* devoted to a critical analysis of this book (see this volume, p. 118). p. 477

328 A reference to articles by the Hungarian journalist Aurelius Ferenc Pulszky, who was a supporter of Kossuth. Residing in London as a refugee, he contributed to the *New-York Daily Tribune* from 1853 to 1860. His reports were published unsigned or under the initials A. P. C. (which evidently stood for
Aurelius Pulszky's Correspondence). Marx got to know about Pulszky contributing to the *New-York Daily Tribune* much later. It is still unclear whether Marx knew that reports signed with the initials A. P. C. belonged to Pulszky.

p. 478

329 Marx's pamphlet *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness* written in November 1853 and published with Adolph Cluss' and Joseph Weydemeyer's assistance in pamphlet form in New York in January 1854 was a reply to the slanderous article by August Willich, "Doktor Karl Marx und seine Enthüllungen", which was published in the *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* on October 28 and November 4, 1853. Soon after Willich's article appeared supporters of Marx and Engels in the USA, Joseph Weydemeyer, Adolph Cluss and Abraham Jacobi, sent a refutation to the newspaper which was published on November 25, 1853. However, Marx thought it expedient to answer himself. A clipping from the *Belletristisches Journal* with Marx's underlinings, etc., is extant. In his pamphlet Marx refutes Willich's attempts to cast doubt on the fairness of Marx's criticism of the activity of the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurer group in his work *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*. Marx included Engels' letter-statement of November 23, 1853 which he wrote at Marx's request (this letter is not otherwise extant) and also statements of revolutionary refugees who testified to the slanderous character of Willich's assertions (on this see Marx's letter to Engels of December 2, 1853, present edition, Vol. 39). Marx borrowed some passages for his pamphlet from the work *The Great Men of the Exile* which he wrote jointly with Engels in May-June 1852 but which was not published (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 227-326).

p. 479

330 *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 395-457), which Marx wrote between late October and early December 1852, was published in pamphlet form in Basle in January 1853. Almost all its copies (2,000) were confiscated by the police in Baden while being transported from Switzerland to Germany. In the USA the work was initially reprinted in March and April in instalments in the Boston *New-England Zeitung*, and at the end of April 1853 it was published by this newspaper as a pamphlet. In *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness* Marx cites the *Revelations* from a separate Boston edition.

p. 481

331 The editors gave the following footnote to this passage: "Mr. Blum is in Philadelphia, not in Australia, and when the American Workers' Union was formed he sat on its board as Willich's agent."

p. 482

332 The *Black Bureau*—a secret institution established at postal departments in France, Prussia, Austria and several other states to inspect private correspondence. It existed at the time of absolute monarchies in Europe.

p. 485

333 A reference to the Communist League, the first German and international communist organisation of the proletariat, formed under the leadership of Marx and Engels in London early in June 1847, as a result of the reorganisation of the League of the Just (a secret association of workers and
artisans that appeared in the 1830s and had communities in Germany, France, Switzerland and England). The programme and organisational principles of the Communist League were drawn up with the direct participation of Marx and Engels. The League's members took an active part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany in 1848-49. Though the defeat of the revolution dealt a blow at the League, it was reorganised in 1849-50 and continued its activities. In the summer of 1850 disagreements arose in the League between the supporters of Marx and Engels and the Willich-Schapper sectarian group which tried to impose on the League its adventurist tactics of starting a revolution immediately without taking into account the actual situation and the practical possibilities. The discord resulted in a split within the League. Owing to police persecutions and arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the Communist League as an organisation in Germany practically ceased. On November 17, 1852, on a motion by Marx, the London District announced the dissolution of the League.

The Communist League played an important historical role as the first proletarian party based on scientific principles of communism, as a school of proletarian revolutionaries, and as the historical forerunner of the International Working Men's Association.

334 Synoptics—the writers of the first three Gospels. Marx is referring to Bruno Bauer's book which points out contradictions between the different Gospel versions and also between actual historical events and the Gospels. p. 485

335 A reference to the German Workers' Educational Society in London which was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other leaders of the League of the Just. After the reorganisation of the League of the Just in the summer of 1847 and the founding of the Communist League (see Note 333), the League's local communities played a leading role in the Society. During various periods of its activity, the Society had branches in working-class districts in London. In 1847 and 1849-50 Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but on September 17, 1850 Marx, Engels and a number of their followers withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurist faction had temporarily increased its influence in the Society, causing a split in the Communist League. In the late 1850s Marx and Engels resumed their work in the Educational Society, which existed up to 1918, when it was closed down by the British Government. p. 488

336 The tasks of these two organisations, both with small memberships and headed mainly by petty-bourgeois democrats, were to collect money for starting an "immediate revolution" in Germany. Willich and other Communist League members who belonged to his faction joined the Émigré Club. Shortly afterwards these two organisations broke up. For details on the disputes between them see: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The Great Men of the Exile (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 227-326). p. 488

337 A reference to the attempts by Johann Gottfried Kinkel and other leaders of the Émigré Club to organise a so-called German-American revolutionary loan. To this end Kinkel went to the USA in September 1851. The loan was to be floated among the German-born Americans and used to begin an immediate
revolution in Germany. The Agitation Union, headed by Arnold Ruge, was in rivalry with the Émigré Club and also sent a representative to the USA to canvass for revolutionary funds. The attempt to distribute the "revolutionary loan" failed. Marx and Engels in a number of works and letters denounced the undertaking as an adventurist attempt to produce a revolution artificially during a period when the revolutionary movement was on the wane.

338 The *Holy Grail*—according to medieval legend, the cup or chalice used by Christ at the Last Supper.

339 *Demagogues*—members of the opposition movement among German intellectuals. The word has been in use since the Carlsbad Conference of Ministers of German States in August 1819, which adopted a special resolution against the demagogues' intrigues.

340 A reference to the detachment formed by Willich in Besançon, France, in November 1848 from German emigrant workers and artisans. The members of the detachment received allowances from the French Government until the beginning of 1849. Later the detachment merged with a volunteer corps which took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849 under the command of Willich.

341 Engels is referring to the Spartan King Leonidas and his troop of three hundred men who fought the battle of Thermopylae in 480 B.C., defending the mountain pass against an army of Persians during the Greco-Persian wars. King Leonidas and his men were all killed during the battle.

342 In September 1849 Marx was elected to the German Relief Committee formed by the German Workers' Educational Society in London. With a view to counteracting the attempts of petty-bourgeois refugee democrats to influence the proletarian refugees, the Committee was reorganised into the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, as suggested by Marx and other Communist League leaders. Engels was among the leaders of the new committee. In mid-September 1850 Marx and Engels withdrew from the Refugee Committee because the majority of its members were under the influence of the Willich-Schapper group.

343 Marx is referring to the Central Committee of the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurist faction which split away from the Communist League in September 1850 and formed an independent organisation. Marx and Engels ironically called this organisation the Sonderbund by analogy with the separatist union of the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed in the 1840s to resist progressive bourgeois reforms.

344 A reference to the workers' society founded in London in January 1852 with Marx's support and a Hanoverian refugee, the carpenter G.L. Stechan, as President. It included workers who broke away from the German Workers' Educational Society which had come under the influence of the Willich-
Schapper group. The Communist League member Georg Lochner, a worker close to Marx and Engels, also took an active part in organising this society. Later, many of its members, including Stechan himself, came under the influence of the Willich-Schapper group and re-joined the Educational Society.

p. 500

345 A reference to the articles by Marx and Engels on the uprising of Paris workers in June 1848, the anti-revolutionary policy of the liberal majority in the Frankfurt National Assembly, the collaborationist position of the liberal deputies in the Prussian National Assembly, and the wavering of the petty-bourgeois leaders of the March Associations (see present edition, Vols. 7-9).

March Associations, which were organised at the end of November 1848 by representatives of the Left wing of the Frankfurt National Assembly, existed in a number of German towns and were headed by the Central March Association in Frankfurt. They were named after the March revolution of 1848 in Germany. Their leaders, Fröbel, Simon, Wesendock, Raveaux, Eizenmann, Ruge, Vogt and others, all petty-bourgeois democrats, confined themselves to revolutionary bluster and were hesitant and inconsistent in their struggle against counter-revolution. In December 1848 Marx and Engels, writing in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, began to criticise the hesitant and ambivalent policy of the leaders of the March Associations, pointing out that such a policy aided the enemies of the revolution.

p. 501

346 A reference to the conflict between Prussia and Austria which arose in the autumn of 1850 as a result of their struggle for supremacy in Germany. Prussia and Austria both demanded the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Hesse-Cassel electorate to suppress the growing movement for a Constitution directed against Frederick William I and his reactionary Ministers. Austria received diplomatic support from Nicholas I, the Russian Tsar. Prussia was obliged to surrender and let the Austrians carry out a punitive mission in Hesse-Cassel.

p. 503

347 On February 24, 1851 an international meeting, the so-called banquet of the equal, was organised in London by some French emigrants headed by Louis Blanc and the Blanquist refugees Barthélemy, Adam and others, together with the Willich-Schapper faction, to celebrate the anniversary of the February revolution of 1848. Marx and Engels sent their supporters, Konrad Schramm and Wilhelm Pieper, to the banquet, who were assaulted and turned out by Willich and Schapper’s followers. Blanqui, who was in prison at the time, sent the text of a toast to London to be read out at the banquet. In the toast he denounced Louis Blanc and other members of the Provisional Government of the French Republic. The text was deliberately withheld from those present at the banquet by its organisers. However, it was published in a number of French newspapers. Marx and Engels translated it into English and German and provided it with a preface (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 537-39). The German version was printed in a large edition and distributed in Germany and England. The fate of the English translation is unknown.

p. 505
A reference to Frederick William IV breaking his solemn promise to the people during the March revolution of 1848 in Prussia to establish a constitutional order. p. 509

Before the revolution of 1848-49 representatives of religious trends in Germany, so-called German Catholicism and the Protestant Free Communities, tried to establish a German National Church. German Catholicism, which appeared in 1844 in a number of German states, was aimed against the obscurantism and ritualism of the Catholic Church. While rejecting the Papacy and many dogmas and rituals of the Catholic Church, the German Catholics tried to apply Catholicism to the needs of the German bourgeoisie. The Free Communities broke away from the official Protestant Church in 1846 under the influence of the so-called Friends of Light, who were against Pietism, a mystical and self-righteous trend which dominated the Protestant Church. These two forms of religious opposition reflected the discontent of the bourgeoisie in the 1840s with the reactionary order in Germany and its striving for political unification of the country. The Free Communities and the German Catholics united in 1859. p. 510

The conflict concerning the religious denomination of children of mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants arose in 1837 with the arrest of C.A.Droste-Vischering, Archbishop of Cologne, who was accused of high treason for refusing to obey the orders of Frederick William III, the King of Prussia. It ended in 1841 under Frederick William IV with the Prussian Government yielding to the Catholic Church. p. 510

This article was published in The Eastern Question and attributed to Marx. At the beginning of the article Engels would seem to be referring to his article "Progress of the Turkish War", which appeared as a leader in the New-York Daily Tribune of December 7, 1853 (see this volume, pp. 471-76). p. 516

The beginning of the article was published under the title "Diplomacy Again" in The Eastern Question. p. 523

See Notes 114 and 119. p. 523

This article was published in The Eastern Question. p. 527

See Note 195. p. 527

In Marx's notebook of excerpts for 1853 there is a passage from Palmerston's letter to Bulwer dated September 10, 1839. As a source Marx used the Correspondence Relative to the Affairs of the Levant, London, 1841. p. 530

In the known and published articles by Marx written for the New-York Daily Tribune during this period this fact is not mentioned. It is possible that this material was left out by the editors. p. 533
In 1844 the British Home Secretary, Sir James Graham, to please the Austrian Government, ordered the Post Office to allow the police to open the correspondence of Italian revolutionary immigrants.

Marx is referring to the Bandiera brothers, members of a conspiratorial organisation, who landed in June 1844 on the Calabrian coast at the head of a small detachment of Italian patriots, with the intention of sparking off an insurrection against the Bourbons of Naples and Austrian rule. The members of the expedition were betrayed by one of their number; however, and taken prisoner. The Bandiera brothers were shot.

Passages from this article were published in *The Eastern Question.* p. 536

The battle of Sinope was fought on November 30, 1853. The Turkish fleet on its way to deliver troops and arms to the Caucasian coast, was detected and attacked by the Russian Black Sea squadron, under the command of Vice-Admiral P. S. Nakhimov. The Russian fleet included six battleships and two frigates; the Turks, supported by coastal batteries, had sixteen ships, including two steamships. The Russian armament was superior, however, and during the battle fifteen Turkish ships were sunk and their commander, Admiral Osman Pasha, was taken prisoner. The Sinope victory consolidated Russia's position on the Black Sea and at the same time precipitated a declaration of war on Russia by Britain and France.

The Manifesto issued by Nicholas I on June 26, 1853 in connection with the Tsarist Government's decision to bring troops into the Danubian Principalities, and also a number of Russian diplomatic documents, stated that the aim of occupying the Principalities was to create "material guarantees" to safeguard the rights and privileges of the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey and ensure that the Sultan fulfilled his obligations to Russia.

Claremont—a house near London, the residence of Louis Philippe after his escape from France.

A reference to the commission of seventeen Orleanist and Legitimist deputies of the Legislative Assembly, notorious for their reactionary views, appointed by the Minister of the Interior in May 1850 to draft a new electoral law. The name is borrowed from the title of an historical drama by Victor Hugo set in medieval Germany where the *Burggraf* was governor, appointed by the Emperor, of a *Burg* (city) or district.

An allusion to General Malet's unsuccessful plot against Napoleon I in October 1812. The organisers of the plot, in which both extreme Royalists and Republicans took part, were counting on Napoleon's defeat in Russia and tried to make use of a rumour of his death during the Russian campaign.

See Note 309.

This article was published in *The Eastern Question.*
Palmerston announced his resignation from the Aberdeen Coalition Ministry on December 16, 1853. It was not accepted, however, and he soon returned to the post of Home Secretary.

An allusion to the hasty recognition by Palmerston of the Bonapartist coup of December 2, 1851 (see Note 56).

This article was written by Engels on the basis of material in the British and French official press (The Times, The Morning Herald, Le Moniteur universel) which was biased in its appraisal of the military operations on the eve of the Western powers declaring war on Russia and in its comments on Russian reports during the Crimean war. This accounts for the inaccuracies in Engels' description of the battle of Sineope and his analysis of the balance of forces and the fighting power and actions of the Russian fleet in the Black Sea. Drawing on British newspapers Engels used information which stated incorrectly that the Black Sea fleet was tactically weak and its personnel consisted mainly of "fresh water sailors" and non-Russians. A considerable role in belittling the importance of the battle of Sineope was played by the political bias of this article directed against Russian Tsarism as the bulwark of reaction. The article was published in The Eastern Question.

The battle of Akhalzikh in the Caucasian theatre of military operations took place on November 26, 1853.

This article was published in The Eastern Question.

During his Italian campaigns of 1795-96 and 1800, Napoleon Bonaparte took advantage of the Italian republican and national liberation movement against Austrian feudal-absolutist rule in order to establish French supremacy in some of the Italian states; some Italian regions were annexed to France.

A reference to the abolition of the Roman Republic and the restoration of the secular power of the Pope in July 1849, as a result of French military intervention initiated by Louis Bonaparte after he had been elected President of the French Republic.

During the war of the Bavarian succession (1778-79), waged between Austria and the allied Prussia and Saxony, the Prussian Government made attempts to gain Tsarist Russia's support, and this enabled the latter to play the role of arbiter during the Teschen peace negotiations. However, Prussia's plans were frustrated by the defence alliance concluded in 1780 between Russia and Austria.

In 1800, during the war of France against the second anti-French coalition, Prussia tried to act as the mediator between the belligerent powers, but as a result was itself isolated.

In 1805, during the war of the third coalition (Austria, Britain, Sweden and Russia) against Napoleonic France, Prussia took a neutral stand, waiting to see how the situation developed. After Austria's defeat and withdrawal from the war, Prussia joined the allies, who formed a fourth anti-French coalition in September 1806, but in October was routed by Napoleon's troops.
The Paixhans guns were used in the navy. They were invented by the French General Paixhans in 1822 to fire hollow explosive shells. They are described by Engels in his article “Navy” (see present edition, Vol. 18).

See Note 319.

Part of this article was published under the title “More Documents” in *The Eastern Question.*

After the defeat of the 1848-49 Hungarian revolution, Kossuth and his supporters hid the regalia of the first King, Stephen, in the vicinity of Orsova, including his crown by which the Austrian emperors were crowned kings of Hungary. On September 8, 1853 the hiding place was discovered, and rumours spread about who had given away the secret to the Austrian authorities. Drawing on the information of their London correspondent A. Pulszky, the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* on October 19, 1853 wrongly accused Bertalan Szemere, a participant in the Hungarian revolution.

On January 6-9, 1854 food riots began in several towns in Devonshire; they were caused by the rise in bread prices, and soon spread throughout the county. The main participants were women and children who looted foodshops. The disturbances were suppressed by the army.

A reference to the secret article in the Russo-Turkish treaty of friendship and mutual defence signed in Unkias-Skelessi on July 8, 1833 (see Note 152).

The first Anglo-Afghan war of 1838-42 started with the invasion of Afghanistan by British occupation troops in Sind. The invasion was carried out under the pretext of rendering assistance to the pretender, the Emir Dost Mohammed’s brother Shuja. However, a popular uprising in November 1841 against the British invaders and Shuja compelled the British, who sustained a severe defeat, to withdraw.

For the bombardment of Copenhagen see Note 261.

This article was written by Marx for the newspaper *Zuid Afrikaan* published in Capetown simultaneously in English and Dutch. In December 1853 Marx received an invitation to contribute to this paper through the husband of his younger sister Louise, the Dutch businessman J. K. Juta. Only one of the three articles Marx sent to *Zuid Afrikaan* was published.

The report on the sinking of the Russian battleship *Rostislav* published in *The Times*, No. 21631, on January 9, 1854 was incorrect. According to Russian official documents, after the battle of Sinope the *Rostislav* returned safely to Sevastopol for repairs.
A reference to the meeting of Count Chambord, the pretender to the French throne, with the Orleanist Duke Louis de Nemours, which took place at the end of 1853, and also Chambord's visit to Louis Philippe's widow at the beginning of 1854. However, this fresh attempt at merging the junior and senior branches of the Bourbon dynasty was unsuccessful. p. 574

A reference to the Protocol signed on December 5, 1853 at the conference in Vienna by the representatives of Britain, France and Prussia and the Austrian Foreign Minister Buol. In this Protocol as in the subsequent Notes the four powers offered their mediation in the conflict between Russia and Turkey.

The letter of December 12, 1853, from the French and British ambassadors to Constantinople, Baraguay d'Hilliers and Stratford de Redcliffe, to the Turkish Foreign Minister Reshid Pasha, stated that the presence of the French and British fleets in the Bosporus testified to the friendly intentions of the British and French governments towards Turkey and that in the event of the Tsarist Government landing its troops on Turkish territory their fleets would aid the Ottoman Empire. p. 575

After Oltenitza in early November 1853 the battle of Chetatea was the second most important battle between the Turkish and Russian armies in the Danubian theatre during the early period of the Crimean war. The main military operations took place in January 1854 when the Turks attempted to launch an offensive in the vicinity of Kalafat at the junction of the borders of Wallachia, Serbia and Bulgaria. After staunch resistance the Russian detachment abandoned its position at Chetatea in the face of a large Turkish force (about 18,000 men). However, the arrival of Russian reinforcements put the Turks on the defensive and subsequently caused them to withdraw to Kalafat. p. 579

A reference to the Note to Constantinople signed by the British, French, Austrian and Prussian ambassadors on December 12, 1853 (see this volume, p. 560). The Note contained a fresh offer of mediation in the Russo-Turkish conflict. In a reply sent on December 31, 1853, Turkey stated her conditions for peace negotiations: 1) the preservation and guarantee of her territorial integrity; 2) Russian evacuation of the Danubian Principalities; 3) the renewal and observance of the 1841 treaty; 4) respect of the Sultan's sovereignty. These conditions were approved by a new Vienna Conference of the ambassadors on January 13, 1854 and forwarded to the Tsarist Government. p. 582

A part of this article was published under the title "The War in Asia" in The Eastern Question. p. 583

See Note 387. p. 584

Landwehr—the army reserve formed in Prussia during the struggle against Napoleon. In the 1840s the army reserve consisted of men under forty who had done three years active service and not less than two years in the reserve. In contrast to the regular army, conscription to the army reserve took place in cases of extreme necessity (war, or the threat of war). p. 588

In his description of the campaign against Albert, the Prince Consort, Marx used material published in the Chartist People's Paper on January 21, 1854. This article, excluding the last paragraph, was published under the same title in The Eastern Question. p. 589
The description of the fortification of Constantinople was apparently written by Engels. In his letter to Engels of January 25, 1854, Marx asked his opinion on the subject (see present edition, Vol. 39). Presumably Marx received a note or a letter from Engels, which is not extant, with the relevant material and included it in his report for the *New-York Daily Tribune* dated January 27, 1854. The rest of the article is probably by Marx. The first two sections of this article were published under the title “Cobden and Russia” in *The Eastern Question*.

Cobden’s pamphlet is quoted below from A. Somerville’s *Cobdenic Policy, the International Enemy of England*, London, 1854.

A reference to the declaration by Sweden and Denmark (December 1853) that if hostilities commenced in the Baltic Sea they would remain neutral. p. 594

According to a tradition that grew up after the Act of Union, twenty-six Irish peers out of approximately a hundred (the title of peer was conferred on many members of the British aristocracy possessing large landed estates in Ireland) were elected to the House of Lords; the rest could stand for election to the House of Commons. p. 597

An abridged version of this article was published under the title “War Finance” in *The Eastern Question*. p. 601

On the instructions of Nicholas I, A. F. Orlov negotiated with Emperor Francis Joseph in Vienna in late January and early February 1854. The Russian Government sought to secure Austria’s benevolent neutrality in the war, in return for a guarantee of the inviolability of Austrian possessions. It also advanced a plan for a joint Russo-Austrian protectorate over states which would be formed in the Balkans if Turkey disintegrated. Orlov’s mission was unsuccessful, however, owing to disagreements between Russia and Austria on the Eastern question. p. 601

As Ambassador Extraordinary to Constantinople and commander-in-chief of the Russian troops sent to assist the Turkish Sultan Mahmud II to defeat Mehemet Ali of Egypt, Orlov played a major part in the conclusion of the Unk iar-Skelessi Treaty between Russia and Turkey in 1833 (see Note 152). p. 601

*Renegades* was the name given in the Middle Ages to Christians in Moslem Spain who embraced Islam. Among Christians in Europe the word was afterwards applied generally to Christians in the Eastern countries who became Mohammedans. p. 602

A reference to the new Danish Constitution drafted in 1853 (see Note 187). It restricted the autonomy of Denmark proper, Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg and made them more dependent on the Danish Crown. This Constitution, which came into force on October 2, 1855, met with strong opposition and was replaced in 1863 with a more liberal one. p. 605

Excerpts from this article were published under the title “Blue Books.—Ambassadors Withdrawing” in *The Eastern Question*.

The blue book on the Eastern question mentioned in this article is *Correspondence respecting the Rights and Privileges of the Latin and Greek Churches*.
A reference to the reports submitted to Parliament on the negotiations between Alexander Burnes, the British representative in Kabul, and the Emir of Afghanistan, Dost Mohammed. As a result of the negotiations the British Government, at Palmerston's insistence, declared war on Afghanistan in 1838. The reports were submitted to Parliament in 1839 but, as subsequently transpired, the most important papers were not produced, which made it possible to claim that Dost Mohammed was the initiator of the Anglo-Afghan conflict. Palmerston's opponents raised this question in the House of Commons in 1848.

The British ship Tayleur bound for Melbourne was wrecked and sank near the island of Lambey not far from Dublin. Investigations revealed that the ship's crew consisted of untrained, inexperienced sailors.

The Litchfield-house contract (or compact) was concluded between the Whig leaders and Daniel O'Connell, leader of the Liberal wing of the Irish national liberation movement, who headed the Irish faction in Parliament. The negotiations were conducted at Lord Litchfield's house in London. Under the contract the Irish Liberal leaders were promised some posts in the government. In his turn, O'Connell pledged to stop the mass campaign for the repeal of the Union and to support the Whigs in Parliament.

The "Society of Arts" and tricks—an ironical name given by Marx to the cultural and philanthropic Society of Arts founded in 1754; in the 1850s its President was Prince Albert. The Society tried to prevent the development of the mass strike movement in Britain and the convocation of the Labour Parliament (see Note 325), and sought to play the part of arbitrator between workers and employers. At its meeting in January 1854 Ernest Jones tried to propose a resolution recognising the workers' right to strike and condemning lockouts, but the meeting would not let him speak. His comrades-in-arms walked out in protest. Robert Owen also spoke against the view, supported by a majority at the meeting, that the labour question could be solved by philanthropic measures and arbitration.

A reference to the Labour Commission that met at the Luxembourg Palace under the chairmanship of Louis Blanc. It was set up on February 28, 1848 by the Provisional Government under pressure from the workers who demanded a Ministry of Labour. The Commission, in which both workers and employers were represented, acted as mediator in labour conflicts, often taking the side of the employers. The revolutionary action of the masses on May 15, 1848 put an end to the Luxembourg Commission, which the government disbanded on May 16, 1848.

This article was published in *The Eastern Question.*
Capitulations—documents that granted commercial advantages and privileges to the subjects of West-European states in Oriental countries, including Turkey. p. 615

Marx is ironically dubbing Louis Bonaparte with the title the Pope conferred on Ferdinand, King of Aragon (1479-1516), for the banishment of the Moors from Spain and which was subsequently used by the Pope in addressing the Spanish kings. p. 615

See Note 217. p. 616

See Note 24. p. 617

These notes by Marx on Henry Charles Carey's views consist of fragments from Marx's letters to his pupil and comrade-in-arms Adolph Cluss, that were inserted by the latter in his article "The 'Best Paper in the Union' and Its 'Best Men' and Political Economists". The article by Cluss was published in the American working-class newspaper Die Reform. It contained criticism of the ideological discord among the German petty-bourgeois émigrés and their infatuation with the theories of bourgeois economists. Cluss reproduced whole passages from Marx's letters, making some changes or additions evidently for the sake of coherence, of which he wrote to Marx on September 11, 1853, referring jokingly to his own work as a plagiarism. Marx's authorship is also evident from their similarity to and frequently full coincidence with what Marx wrote on Carey's views to Engels (June 14, 1853) and Weydemeyer (March 5, 1852) (see present edition, Vol. 39). In his letter to Engels of October 8, 1853, Marx took a favourable view of Cluss' work but at the same time he stated definitely: "In his attack upon the Neu-England Zeitung he—aptly as I think—makes use of sundry passages from my letters about Carey, etc." (Ibid.) Since the text belonging to Cluss is also based on Marx's advice and instructions and his description of petty-bourgeois émigrés, and also because this form is more convenient for the reader, in this edition the article is published in full, and Cluss' text is given in smaller type.

Marx's notes, as a separate publication, appeared in Russian in the journal The U.S.A., No. 5, 1977. p. 623

An allusion to the fact that the German refugee newspaper Janus, published by Karl Heinzen in New York, ceased publication at the end of 1852. Its issues for 1852 contained articles by Arnold Ruge, which Marx, in his letter to Engels of April 30, 1852, described as follows: "...in the Janus we sent you, Ruge seeks—and how he seeks, mon Dieu!—to appropriate communism as the latest product of his 'humanist thought'" (see present edition, Vol. 39). p. 624

See Note 137. p. 625

Marx's criticism of the Neu-England Zeitung was evidently prompted by Poesche's article "Die 'Klassenkämpfer'", published in that newspaper on September 3, 1853. In connection with the article Marx wrote to Adolph Cluss on September 15, 1853 that Poesche makes "insipid would-be jokes about cranky proponents of the class struggle", etc., and further, "I think it is time you made a fresh start in the polemic and picked a few holes in the jejune arguments of Goepp-Poesche, discoverers of the material view though their materialism is that of the man-in-the-street" (see present edition, Vol. 39). p. 625
A similar idea is expressed in Marx's letter to Weydemeyer of March 5, 1852: "He [Carey] tries to refute them [Ricardo, Malthus, Mill, Say, etc.], not, it is true, like the fatuous Heinzen, by relating the existence of classes to the existence of political privileges and monopolies, but by seeking to demonstrate that economic conditions—rent (landed property), profit (capital) and wages (wage labour), rather than being conditions of struggle and antagonism, are conditions of association and harmony." In reproducing Marx's notes in his article, Cluss possibly made some editorial changes in this passage, as suggested by his letter to Marx of September 11, 1853.

Marx is referring to Carey's book *The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign: Why It Exists, and How It May Be Extinguished*, published in Philadelphia in 1853. (In the same year a stereotyped edition of the book came out in London.) In his book (pp. 202-04), Carey quoted from Marx's article "Elections.—Financial Clouds.—The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery" published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* on February 9, 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 486-94). Marx read Carey's book when he received a copy from the author, and gave a brief critical review of it in his letter to Engels of June 14, 1853. The main points of this criticism are reproduced in this article.

A reference to the Central Committee of European Democracy set up in London in June 1850 on the initiative of Giuseppe Mazzini. It included bourgeois and petty-bourgeois refugees from various countries. Extremely heterogeneous in composition and ideological principles, the Central Committee of European Democracy had practically disintegrated by March 1852 because of strained relations between the Italian and French democratic refugees. Its inaugural manifesto "Aux peuples!" of July 3, 1850 was criticised by Marx and Engels in their international review (from May to October) published in the autumn of 1850 in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 490-532).
NAME INDEX

A

Abbas I (1813-1854)—Pasha of Egypt (1849-54).—571

Abd-el-Kader (1808-1883)—Emir of Algeria, a leader in the national liberation war of 1832-47 in Morocco and Algeria against the French invaders; was taken prisoner in 1847; with Napoleon III's permission emigrated to Turkey in 1852.—423

Abdi Pasha (b. 1801)—Turkish general, commander of the Turkish army in the Caucasus in 1853.—432, 433, 550, 572, 584

Abdul Aziz (1830-1876)—Sultan of Turkey (1861-76), brother of Abdul Mejid.—211


A’Court, William, Baron Heytesbury (1779-1860)—British diplomat, ambassador to Russia (1828-32).—393

Adam—French worker, Blanquist; after the June 1848 uprising in Paris emigrated to Belgium and later to London; member of the Société des proscrits démocrates et socialistes in London in 1850.—508

Adélaide (1777-1847)—Princess of Orleans, sister of Louis Philippe, King of the French.—203, 206

Aesop (6th century B.C.)—semilegendarry Greek fabulist.—53

Agha Mohammed (1742-1797)—Shah of Persia (1794-97), founder of the Qajar dynasty.—113

Ahmed (d. 1855)—Bey of Tunisia (1837-55).—408

Ahmed Pasha—Turkish general, commander of the Turkish army in the Caucasus at the end of 1853.—572, 584

Ahmet Pasha—Turkish general, commander of the Turkish troops on the Danube in 1853-54.—294

Albano—English architect.—256

Albemarle, George Thomas Keppel, 6th Earl of (1799-1891)—British politi-
cian and general, Whig; in the early 1820s held high posts in the British army in India.—215
Albert, Prince Consort of Queen Victoria of Great Britain (1819-1861).—254-55, 538, 544, 577, 589-92, 601
Alcock, Sir Rutherford (1809-1897)—British diplomat, consul in Shanghai (1846-58).—96
Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—5, 324, 362, 368, 604
Alexander Karageorgevic (1806-1885)—Prince of Serbia (1842-58).—228, 278-79, 458, 523, 544
Alexandra Fyodorovna (Charlotte Louise) (1798-1860)—daughter of Frederick William III and wife of Tsar Nicholas I.—404
Ali Asmi Pasha—commander of the Turkish troops in Aleppo in 1853.—279
Ali Pasha (1741-1822)—founder and ruler of a state in the south-west of the Balkans whose capital was Janina (1788-1822); fought against the Turkish Sultan (1820-22), was assassinated after his capitulation.—33
Amherst, William Pitt Amherst, Earl (1773-1857)—British diplomat and statesman, Governor-General of India (1823-28).—201
Anderson—manager of the Bank of Scotland.—300
Anderton, William—Yorkshire manufacturer.—413
Andronnikoff (Andronnikov), Ivan Makhazovich, Prince (1798-1868)—Russian general of Georgian descent; took part in military operations in the Caucasus during the Crimean war.—551
Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—44, 45
Annesley, William Richard, 4th Earl of (1830-1874)—Irish peer, Tory M.P.—597
Anrep-Elmpt, Iosif Romanovich, Count (1798-1860)—Russian general; commanded Russian troops on the Danube in 1853 and early 1854.—585
Anstey, Thomas Chisholm (1816-1873)—English lawyer and politician; radical M.P. (1847-52).—361, 380-81, 385, 387-90, 398, 400
Antoine, Gustav—French refugee in London in the early 1850s; son-in-law of Auguste Blanqui.—506
Apponyi, Antal, Count (1782-1852)—Austrian diplomat of Hungarian descent; ambassador to Paris (1826-49).—389
Aquinas, Thomas (Thomas of Aquino) (1225-1274)—scholastic theologian and philosopher; was canonised by the Catholic Church.—49, 55
Ardant, Paul Joseph (1800-1858)—French colonel, general from 1855, military engineer; in 1854 was sent on a military mission to Turkey.—610
Argyll, George John Douglas Campbell, 8th Duke of (1823-1900)—British statesman, Peelite; Lord Privy Seal (1853-55, 1859-66, 1880-81); Secretary for India (1868-74).—192
Arif Hikmet Bey (b. 1786)—Turkish statesman, Sheikh-ul-Islam (1846-54).—423
Ariosto, Lodovico (1474-1533)—Italian Renaissance poet, author of L'Orlando furioso.—345
Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—178
Arnim, Heinrich Friedrich, Count of (1791-1859)—Prussian diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1849), ambassador to Vienna (1845-48, 1851-58).—254
Assurbanipal—King of Assyria (668-c. 626 B.C.).—268
Attwood, Thomas (1783-1856)—English banker, economist and radical politician, until 1839 adhered to the Right wing of the Chartist movement.—383, 385, 389, 405
Augier, J.—French journalist.—109
Aurangzeb, Mohi ud-din Mohammed (1658-1707)—ruler of the Grand Mogul Empire in India.—126
Austin—deputy governor of the Birmingham borough gaol (1853).—303
Backhouse, John (1772-1845)—British official, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (1827-42).—387, 396
Baillie, Henry James (b. 1804)—British M.P., Tory.—606
Bahadur Shah II (1767-1862)—last nominal ruler of the Grand Mogul Empire in India.—199
Bakunin, Mikhail (1814-1876)—Russian democrat, journalist; participant in the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany; subsequently an ideologist of Narodism and anarchism.—284-86, 290, 291
Balcarres—see Crawford, James
Bandiera brothers, Attilio (1810-1844) and Emilio (1819-1844)—Austrian naval officers, leaders of the national liberation movement in Italy, members of the Young Italy society; executed for their attempt to stir up an insurrection in Calabria (1844).—533
Bangya, Janos (1817-1868)—Hungarian journalist and officer, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; Kossuth's emissary abroad and at the same time an agent-provocateur; later served in the Turkish army under the name of Mehemed bey.—40, 42
Baraguay d'Hilliers, Achille, comte (1795-1878)—French general, since 1854 marshal, Bonapartist; ambassador to Constantinople (1853-54); commander of the French expeditionary corps in the Baltic in 1854.—531, 560, 575, 588, 619
Baring Alexander, 1st Baron Ashburton (1774-1848)—head of a banking house in London, Tory M.P.—300
Barrington, William Keppel, Viscount (b. 1793)—Irish peer, M.P.—597
Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873)—French politician and lawyer; leader of the liberal dynastic opposition until February 1848; from December 1848 to October 1849 headed the monarchist coalition ministry.—615
Barthélemy, Emmanuel (c. 1820-1855)—French worker, Blanquist, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July revolutionary societies during the July revolution and participant in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; a leader of the Société des proscrits démocrates et socialistes in London; executed in 1855 on a criminal charge.—494, 496, 506-07
Basilius Haivalian—Patriarch of the Armenian Church in Aleppo (1853-54).—279
Bastiat, Frédéric (1801-1850)—French economist; preached harmony of class interests in bourgeois society.—625, 627, 630
Batthyány, Kázmér, Count of (1807-1854)—Hungarian statesman, liberal aristocrat; Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Hungarian revolutionary Government of Szemere (1849); after the suppression of the revolution emigrated to Turkey and then to France.—559
Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German philosopher, Young Hegelian.—42, 487, 624
Beaumont, Miles Thomas Stapleton, Baron (1805-1854)—English landowner, member of the House of Lords, Liberal.—211, 263
Beaumont-Vassy, Edouard Ferdinand de la Bonninière, vicomte de (1816-1876)—French writer and historian; monarchist.—117
Becker, Hermann Heinrich (1820-1885)—German lawyer and journalist, member of the Communist League (from 1850); sentenced to five years' imprisonment at the Cologne Communist trial in 1852; subsequently a national-liberal.—482, 485, 487, 502-04
Becker, Nicolaus (1809-1845)—German poet.—67
Bell—chief engineer on the Egyptian frigate Pervaz Bahri, an Englishman.—571
Bell, George—British merchant, brother and partner of James Bell.—398, 402-06
Bell, James Stanislas (d. 1842)—British merchant; a spy in the Caucasus in the 1830s.—395, 405
Bem, Józef (1795-1850)—Polish general, participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and in the revolutionary struggle in Vienna in 1848; a leader of the Hungarian revolutionary army in 1848-49; emigrated to Turkey after the defeat of the revolution.—257, 564
Bennoch Francis—British merchant, London City Councillor (1853).—512
Béranger, Pierre Jean de (1780-1857)—French poet and song writer, author of political satires, democrat.—6
Berends, Julius (b. 1817)—owner of a printshop in Berlin, Left-wing deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (1848).—28, 30
Berg—Russian diplomat, First Secretary of the Russian embassy in London (c. 1842-54).—608
Berkely, Francis Henry Fitzhardinge (1794-1870)—English politician, Liberal M.P.—137
Berliner, Louis Marie Armand (1801-1854)—French journalist, Orleanist; publisher of the Journal des Débats in 1841-54.—117
Bethmann-Hollweg, Moritz August von (1795-1877)—Prussian lawyer and politician; a conservative leader, deputy to the First (1849-52) and the Second (1852-55) Chamber of the Prussian Diet.—29, 37
Bethune, John Elliot Drinkwater (1801-1851)—British lawyer; from 1848 to 1851 legislative member of the Supreme Council of India.—122
Bineau, Jean Martial (1805-1855)—French engineer and politician, Bonapartist; Minister of Public Works (1849-51) and Minister of Finance (1852-55).—316, 604
Bird, T.—Vienna correspondent of The Times (1848-66).—561
Blackett, John Fenwick Burgoyne (1821-1856)—British M.P.—125, 273, 275
Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; member of the Provisional Government in 1848; pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; from August 1848 a leader of petty-bourgeois émigrés in London.—505-06, 612
Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist; organiser of secret societies and plots; during the 1848 revolution adhered to the extreme Left of the democratic and proletarian movement in France.—505, 507
Blind, Karl (1826-1907)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden in 1848-49; in the 1850s was a leader of German petty-bourgeois émigrés in London, subsequently a national-liberal.—630, 631
Bluhme, Christian Albrecht (1794-1866)—Danish statesman, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1851-54) and Prime Minister (1852-53).—574
Blum, Hans—German democrat, member of the Communist League; from 1850 adhered to the Willich-Schapper sectarian group; subsequently emigrated to the USA and took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—482
Bodkin, Sir William Henry (1791-1874)—British lawyer, Tory M.P. (1841-47); in 1853 government solicitor.—83
Boiardo, Matteo Maria (1434-1494)—Italian Renaissance poet, author of L'Orlando innamorato.—488
Bonaparte—imperial dynasty in France (1804-14, 1815 and 1852-70).—540
Bonaparte—see Napoleon I
Bonaparte, Louis—see Napoleon III
Boniface, Louis (b. 1796)—French journalist, Bonapartist.—111, 294
Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15 and 1815-30).—538-40, 557, 577, 590
Bourqueney, François Adolphe, comte de (1799-1869)—French diplomat, envoy (1841-44) and the ambas-
sador to Constantinople (1844-48), envoy (1853-56) and ambassador to Vienna (1856-59).—234

Boustrapa—see Napoleon III

Boylin, James—a clerk employed at Hale’s rocket factory in a London suburb.—82

Brady, John (b. 1812)—British physician, M.P.—598

Briggs, John (1785-1875)—British general; served in the East India Company (1801-35); member of its Court of Proprietors (1853).—198

Bright, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer and politician, a Free Trade leader and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—58, 123, 137, 175-77, 182, 192, 197, 202, 419, 447, 448, 590, 625

Broc, Pyotr Fyodorovich (1805-1875)—Russian statesman, Minister of Finance (1852-58).—241

Brougham and Vaux, Henry Peter, 1st Baron (1778-1868)—English Whig statesman, lawyer and writer.—186, 577

Broughon—see Hobhouse, John Cam

Brown, John P.—American chargé d'affaires in Turkey (1853).—211

Bruat, Armand Joseph (1796-1855)—French admiral, commander of a squadron (1854), then of the French navy in the Black Sea (1855).—614

Bruck, Karl Ludwig, Baron von (1798-1860)—Austrian manufacturer and statesman; Minister of Trade, Industry and Public Works (1848-51), envoy to Constantinople (1853-55), Minister of Finance (1855-60).—193, 278, 407, 417

Brüggemann, Karl Heinrich (1810-1887)—German journalist, moderate liberal, editor-in-chief of the Kölnische Zeitung (1845-55).—632

Bruhn, Karl von (b. 1803)—German journalist, member of the Communist League; expelled in 1850; subsequently editor of the Lassallean paper Nordstern in Hamburg (1861-66).—486

Brunnow, Filipp Ivanovich, Baron (1797-1875)—Russian diplomat, envoy (1840-54 and 1858-60) and ambassador (1860-74) to London.—19, 137, 138, 142, 143, 175, 205-08, 255, 259, 266, 574, 589, 608

Brutus, Marcus Junius (c. 85-42 B.C.)—Roman republican statesman, an initiator of a conspiracy against Julius Caesar.—30, 592

Buchanan, Sir Andrew (1807-1882)—English diplomat, envoy to Copenhagen (1853-58).—594

Bucher, Lothar (1817-1892)—Prussian official and journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848 and then a refugee in London; subsequently a national liberal and supporter of Bismarck.—488

Budberg, Alexander Ivanovich, Baron (1798-1876)—Russian general; Commissioner Plenipotentiary in the Danubian Principalities (1853-54).—538

Bulwer-Lytton—see Lytton, Edward George

Bulwer, William Henry Lytton Earle, Baron Dalling and Bulwer (1801-1872)—English diplomat, Whig M.P. (1830-37); chargé d'affaires in Paris, 1839 and 1840, then envoy to Madrid (1843-48), to Washington (1849-52) and Florence (1852-55); in 1858-65 ambassador to Constantinople.—373, 389, 530

Buol-Schauenstein, Karl Ferdinand, Count of (1797-1865)—Austrian statesman and diplomat; envoy to St. Petersburg (1848-50) and to London (1851-52), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1852-59).—193, 234, 258, 267, 321, 537, 577

Bürgers, Heinrich (1820-1878)—German journalist, contributor to the Rheinische Zeitung (1842 and 1843); member of the Cologne community of the Communist League (1848); an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; from 1850 member of the Communist League Central Authority; sentenced to six years’ imprisonment at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); subsequently a liberal.—498
Burgoyne, Sir John Fox, Baronet (1782-1871)—English general, military engineer; inspector general of fortifications (1845-68); the principal engineer adviser to the English commander during the first part of the siege of Sevastopol, field marshal from 1868.—610

Burke, Edmund (1729-1797)—English journalist and statesman, Whig M.P., opponent of the French Revolution.—183, 184

Butenev, Appolinary Petrovich (1787-1866)—Russian diplomat, ambassador to Constantinople (1830-40).—379

Butt, Isaac (1813-1879)—Irish lawyer and politician, Liberal M.P.; in the 1870s one of the initiators of the Home Rule movement.—58, 611

C

Campbell, Sir George (1824-1892)—British official in India, author of works on India; subsequently Liberal M.P. (1875-92).—181-82, 184, 199, 214, 215, 216, 220

Canning, George (1770-1827)—English Tory statesman and diplomat; Foreign Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27) and Prime Minister (1827).—110, 347-48, 351, 363-64, 386

Capo d'Istria, Giovanni Antonio (Joannes), Count (1776-1831)—Greek statesman; from 1809 to 1822 was in the Russian service, Second Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Russia (1815-22); President of Greece (1827-31).—357

Cardwell, Edward Cardwell, Viscount (1813-1886)—English statesman, a leader of the Peelites and then a Liberal; President of the Board of Trade (1852-55), Secretary for Ireland (1859-61), Secretary for the Colonies (1864-66) and Secretary for War (1868-74).—192

Carey, Henry Charles (1793-1879)—American economist, advocated harmony of class interests in capitalist society.—623, 625-28, 630

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881)—British writer, historian and philosopher, supported the Tories; preached views bordering on feudal socialism up to 1848; later a relentless opponent of the working-class movement.—303, 347

Carmarthen—see Osborne, Sir Thomas

Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte (1801-1888)—French journalist and politician; member of the Provisional Government (1848); after 1851 a leader of the republican opposition to the Bonapartist regime.—539

Carrard, Nicolas (d. 1853)—a leader of the clerical opposition to the Swiss government; organised putsches in Fribourg in 1850, 1851 and 1853.—85

Cassola, Carlo (b. 1814)—Italian revolutionary, follower of Mazzini.—302

Castelbajac, Barthélemy Dominique Jacques Armand, marquis de (1787-1864)—French general, Legitimist; from 1850 to 1854 envoy to St. Petersburg.—589-90, 608

Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount (1769-1822)—British Tory statesman; Secretary for War and for the Colonies (1805-06, 1807-09) and Foreign Secretary (1812-22).—369

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-96).—33, 112, 113, 404, 603, 632

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.—77, 348, 631

Chambord, Henri Charles, duc de Bordeaux, comte de (1820-1883)—last representative of the elder Bourbon line, pretender to the French throne as Henry V.—538, 577

Chapman, John (1801-1854)—English radical writer, advocate of reforms in India.—220

Charles I (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49); executed during the English Revolution.—148
Charles II (1650-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—273
Charles V (1500-1558)—Holy Roman Emperor (1519-56) and King of Spain under the name of Charles I (1516-56).—59
Charles X (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30).—165, 230
Charles Albert (Carlo Alberto) (1798-1849)—King of Sardinia (1831-49).—511
Charles Frederick Alexander (1823-1891)—Prince of Württemberg and subsequently King Charles I of Württemberg (1864-91).—255
Charles the Great (Charlemagne) (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Holy Roman Emperor (800-814).—230
Charles, Jacques Hubert (1793-1882)—Swiss conservative politician and writer, participant in the Fribourg putsch of 1853.—85
Chekib Effendi—Turkish statesman, member of the State Council (Divan); in July 1853 was empowered to investigate the Smyrna incident.—211
Chenu, Adolphe (born c. 1817)—member of secret revolutionary societies in France during the July monarchy, agent-provocateur of the secret police.—40
Chesney, Francis Rawdon (1789-1872)—English colonel, general after 1855; author of Russo-Turkish Campaigns of 1828 and 1829.—563, 564
Child, Sir Josiah (1630-1699)—English economist, banker and merchant; mercantilist; President of the Court of Directors of the East India Company (1681-83 and 1686-88).—152
Childs, Thomas—captain of the British ship Vixen.—398
Chollet, Joseph—participant in the Fribourg putsch of 1853.—85
Christian IX (1818-1906)—Prince of Glücksburg, later King of Denmark (1863-1906).—238
Clanricarde, Ulick John de Burgh, 1st Marquis and 14th Earl of (1802-1874)—British Whig diplomat and politician, ambassador to St. Petersburg (1838-41).—186, 251, 263, 561, 607, 608
Clédat, Jean—member of the Société des proscrits démocrates et socialistes in London (1850).—508
Clementi, Luigi—Italian revolutionary, follower of Mazzini.—302
Clive, Robert, Baron Clive of Plassey (1725-1774)—governor of Bengal (1757-60 and 1765-67).—151, 221
Cloots, Jean Baptiste (Anacharsis) (1755-1794)—a leader of the French Revolution, Danish by birth; was close to the Left Jacobins; prior to the Revolution Prussian baron.—291
Cluss, Adolph (1825-1905)—German engineer, member of the Communist League; secretary of the Workers’ Educational Society in Mainz (1848); in 1848 emigrated to the USA, where he took part in the work of German-American workers’ organisations in the 1850s; one of the first propagandists of scientific communism in America.—623, 625, 626, 629, 632
Cobbett, John Morgan (1800-1877)—English lawyer and politician, M.P., son of William Cobbett.—187, 188, 189, 226
Cobbett, William (c.1762-1835)—English politician and radical writer.—44, 149, 187-89
Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and politician, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—58, 137, 175-77, 234, 274-76, 280, 419, 436, 447, 448, 462, 590, 594-96
Coburgs—representatives of the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha dynasty; ruled in Belgium, Portugal, Britain and several
other European states.—254, 308, 370, 371, 544, 577

**Coburg**—see Albert

**Codrington, Sir Edward** (1770-1851)—British admiral, commander of the combined Russian, British and French fleet in the battle of Navarino (1827).—354, 376

**Cola, M.**—Russian consul in Galatz (1853).—116

**Colbert, Jean Baptiste** (1619-1683)—French statesman, Controller-General of Finance (1665-83); virtually directed France's home and foreign policy.—70

**Collier, Robert Porrett, 1st Baron Monkswell** (1817-1886)—English lawyer and radical politician, M.P.—50

**Confucius** (550 or 551-479 B.C.)—Chinese philosopher and statesman.—624

**Constantine (Konstantin) Pavlovich** (1779-1831)—Russian Grand Duke, commander of the Polish army from 1814; virtual Viceroy of Poland (1814-31).—113, 386

**Cooper, James Fenimore** (1789-1851)—American novelist.—40

**Coppock, James** (1798-1857)—English lawyer, electoral agent.—304

**Corry, Armar Lawry** (1792-1855)—British admiral.—112

**Cowell, George**—English worker, Chartist; one of the leaders of the Preston strike in 1853-54.—446, 462

**Cowley, Henry Wellesley, 1st Earl of** (1804-1884)—British diplomat, ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—4

**Crawford, Edward Henry John** (b. 1816)—English judge; M.P. (1852-53).—176, 177

**Crawford, James Lindsay Balcarres, Earl of** (1783-1869)—English landlord and mine-owner.—331, 436, 447

**Cromwell, Oliver** (1599-1658)—leader of the English revolution; from 1653 Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland.—148, 273

**Crossley, Sir Francis** (1817-1872)—English manufacturer, radical M.P.—196

**Cushing, Caleb** (1800-1879)—American lawyer and politician, Attorney-General (1853-57).—625

**Czartoryski, Adam Jerzy, Prince** (1770-1861)—Polish magnate, friend of Alexander I; Russian Foreign Minister (1804-06); head of the Provisional Government during the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, later leader of Polish conservative-monarchist émigrés in Paris.—280, 386

**Dalhousie, James Andrew Broun Ramsay, Marquess and Earl of** (1812-1860)—British statesman, Peelite; Governor-General of India (1848-56); pursued a policy of colonial conquests.—121, 122, 199, 282

**Danilo I Petrović Njegoš** (1826-1860)—Prince of Montenegro (1852-60).—446, 617

**Dannenberg, Pyotr Andreyevich** (1792-1872)—Russian general, commander of Russian forces on the Danube and in the Crimea during the Crimean war.—458, 472

**Danton, Georges Jacques** (1759-1794)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Right-wing Jacobins.—291

**Decker, Karl von** (1784-1844)—German general and military writer.—481

**Delacour (De la Cour), Edmond** (1805-1873)—French diplomat, ambassador to Constantinople (1853).—21, 109, 110, 194, 259, 278

**Delahodde (de la Hodde), Lucien** (1808-1865)—French journalist, member of secret revolutionary societies during the Restoration and the July monarchy, police agent-provocateur.—40

**Delasusse, Aaron Louis Frédéric Regnault, Baron de** (1788-1860)—French admiral.—109

**Delestreux, Louis Charles** (1809-1871)—French revolutionary, participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and member of the Paris Commune of 1871.—421
Delius—Prussian official, deputy to the Second Chamber of the Prussian Diet (1852-53), brother of Karl Delius.—30

Delius, Karl—Magdeburg merchant.—30

Demetrius Antachi—Patriarch of the Greek Church in Aleppo (1853-54).—279

Democritus (c. 460-c. 370 B.C.)—Greek philosopher, a founder of the atomistic theory.—630

Demonethes (384-322 B.C.)—Greek orator and politician; Athens leader of the Anti-Macedonian Party; champion of democracy in slave-owning society.—20

Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, Earl of (1799-1869)—British statesman, Tory leader, Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59 and 1866-68).—3, 186, 252, 280, 281, 377, 401, 406, 413, 570, 611, 617

Desmoulins, Lucie Simplice Camille Be- noist (1760-1794)—French journalist; leader in the French Revolution; Right-wing Jacobin.—291

Dickens, Charles John Huff am (1812-1870)—English novelist.—79, 360

Dickinson—owner of iron works in Blackburn, Lancashire.—331

Dickinson, John (1815-1876)—English writer, Free Trader, author of several books on India, a founder of India Reform Society.—155, 180, 183, 184, 219

Dietrich-Zabalkansky, Ivan Ivanovich, Count (Dietitsch, Hans Karl Friedrich Ant on) (1785-1831)—Russian field marshal, commander-in-chief of the Russian army during the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 and of the troops which crushed the Polish uprising of 1830-31.—7, 33, 457

Dietz, Oswald (c. 1824-1864)—German architect; participated in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to London; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; after the split of the League in 1850 joined the sectarian Willich-Schapper group, member of its Central Committee; subsequently took part in the American Civil War on the side of the North.—499, 500

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and author, a Tory leader; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59 and 1866-68) and Prime Minister (1868 and 1874-80).—3, 46, 48, 53, 54, 55, 58-60, 63, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 80, 81, 137, 177, 178, 186, 202, 240, 253, 265, 295, 589, 597

Dolgorukoff (Dolgorukov), Vasily Andreyevich, Prince (1803-1868)—Russian statesman; War Minister (1853-56); Chief of the gendarmes (1856-66).—240, 241

Dornbusch.—409

Dost Mohammed Khan (1793-1863)—Afghan Emir (1826-39 and 1842-63).—566

Dotézac, Adolphe (1808-1889)—French diplomat, envoy to Copenhagen (1848-69).—594

Dronke, Ernst (1822-1891)—German writer, at first a "true socialist", later member of the Communist League and an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; after the 1848-49 revolution emigrated to England; supported Marx and Engels.—41, 42, 485, 486

Drouyn de Lhuys, Edouard (1805-1881)—French diplomat and politician, in the 1840s Orleanist and after 1851 Bonapartist; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1848-49, 1851, 1852-55, 1862-66).—203, 209, 211, 258, 267, 301, 321, 556, 560, 562, 575

Druy, Henri (1799-1855)—Swiss radical statesman; member of the Federal Council (1848-54), and President of the Swiss Confederation in 1850.—91

Dundas, Sir James Whitley Deans (1785-1862)—British admiral, commander-in-chief of the British navy in the Mediterranean from 1852 to January 1855.—5, 112, 118, 553

Duplat, Gustavus Charles—British diplomat, consul at Warsaw (1841-54).—365

Durham, John George Lambton, 1st Earl of (1792-1840)—British politician,
Whig; ambassador to St. Petersburg (1835-37).—389, 394, 403

E

Eccarius, Johann Friedrich—German tailor, member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1851; supported Marx and Engels during the split in the Communist League.—500

Eccarius Johann Georg (1818-1889)—German tailor, brother of Johann Friedrich Eccarius; prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; member of the General Council of the First International; subsequently took part in the British trade union movement.—500

Edward IV (1442-1483)—King of England (1461-83).—251

Elizabeth I (1533-1603)—Queen of England (1558-1603).—148, 152

Ellenborough, Edward Law, 1st Earl of (1790-1871)—British Tory statesman; Governor-General of India (1842-44); First Lord of the Admiralty (1846); President of the Board of Control for India (1858).—181, 186, 198, 263

Eltice, Edward (1781-1863)—British politician, M.P. (1818, 1820, 1830 and 1831-63).—48, 55

Elphinstone, Mountstuart (1779-1859)—governor of Bombay (1819-27), author of a History of India.—199

Emmanuel, Georgy Arsenyevich (1775-1837)—Russian general of Magyar descent, Russian commander in the Caucasus (1826-31).—392

Engelhardt—Russian general, commander of Russian troops on the Danube in 1853.—472

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895).—41, 42, 82, 87, 232, 285, 450-52, 457, 474, 486, 496, 497, 507, 516

Ersch, Johann Samuel (1766-1828)—German bibliographer, professor of geography and statistics in Halle.—59

Esterházy of Galántha, Paul Anton (Pál Antal), Prince (1786-1866)—Hungarian magnate, diplomat in the service of Austria, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Hungarian government (March-September 1848).—205-06

Evans, Sir George de Lacy (1787-1870)—English general; participant in the Crimean war; M.P.—357, 362, 382

Ewerbeck, August Hermann (1816-1860)—German physician and man of letters; member of the Communist League until 1850.—284, 291

F

Falloux, Frédéric Alfred Pierre, comte de (1811-1886)—French politician and writer, Legitimist and clerical; in 1848 inspired the suppression of the June uprising in Paris; Minister of Education (1848-49).—615

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of Naples (1830-59).—243

Ferdinand VII (1784-1833)—King of Spain (1808 and 1814-33).—353

Ferdinand August Franz Anton (1816-1885)—Prince Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld-Kohary, husband of Queen Maria II da Gloria of Portugal, King of Portugal under the name of Ferdinand II (1837-53) and regent from 1853 to 1855.—370

Ferdinando Alberto Amedeo (1822-1855)—Duke of Genoa, brother of Victor Emmanuel II, King of Sardinia.—108

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas von (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher.—624

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb (1762-1814)—German philosopher.—624

Fickler, Joseph (1808-1865)—German journalist, democrat; a leader of the 1848-49 democratic movement in Baden; after the revolution emi-
grated to Switzerland and then to Britain and America.—488

Filmore, L.—Berlin correspondent of The Times (1853-54).—609

Fischbach—Russian general, commander of Russian troops on the Danube in 1853.—473

Fitzroy, Henry (1807-1859)—English politician, Peelite, Under-Secretary for Home Affairs from 1852 to 1855.—224, 225


Fletcher Ann.—469

Fletcher Margaret.—469

Fleury, Charles (real name: Carl Friedrich August Krause) (b. 1824)—London businessman, Prussian spy and police agent.—40, 82

Forbes, Charles—Scottish landowner.—415

Fox, Charles James (1749-1806)—British statesman, Whig leader; in 1783 Foreign Secretary in Portland’s Coalition Ministry (the Fox-North Ministry).—120, 150

Fox, William Johnson (1786-1864)—English politician and author, Free Trader, M.P.—597

Francis I (1494-1547)—King of France (1515-47).—59

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—108, 174, 418, 618

Frederick I (1826-1907)—virtual ruler of Baden from 1852, Grand Duke of Baden from 1856.—510

Frederick I ("Barbarossa" or "Redbeard") (c. 1123-1190)—King of Germany from 1152, Holy Roman Emperor (1155-90).—105, 359

Frederick III (1609-1670)—King of Denmark (1648-70).—238

Frederick VII (1808-1863)—King of Denmark (1848-63).—168, 227, 238, 241, 445

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—29, 30, 108, 209, 314, 509, 511, 602

Fuad Pasha, Mehemmed (1814-1869)—Turkish statesman; in the 1850s and 1860s repeatedly held the posts of Grand Vizier and Minister of Foreign Affairs.—5, 18, 106

G

Galway, George Edward Arundell (Monckton-Arundell), Viscount (1805-1876)—Irish peer, Tory M.P.—597

Gammage, Robert George (1815-1888)—shoemaker, a Chartist leader, author of The History of the Chartist Movement (1854).—170, 171

Garašanin, Ilija (1812-1874)—Serbian liberal statesman; Minister of the Interior (1843-52 and 1858-59), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1852-53 and 1861-67).—11, 228, 269

Geber, August—Mecklenburg joiner, member of the Communist League first in Switzerland and then in London; after the split in the League in 1850 joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group, member of its Central Committee.—500

George I (1660-1727)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27).—44, 45, 153

George II (1683-1760)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1727-1760).—44, 45, 153

George III (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820).—44, 45, 150, 153

Gerbex, Charles Léopold Dominique (1816-1879)—Swiss army officer, chief of the National Guard in the canton of Fribourg from 1852 onwards; directed the suppression of the putsch in Fribourg in 1853.—85

Gerlach, Wilhelm—German refugee in London, a worker at Hale’s rocket factory in a London suburb.—84

Germanos—Patriarch of the Greek Church in Constantinople (1852-53).—163

Géza (Gaysa) (c. 949-997)—ruler of Hungary (972-997); spread Christianity.—56

Ghica, Grigore Alexandru, Prince (1807-1857)—hospodar of Moldavia (1849-
53 and 1854-56).—235, 240, 277, 313, 538

Gibson, Thomas Milner (1806-1884)—British politician and statesman, Free Trader and later Liberal; Secretary of the Board of Trade (1859-65 and 1865-66).—58, 62, 69, 175

Girardin, Emile de (1806-1881)—French journalist and politician, editor of the newspaper La Presse; lacked principles in politics; during the 1848-49 revolution a republican and subsequently a Bonapartist.—109

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory and later Peelite, leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the nineteenth century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66), Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—44-49, 52-55, 58-66, 68-73, 75-81, 102, 115, 118, 119, 120, 146, 175, 177, 185, 186, 223, 281, 305, 330, 419, 597

Goderich—see Robinson, Frederick John

Godfrey of Bouillon (Godefroy de Bouillon) (c. 1060-1100)—Duke of Lower Lorraine (1089-1100), a leader of the first crusade (1096-99).—488

Godwin, Sir Henry Thomas (1784-1853)—British general, commander-in-chief of the British army during the second Burmese war (1852).—201

Goebbels, Charles—American writer of German descent; in the 1850s was close to the German petty-bourgeois democratic émigrés in the United States; co-author, with Theodor Poesche, of The New Rome, The United States of the World, published in 1852.—625

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832)—German poet.—132, 133

Goldhörm—Prussian police officer, secret agent of the Prussian police in London in the early 1850s.—82

Golovine (Golovin), Ivan Gavrilovich (1816-1886)—Russian liberal landowner, journalist; emigrated to England; close to Herzen and Bakunin in the 1840s and 1850s.—284, 290, 291

Gorchakoff (Gorchakov), Mikhail Dmitrievich, Prince (1793-1861)—Russian general, commander of the Russian troops on the Danube (1853-54) and commander-in-chief in the Crimea (February to December of 1855); governor of the Kingdom of Poland (1856-61).—174, 211, 235, 240, 310, 323, 336, 416, 417, 435, 445, 453, 458, 471, 474, 475, 538, 580, 589

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861)—British statesman, a Whig at the beginning of his career, later a Peelite; Home Secretary (1841-46), First Lord of the Admiralty (1830-34, 1852-55).—260, 593, 534, 611

Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe (1806-1880)—French journalist, unprincipled politician; Orleanist until the 1848 revolution, subsequently Bonapartist; deputy to the Legislative Corps during the Second Empire, contributed to Le Constitutionnel.—20

Granville, George Leveson-Gower, 2nd Earl of (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig, subsequently one of Liberal Party leaders; Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74 and 1880-85); Secretary of State for the Colonies (1868-70, 1886); President of the Council (1852-54).—192

Greeley, Horace (1811-1872)—American journalist and politician; founder and editor of the New-York Daily Tribune; subsequently abandoned radical views.—176

Greif—Prussian police officer; one of the chiefs of the Prussian secret service in London in the early 1850s.—40

Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl (1764-1845)—British statesman, a Whig leader, Prime Minister (1830-34).—375, 393

Grey, Sir George (1799-1882)—British Whig statesman; Home Secretary (1846-52, 1855-58 and 1861-66) and Secretary of State for the Colonies (1854-55).—188

Grey, Sir Henry George, 3rd Earl of (1802-1894)—British Whig statesman; Secretary-at-War (1835-39) and
Secretary of State for the Colonies (1846-52); son of Charles Grey.—186
Grillenzoni, Giovanni (1796-1868)—Italian revolutionary; follower of
Mazzini.—302
Grosvenor, Lord Robert, 1st Baron Ebury (1801-1893)—British politician, Whig,
later Liberal.—62
Gruber, Johann Gottfried (1774-1851)—German scientist, historian of literature.—59
Grundtvig, Nikolai Frederik Severin (1783-1872)—Danish theologian and poet; deputy to the Folketing.—101
Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; virtually directed France's foreign and home policy from 1840 to the February revolution of 1848.—20, 32, 87, 89, 203
Guriëff (Guriev), Dmitry Alexandrovich, Count (1751-1825)—Russian statesman, Minister of Finance (1810-23).—603
Guyon—see Khourschid Pasha
Günzel—German democrat; refugee in London in the early 1850s.—500
Gyulay, Ferenc, Count (1798-1868)—Austrian general, War Minister (1849-50).—174

H
Habsburgs (or Hapsburgs)—imperial dynasty of the Holy Roman Empire from 1273 to 1806 (with intervals), of Austria' (from 1804) and of Austria-Hungary (1867-1918).—16
Hackelberg, Otto, Baron von—Austrian naval officer, killed in Smyrna in 1853.—611
Hale, Robert—son and partner of William Hale.—82, 83, 84, 107
Hale, William—owner of a rocket factory in a London suburb.—82-84, 107
Halil Pasha (d. 1856)—Turkish military figure and statesman; kapudan Pasha (Naval Minister) (1854-55).—576
Halliday, Sir Frederick James (1806-1901)—East India Company official, Governor of Bengal (1854-59).—177
Hamelin, François Alphonse (1796-1864)—French admiral, commander-in-chief of the French fleet in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (1853-54); Minister of the Navy (1855-60).—553
Hampton—see Seymour, George Hamilton
Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph, Baron von (1774-1856)—Austrian orientalist, author of works on the history of Turkey.—22, 229
Hampden, John (1595-1643)—prominent figure in the English revolution, a leader of the Parliamentary opposition to the absolutist regime.—224
Hardinge, Sir Henry, Viscount (1785-1856)—British general, field marshal from 1855, Tory; Secretary for War (1828-30 and 1841-44); Governor-General of India (1844-47); commander-in-chief of the British army (1852-56).—559
Hardwicke, Charles Philip Yorke, 4th Earl of (1799-1873)—British naval officer and politician, Tory; admiral from 1854.—263
Hasenclever, Johann Peter (1810-1853)—German artist.—232
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—93, 481, 487, 624
Heinzen, Karl (1809-1880)—German radical journalist, participant in the 1849 uprising in Baden and the Palatinate; refugee in Switzerland and later in England; emigrated to the USA in autumn 1850.—626, 630
Heise, Hermann (d. 1860)—German democratic journalist, participant in the revolution of 1848-49, later a refugee in England.—502
Henry V (of France)—see Chambord
Henry, Sir Thomas (1807-1876)—British judge.—82, 84
Hentze, A.—German army officer, member of the Communist League; after the split in the League in 1850 joined the sectarian Willich-Schapper group; witness for the prosecution
at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—501, 502, 503

Heraclitus (c. 540-c. 480 B.C.)—Greek philosopher, a founder of dialectics.—630

Herbert, Sidney, Baron of Lea (1810-1861)—British statesman, Tory at the beginning of his career and later a Peelite; Secretary-at-War (1845-46 and 1852-55) and Secretary for War (1859-60).—58, 192

Herries, John Charles (1778-1855)—British statesman, Tory.—177, 368

Hergen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-1870)—Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher and writer.—284

Heytesbury—see A'Court, William

Hinckeldey, Karl Ludwig Friedrich von (1805-1856)—Prussian official, Police President of Berlin from 1848: President of the Police Department in the Ministry of the Interior from 1853.—28-30

Hirsch, Wilhelm—commercial clerk from Hamburg, Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.—40, 41, 43, 82, 481, 498, 500

Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679)—English philosopher.—597

Hobhouse, John Cam, Baron Broughton de Gyfford (1786-1869)—British Whig statesman, President of the Board of Control for India (1835-41 and 1846-52).—159, 183

Hogg, Sir James Weir (1790-1876)—British politician, Peelite; President of the Court of Directors of the East India Company (1846-47 and 1852-53).—123, 125, 223

Holland, Henry Richard Fox Vassall, Baron (1773-1840)—British Whig politician, member of the Ministries of Granville (1806-07), Grey (1830-34) and Melbourne (1834, 1835-40).—206, 207

Homer—semi-legendary Greek epic poet.—140, 488

Hooson, Edward—British worker, prominent Chartist.—170, 172

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B.C.)—Roman poet.—86

Horsfall, Thomas Berry (b. 1805)—British mine-owner and politician, Tory M.P.—413

Hotham, Beaumont, Baron (1794-1870)—British general; Tory M.P.—597

Hsien Feng (c. 1831-1861)—Emperor of China (1850-61).—95, 98

Hume, Joseph (1777-1855)—British politician, radical leader, M.P.—51, 69, 76, 125, 196, 358, 367, 369, 401, 405, 447

Hunt, Henry (1773-1835)—British politician, radical M.P.—358

Hunt, Thornton Leigh (1810-1873)—English radical journalist, participant in the Chartist movement in the 1840s and 1850s; co-founder with G.H. Lewes of the newspaper The Leader (1850).—525, 624

I

Ibrahim Pasha (1789-1848)—foster-son of the Viceroy of Egypt Mehmet Ali; Egyptian commander-in-chief during the war against Turkey (1831-33 and 1839-41); virtual ruler of Egypt from 1847.—360, 375, 376, 377, 379

Ingis, Sir Robert Harry (1786-1855)—British politician, Tory M.P.—177, 379

Ingraham, Duncan Nathaniel (1802-1891)—American naval officer, captain of the warship St. Louis which was anchored at Smyrna in 1853.—212, 293

Ioanidis—official of the Wallachian Ministry of Home Affairs in 1853.—277

Iskander-bey (1810-1861)—Turkish colonel of Polish descent; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated to Turkey after the defeat of the revolution; commanded Turkish troops on the Danube (1853-54), in the Crimea (1855), and in the Caucasus (1855-56).—294

Ismail Pasha (1805-1861)—Turkish general of Circassian descent.—458

Ismail Pasha (Gyorgy Kmety) (1810-1865)—Turkish general of Magyar
descent; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; Turkish commander on the Danube (1853-54) and in the Caucasus (1854-55).—602
Ivan IV (Ivan Vasilyevich, Ivan the Terrible) (1530-1584)—the first tsar of Russia (1547-84).—631-32
Izylmetieff (Izylmetyev) Ivan Nikolayevich (1813-1870)—Russian rear admiral, commander of the frigate Aurora in 1853-54.—533, 534
Izzet Pasha—Turkish general.—295

James, J.—British consul in Odessa in 1853-54.—571
Jean Paul (pen-name of Richter, Johann Paul Friedrich) (1763-1825)—German satirist.—623
Jocelyn, Robert, Viscount (1816-1854)—British officer, M.P.; secretary of the Board of Control for India (1845-46).—196, 197
John (Lackland) (c. 1167-1216)—King of England (1199-1216).—24
Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869)—prominent figure in the English working-class movement; proletarian poet and journalist, Left-wing Chartist leader; friend of Marx and Engels.—57, 58, 135, 136, 170-72, 196, 226, 414, 448, 462, 463, 470, 513, 514, 525, 612, 625

K
Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—624
Kara George (Karageorge) (1752-1817)—leader of the Serbs in the struggle against Turkish oppression in 1804-13, ruler of independent Serbia (1811-13); in 1813 was forced to leave Serbia and returned incognito in 1817; assassinated by order of Milosh Obrenovich.—36, 458
Karnicki, Wladislaw, Count—Austrian diplomat, chargé d'affaires in Berne in 1853.—107, 108
Kellner von Köllenstein, Friedrich, Baron (b. 1802)—Austrian general, aide-de-camp of Emperor Francis Joseph I from 1849.—618
Keogh, William Nicholas (1817-1878)—Irish lawyer and politician, a leader of the Irish group in Parliament; repeatedly held high judicial posts in Ireland.—120
Kepler, Johannes (1571-1630)—German astronomer.—93
Khalchinsky, Ivan Dmitrievich (1810-1856)—Russian diplomat, consul-general in Moldavia and Wallachia in 1853.—235
Khourschid Pasha (Gyuon, Richard Debaufre) (1803-1856)—Turkish general of British descent, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; Turkish commander in the Caucasus in 1853.—458
Khuli-Khan—see Nadir Shah
Kinkel, Johann Gottfried (1815-1882)—German poet and journalist, democrat; participant in the 1849 uprising in Baden and the Palatinate; sentenced to life imprisonment by Prussian court; escaped from prison and emigrated to England; a leader of petty-bourgeois émigrés in London; opposed Marx and Engels.—43, 485, 488, 489, 500, 502
Kinkel, Johanna (née Mockel) (1810-1858)—German writer, wife of Gottfried Kinkel.—485
Kisseleff (Kiselev), Nikolai Dmitrievich (1800-1869)—Russian diplomat, ambassador to Paris (1851-54).—115, 574, 608
Knight, Henry Gally (1786-1846)—English traveller and writer, M.P.—362
Korniloff (Kornilov), Vladimir Alexeyevich (1806-1854)—Russian admiral, Chief of Staff of the Black Sea Fleet (1849-53); organised the defence of Sevastopol.—5, 549, 571
Kościelski, Władysław (b. 1820)—Polish democrat; emigrant; later a general in the Turkish army.—285
Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation
movement, headed bourgeois-democratic elements during the 1848-49 revolution; head of the Hungarian revolutionary government; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and then to England and the USA.—42, 57, 68, 83, 84, 390, 494, 559

Koszta, Martin (d. 1858)—participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey and then to the USA, where he became a US citizen; the attempt of the Austrian authorities to arrest him in Smyrna in 1853 led to a clash with Hungarian refugees.—193, 211, 243, 258, 293

Kraemer, Georgi—Russian consul-general in London (1853).—82

Kupffer, Adolf Yakovlevich (1799-1865)—Russian physicist and mineralogist; headed a scientific expedition to the Elbrus in 1829.—392

La Fayette, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, marquis de (1757-1834)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, a leader of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); took part in the July revolution of 1830.—58

Lagrené, Théodore Marie Melchior Joseph de (1800-1862)—French diplomat; official of the French legation in St. Petersburg in 1831-34; for some time performed the functions of the chargé d'affaires.—383

La Guérinonnière, Louis Étienne Arthur Dubreuil Hélion, vicomte de (1816-1875)—French political writer, Bonapartist in the 1850s.—209

Lamarche, Hippolyte Dumas de (b. 1789)—French journalist; contributed to Le Siècle.—110

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; a moderate republican leader in the 1840s; Minister of Foreign Affairs and virtually head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—58

Landolphe—French petty-bourgeois socialist, refugee in London; after the split in the Communist League in 1850 joined the sectarian Willich-Schapper group.—506

Lansdowne, Sir Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, Marquis of (1780-1863)—British statesman, Whig; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1806-07); President of the Council (1830-41, 1846-52); Minister without portfolio (1852-63).—252, 598

Larochejaquelein (La Rochejaquelein), Henri Auguste Georges Du Vergier, marquis de (1805-1867)—French politician, a Legitimist leader; deputy to the Constituent Assembly during the Second Republic, senator during the Second Empire.—589

Lavalette (La Valette), Charles Jean Marie Félix, marquis de (1806-1881)—French statesman, Bonapartist; ambassador to Constantinople (1851-53); Minister of the Interior (1865-67); Minister of Foreign Affairs (1868-69).—269

Layard, Sir Austen Henry (1817-1894)—British archaeologist and politician; Radical, subsequently Liberal; M.P.—185, 186, 192, 202, 266, 268-71, 597

Lazareff (Lazarev), Mikhail Petrovich (1788-1851)—Russian admiral, Antarctic explorer; commander-in-chief of the Black Sea Fleet from 1833.—398

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French journalist and politician, a petty-bourgeois democrat leader; editor of La Réforme; Minister
of the Interior in the Provisional Government (1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Montagnards); emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849.—421, 495, 505, 540

Leeds—see Osborne, Sir Thomas

Leiningen-Westerburg, Christian Franz Seraphin Vincenz, Count (1812-1856)—Austrian general; sent on a diplomatic mission to Constantinople in 1853.—18, 262, 616, 618, 619

Leonidas (c. 508-480 B.C.)—King of Sparta (c. 488-480 B.C.), hero of the battle of Thermopylae during the Greco-Persian war.—624, 630

Leopold I (1790-1865)—King of the Belgians (1831-65).—108, 204, 254, 538

Leopold Louis Philippe Marie Victor (1835-1909)—eldest son of Leopold I, King of Belgium under the name of Leopold II (1865-1909).—254

Letellier, A.—French journalist.—210

Libeny (Libény), János (c. 1832-1853)—Hungarian tailor; attempted to assassinate the Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria in 1853.—30

Liddell, Henry George, 2nd Earl of Ravensworth (1821-1903)—British politician, M.P.—187

Lieven, Darya (Dorothea) Khristoforovna, Princess (1785-1857)—wife of Russian diplomat Khristofor Lieven, hostess of political salons in London and Paris.—21

Lieven, Khristofor Andreyevich, Prince (1774-1839)—Russian diplomat, envoy to Berlin (1810-12); ambassador to London (1812-34).—165, 167, 230, 355, 374, 379, 381

Lieven, Wilhelm Karlovich, Baron (1800-1880)—Russian general, sent on diplomatic missions abroad.—314

Liprandi, Pavel Petrovich (1796-1864)—Russian general, commander of Russian troops on the Danube and in the Crimea during the Crimean war.—472

Liverpool, Robert Banks Jenkinson, 2nd Earl of (1770-1828)—British statesman, a Tory leader; Home Secretary (1804-09); Secretary for War and the Colonies (1809-12); Prime Minister (1812-27).—348

Lizius—book-publisher in Frankfurt am Main.—43

Lochner, Georg (born c. 1824)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement, joiner by trade; member of the Communist League and of the General Council of the First International, friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—499

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—70

Louis Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Louis Napoleon—see Napoleon III

Louis Philippe I (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of the French (1830-48).—4, 148, 149, 166, 203, 254

Louise (1817-1898)—Princess of Hesse, wife of Prince Christian of Glücksburg, later King of Denmark.—238

Loustatlot, Elisée (1762-1790)—French democratic journalist, a Jacobin leader in the French Revolution.—108

Lowe, Robert, 1st Viscount Sherbrooke (1811-1892)—British statesman and journalist, contributor to The Times; Whig and later Liberal; M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer (1868-73); Home Secretary 1873-74).—223

Lucas, Frederick (1812-1855)—Irish journalist and politician, a leader of the Irish Tenant-Right movement; M.P. (1852-55).—119

Lüders, Alexander Nikolayevich, Count (1790-1874)—Russian general, commander of a corps on the Danube (1853-54) and of the Southern army (1855); in December 1855 commander-in-chief of the Russian army in the Crimea.—455, 473

Lund—Yorkshire manufacturer.—413

Lusignan, Levon—Armenian prince, political adventurer; in 1853 a refugee in England.—138

Lytton, Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer-Lytton, 1st Baron (1803-
1873)—British writer and politician; at the beginning of his career a Whig and from 1852 a Tory; M.P.—597

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Baron (1800-1859)—English historian and politician, Whig M.P.; as member of the Supreme Council of India (1834-38) took part in drafting a penal code for India, which was adopted in 1860.—122, 181, 597

MacDonnell, Mrs.—Scottish landowner.—414

MacGregor, James—M.P. (1852-53).—58

MacGregor, John (1797-1857)—Scottish statistician and historian, Free Trader, M.P.; promoter of the Royal British Bank (1849-56).—597

Mackinnon, William Alexander (1789-1870)—British politician; at the beginning of his career a Tory and later a Liberal; M.P.—597

McNeill, Sir John (1795-1883)—British diplomat, envoy to Teheran (1836-42).—357, 364

Maddock, Sir Thomas Herbert (1792-1870)—British politician, M.P.—223

Madier—French mechanic; democrat; a refugee in Britain in the early 1850s.—507

Mahmud II (1785-1839)—Sultan of Turkey (1808-39).—163, 165, 166, 204, 355, 356, 372-77, 388, 530

Mahon, Philip Henry Stanhope, Viscount (1805-1875)—British politician and historian, Peelite, M.P.; Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (1834-35).—376, 377, 392, 393

Malcolm, Sir John (1769-1833)—British diplomat and official, sent on missions to Teheran (1799-1801, 1808-09 and 1810); governor of Bombay (1826-30); author of several works on India.—198

Malet, Claude François de (1754-1812)—French general and politician; Republican, headed the anti-Bonapartist conspiracy of 1812, for which he was executed.—540

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834)—English clergyman, economist, founder of a misanthropic population theory.—247, 326, 448, 460, 461

Mandeville, John H.—secretary of the British Embassy in Constantinople in 1853.—406

Mano, Janku—Wallachian Minister of Foreign Affairs (1850-54).—277

Manteuffel, Karl Otto, Baron von (1806-1879)—Prussian statesman; Deputy Minister of the Interior (1851-53); Minister of Agriculture (1854-58); brother of Otto Theodor Manteuffel.—29, 30

Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1848-50), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1850-58).—29, 30, 37, 509

Maria Cristina, eldest (1806-1878)—wife of the Spanish King Ferdinand VII; Regent of Spain (1833-40).—370

Maria II da Gloria (1819-1853)—Queen of Portugal (1826-28 and 1834-53).—370

Maria Luisa Fernanda (1832-1897)—Infanta, sister of Queen Isabella II of Spain, wife of the Duke of Montpensier.—367

Maria Nikolayevna (1819-1876)—daughter of Nicholas I, wife of the Duke of Leuchtenberg.—255

Marie Antoinette (1755-1793)—Queen of France (1774-93), wife of Louis XVI; executed during the French Revolution.—465

Marie Henriette (1836-1902)—Archduchess of Austria, wife of the King of the Belgians Leopold II.—254, 308

Martens, Georg Friedrich von (1756-1821)—German lawyer, diplomat
and writer; author of *Recueil de traités*...—372

Martin, Sir William Fanshawe (1801-1895)—British admiral, Superintendent of the Portsmouth Dockyard in 1853.—533

Marx, Francis Joseph Peter (1816-1876)—English landowner, conservative journalist; friend and associate of David Urquhart.—284

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881)—wife of Karl Marx.—41


Masséna, André, Duke of Rivoli, Prince of Essling (1756-1817)—French marshal, participant in the Napoleonic wars.—426, 455

Matthews, John—English worker, Chartist.—462

Maupas, Charles-Auguste Emile de (1818-1888)—French lawyer, Bonapartist, Prefect of the Paris police (1851); one of the organisers of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of Police (1852-53).—28, 30

Maurageni—Turkish diplomat, chargé d'affaires in Vienna in the early 1830s.—374

Mayer, P.—French journalist.—507

Mayne, Sir Richard (1796-1868)—London Chief of Police from 1850.—288

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, bourgeois democrat, head of the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London in 1850; in the early 1850s sought support of the Bonapartists but later opposed them.—3, 4, 37, 38, 57, 91, 107, 509, 511, 512

Mehemet Mutergim Pasha—Turkish statesman, War Minister in early 1853.—110

Mehemet Ali (or Mohammed Ali) (1769-1849)—Viceroy of Egypt (1805-49); carried out several progressive reforms; waged wars against the Sultan of Turkey (1831-33 and 1839-40).—195, 203-05, 207, 360, 373, 375, 376, 377, 529

Mehemet Ali Pasha (1807-1868)—Turkish statesman, Grand Vizier (1852-53); War Minister (1853-54).—104, 203-05, 325, 360, 373, 375, 376, 377, 529

Melanchthon, Philipp (1497-1560)—German theologian, close associate of Luther; together with him adapted Lutheranism to the princes' interests.—488

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848)—British statesman, Whig; Home Secretary (1830-34), Prime Minister (1834 and 1835-41).—207, 306, 611

Menchikoff (Menshikov), Alexander Sergeevich, Prince (1787-1869)—Russian general and statesman; Ambassador Extraordinary in Constantinople (1853); commander-in-chief of the Russian army and navy in the Crimea (1853-55).—4, 5, 18, 39, 105, 109, 110, 112, 137, 138, 142, 143, 145, 193, 228, 261, 262, 263, 266, 267, 269, 270, 313, 322, 323, 416, 523, 529, 571, 589, 616, 619, 631

Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1773-1859)—Austrian diplomat and statesman; Foreign Minister (1809-21), Chancellor (1821-48); one of the founders of the Holy Alliance.—32, 87, 89, 166, 207, 354, 386, 533, 586

Meyendorff, Pyotr Kazimirovich, Baron (1796-1863)—Russian diplomat, envoy to Vienna (1850-54).—193, 246, 267, 314, 323, 577

Miall, Edward (1809-1881)—English author, preacher of non-conformism,
M.P.; flirted with the Chartists in the 1840s.—597
Michell, William—English physician, M.P.—598
Miguel, Maria Evarist (1802-1866)—King of Portugal (1828-34).—355
Mill, James (1773-1836)—British economist and philosopher.—150
Miller, Joseph or Josias (commonly called Joe Miller) (1684-1738)—English comic actor.—68
Milner Gibson—see Gibson, Thomas Milner
Milnes, Richard Monckton, 1st Baron Haughton (1809-1885)—English author and politician, M.P.; at the beginning of his career a Tory, in the latter half of the 19th century a Liberal.—272, 280, 366, 597
Mindon—Burmese King (1853-78).—282, 283
Minié, Claude Étienne (1804-1879)—French army officer and military inventor.—475
Minto, Gilbert Elliot, 2nd Earl of (1782-1859)—British diplomat and statesman, Whig; First Lord of the Admiralty (1835-41); Lord Privy Seal (1846-52).—207
Miskowsky, Henryk Ludvic (d. 1854)—Polish army officer, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated to Turkey after the revolution and later to London.—494, 495
Mitchell, John (1815-1875)—Irish revolutionary democrat, Left-wing leader of Young Ireland; deported to a penal colony in 1848; escaped in 1853 and emigrated to the USA.—302
Molesworth, Sir William (1810-1855)—British statesman, Liberal; First Commissioner of the Board of Works (1853); Secretary of State for the Colonies (1855).—50, 192, 256, 597
Monck, Sir Charles Stanley, Fourth Viscount Monck in Irish peerage, First Baron Monck in peerage of the United Kingdom (1819-1894)—British statesman, Liberal; Lord of the Treasury (1855-58).—597
Monrad, Ditlev Gothard (1811-1887)—Danish bishop, Minister of Worship (1848 and 1859-63), Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (1863-64); leader of the National-Liberal Party in the 1850s.—445
Monsell, William, Baron Emly (1812-1894)—Irish Liberal, a leader of the Irish faction in Parliament; clerk of ordnance (1852-57).—120
Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de (1810-1870)—French politician and writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Orleanist.—615
Montpensier, Antoine Marie Philippe Louis d’Orléans, duc de (1824-1890)—son of King Louis Philippe of the French, and husband of the Spanish Infanta Maria Luisa Fernanda; pretender to the Spanish throne in 1868-69.—367
Morison, James (1770-1840)—English quack who made a fortune selling “Morison’s pills”.—482
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)—Austrian composer.—372
Müllner, Amadeus Gottfried Adolf (1774-1829)—German poet, playwright and literary critic.—43
Mun, Thomas (1571-1641)—English merchant and economist, mercantilist; a Director of the East India Company from 1615.—152
Munro, Sir Thomas (1761-1827)—British general, governor of Madras (1819-27).—197-98
Muntz, George Frederick (1794-1857)—English radical, M.P.; organised a number of mass meetings in support of the campaign for the Reform Bill of 1832.—273
Murat, Joachim (1767-1815)—Marshal of France (1804); King of Naples (1808-15).—554
Murat, Napoléon Lucien Charles, Prince (1803-1878)—French politician, Bonapartist, cousin of Napoleon III.—554
Mure, William (1799-1860)—English philologist and historian, Tory M.P.—597

Mussurus Bey—Turkish ambassador to Britain (1851-56).—601

Mustafa Pasha (born c. 1796)—Turkish statesman, Grand Vizier (1853-54).—313, 325

Nachimoff (Nakhimov), Pavel Stepanovich (1802-1855)—Russian admiral, commander of the Russian squadron at the battle of Sinope; an organiser and leader of the defence of Sevastopol (1854-55).—548, 549

Nadir Shah (Khuli-Khan) (1688-1747)—Shah of Persia (1736-47); invaded India in 1738-39.—122, 126

Naeff, Wilhelm (1802-1881)—Swiss statesman; President of the Swiss Confederation in 1853.—107-08

Namick Pasha—Turkish politician; sent on a diplomatic mission to London in October 1832.—374

Napier, Sir Charles (1786-1860)—British admiral; fought in the wars against Portugal (1810 and 1834) and Syria (1840); commander of the British fleet in the Baltic in 1854.—609

Napier, Sir Joseph (1804-1882)—British politician, Tory M.P., Attorney-General for Ireland (1852); Lord Chancellor for Ireland (1858-59).—252

Napoleon I (Bonaparte) (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815).—5, 6, 353, 362, 368, 452, 474, 538, 541


Nasr-ed-Din (1831-1896)—Shah of Persia (1848-96).—245, 408, 560

Naut, Stephan Adolf—Cologne merchant, one of the responsible editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung.—501

Nefftzer, Auguste (1820-1876)—French journalist, contributor to La Presse (1844-57 and 1859-61).—243

Nemours, Louis Charles Philippe Raphaél, duc de (1814-1896)—second son of King Louis Philippe of France.—538, 577

Nepokoichitsky, Artur Adamovich (1813-1881)—Russian general; fought in the Crimean war.—5

Nesselrode, Dmitry Karlovich, Count—Russian diplomat, son of Karl Vasilyevich Nesselrode.—5

Nesselrode, Karl Vasilyevich, Count (1780-1862)—Russian diplomat and statesman; Foreign Minister (1816-56); State Chancellor from 1845 onwards.—18, 164-65, 175, 192, 194, 196, 203, 205, 206, 209, 210, 227, 237, 242, 246, 258, 262, 301, 314, 322, 323, 324, 383, 394, 397, 404, 406, 409, 416, 594, 631

Neumann, Philipp, Baron von (b. 1778)—Austrian diplomat and statesman.—207

Newcastle, Henry Pelham Fiennes Pelham Clinton, 5th Duke of (1811-1864)—British statesman, Peelite; Chief Secretary for Ireland (1846), Secretary for War and the Colonies (1852-54), Colonial Secretary (1859-64).—252, 325

Newman, Francis William (1805-1897)—English professor of philology and writer, radical.—161

Newton, Sir Isaac (1642-1727)—English physicist, astronomer and mathematician.—93

Name Index


Nírod—Russian general; commander on the Danube in 1853.—473

Norfolk, Henry Charles Howard, 13th Duke of (1791-1856)—Whig M.P. (1829-41), Lord Steward (1853-54).—559-60, 598

Normanby, Constantine Henry Phipps, 1st Marquess of (1797-1863)—British statesman, Whig; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1835-39); Secretary for War and the Colonies (1839), Home Secretary (1839-41); in 1846-52, ambassador to Paris.—367

Nörner—Prussian law officer in the early 1850s.—82

North, Frederick, 2nd Earl of Guilford (1732-1792)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1767), Prime Minister (1770-82); Home Secretary in Portland’s Coalition Cabinet (Fox-North Cabinet).—120, 150

O

Obrenović—dynasty of princes (1817-42 and 1858-82) and kings (1882-1903) of Serbia.—574, 586

Obrenović, Mihailo (1823-1868)—Prince of Serbia (1839-42 and 1860-68).—228, 269, 574, 586

Obrenović, Miloš (1780-1860)—Prince of Serbia (1817-39 and 1858-60).—36, 574, 586

O’Brien, William Smith (1803-1864)—prominent figure in the Irish national liberation movement, Right-wing leader of Young Ireland; sentenced to death, commuted to life deportation; amnestied in 1856.—302, 367

Obrucheff (Obruchev), Alexander Afanasyevich—Russian general.—572, 584

O’Connor, Feargus Edward (1794-1855)—Left-wing Chartist leader, editor-in-chief of The Northern Star; reformist after 1848.—57, 58, 525

O’Donnell—British general.—295

Oersted, Anders Sandøe (1778-1860)—Danish lawyer and statesman; Prime Minister (1853-54).—445, 594

Offley, E.S.—American consul in Smyrna (1853).—211-12

Olga Nikolayevna (1822-1892)—daughter of Nicholas I and wife of Karl Friedrich Alexander, Prince of Württemberg and subsequently King Charles I of Württemberg.—255

Oliveira, Benjamin (b. 1806)—British M.P.—597


Orléans—royal dynasty in France (1830-48).—544, 577

Orléans, Hélène Louise Elizabeth de Mecklenbourg-Schwerin, duchesse d’Orléans (1814-1858)—widow of Ferdinand, eldest son of Louis Philippe, and mother of the Count of Paris, pretender to the French throne.—254

Orloff (Orlov), Alexei Fyodorovich, Count, after 1856—Prince (1786-1861)—Russian general and statesman; signed the treaties of Adrianople (1829) and Unkia-Skelessi (1833) with Turkey; headed the Russian delegation to the Paris Congress (1856).—372, 383, 390, 601, 606, 609, 613, 614

Orsini, Felice (1819-1858)—Italian democrat, republican; executed for his attempt to assassinate Napoleon III.—511

Osborne, Sir Thomas, successively 1st Earl of Danby, Marquis of Carmarthen, Duke of Leeds (1631-1712)—British

Liberal wing of the national liberation movement.—57, 402, 611
Tory statesman; Prime Minister (1674-79 and 1690-95); charged with bribery by Parliament in 1695.—149, 390

Osman Pasha (c. 1785-c. 1860)—Turkish admiral; commander of the Turkish squadron at the battle of Sinope.—550

Osman Pasha—governor of Aleppo in 1853.—279

Osten-Sacken, Dmitry Yerofeyevich, Count (1789-1881)—Russian general; commander in the South of Russia during the Crimean war (1853-54) and of the Sevastopol garrison (late 1854 and 1855).—473, 564, 580

Otto I (1815-1867)—Prince of Bavaria, King of Greece (1832-62).—371

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—British utopian socialist.—612

Ozeroff (Ozerov)—Russian diplomat, acting chargé d'affaires in Constantinople in 1853.—18, 618

Paixhans, Henri Joseph (1783-1854)—French general, military engineer and inventor.—556

Pakington, Sir John Somerset (1799-1880)—British statesman, Tory, later Conservative; Secretary for War and the Colonies (1852); First Lord of the Admiralty (1858-59 and 1866-67) and Secretary for War (1867-68).—3, 58, 74, 223, 265, 271

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman; at the beginning of his career a Tory, from 1830 onwards a Whig leader; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1848-51); Home Secretary (1852-55), and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65).—3, 20, 26, 32, 33, 58, 59, 68, 144-46, 188, 189, 192, 205-08, 226, 234, 246, 255, 256, 276, 277, 280, 295, 303, 304, 309, 310, 311, 312, 325, 345-87, 388, 389, 390, 393, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 419, 470, 477, 525, 527, 529, 531, 533, 534, 537, 543-46, 554, 566, 567, 591, 592, 597, 606, 607, 608

Paradis, Jean Baptiste (b. 1827)—French journalist, contributed to La Presse in 1853.—228

Paskiewich (Paskevich), Ivan Fyodorovich, Prince (1782-1856)—Russian field marshal-general; from June 1831, commander-in-chief of the Tsarist army suppressing the Polish insurrection; governor of the Kingdom of Poland from 1832; commander-in-chief of the army suppressing the revolution in Hungary (1849), and of the Russian forces on the Danube (1854).—424, 429, 602

Pawloff (Pavlov), Prokofy Yakovlevich (1796-1868)—Russian general; Russian commander on the Danube and in the Crimea during the Crimean war.—458, 472

Peace—employee of the Earl of Crawford, a mine-owner.—447

Peacock, Sir Barnes (1810-1890)—English lawyer; held high posts in the Indian colonial administration and justice department in the 1850s and 1860s.—122-23

Pedro I (1798-1834)—Emperor of Brazil (1822-31); King of Portugal under the name of Pedro IV (1826); abdicated in favour of his daughter, Maria II da Gloria.—370

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)—British statesman; moderate Tory; Prime Minister (1834-35 and 1841-46); repealed the Corn Laws in 1846.—60, 71, 181, 254, 292, 296-97, 298, 299, 300, 314, 358, 365, 369, 371, 375, 376, 382, 384, 404, 405, 406, 409, 436, 611

Peel, Sir Robert (1822-1895)—British politician and diplomat, son of Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel; in the early 1850s a Peelite; M.P.—137

Pélissier, Aimable Jean Jacques (1794-1864)—French general, marshal from 1855; participated in the conquest of Algeria in 1830-50; commander-in-chief of the French army in the Crimea (May 1855-July 1856).—610
Pellatt, Apsley (1791-1863) — English manufacturer, radical M.P. — 170
Pellier, Am. — French journalist. — 318
Perceval, Spencer (1762-1812) — British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1807-09); Prime Minister (1809-12). — 348
Perczel, Moritz (Mor) (1811-1899) — Hungarian general; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary, after its defeat emigrated to Turkey and in 1851 to Britain. — 42
Pericles (c. 490-429 B.C.) — Athenian statesman. — 371
Perowski (Perovsky), Vasily Alexeyevich (1795-1857) — Russian general; military governor of Orenburg (1833-42); Governor-General of the Orenburg and Samara gubernias (1851-57); headed a military expedition to Khiva in 1839-40. — 444
Perrier, Charles Nicolas Ferdinand (1812-1882) — Swiss officer and conservative writer; a leader of the Fribourg putsch (1853). — 85
Persigny, Jean Gilbert Victor Fialin, comte (1808-1872) — French statesman, Bonapartist; one of the organisers of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (1852-54 and 1860-63). — 587
Peter I (the Great) (1672-1725) — Russian Tsar (1682-1721); Emperor of Russia from 1721. — 72, 73, 150, 151, 179
Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878) — Pope (1846-78). — 119, 302, 554, 615
Poesche, Theodor (1826-1899) — German statistician, democrat, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution; co-author, with Ch. Goepp, of The New Rome. The United States of the World. — 625
Pollexfen, John (born c. 1638) — English merchant and economist; advocated abolition of the East India Company's monopoly. — 153
Ponsonby, Sir John, Viscount (c. 1770-1855) — British diplomat; envoy to Naples (1832); ambassador to Constantinople (1832-41) and Vienna (1846-50). — 377, 381, 388, 405
Portland, William Henry Cavendish Bentinck, 3rd Duke of (1738-1809) — British statesman, Whig; Home Secretary (1794-1801); Prime Minister (1783 and 1807-09). — 348
Potemkin, Grigory Alexandrovich, Prince (1739-1791) Russian statesman, field marshal-general from 1784; directed the colonisation of the Southern territories incorporated into Russia. — 404
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865) — French writer, economist and sociologist, founder of anarchism. — 625
Pulszky, Ferenc (1814-1897) — Hungarian politician, writer and archaeologist, a Pole by birth; took part in the
Pierse. — 598

Pindar (c. 518-c. 442 B.C.) — Greek lyric poet, famous for his odes. — 348, 500
Pirenz — Austrian consul in Sinope (1854). — 571
Pitt, William (1759-1806) — British Tory statesman; Prime Minister (1783-1801 and 1804-06). — 72, 73, 150, 151, 179
Pindar (c. 518-c. 442 B.C.) — Greek lyric poet, famous for his odes. — 348, 500
Pirenz — Austrian consul in Sinope (1854). — 571
Pitt, William (1759-1806) — British Tory statesman; Prime Minister (1783-1801 and 1804-06). — 72, 73, 150, 151, 179
Piess IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878) — Pope (1846-78). — 119, 302, 554, 615
Poesche, Theodor (1826-1899) — German statistician, democrat, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution; co-author, with Ch. Goepp, of The New Rome. The United States of the World. — 625
Pollexfen, John (born c. 1638) — English merchant and economist; advocated abolition of the East India Company's monopoly. — 153
Ponsonby, Sir John, Viscount (c. 1770-1855) — British diplomat; envoy to Naples (1832); ambassador to Constantinople (1832-41) and Vienna (1846-50). — 377, 381, 388, 405
Portland, William Henry Cavendish Bentinck, 3rd Duke of (1738-1809) — British statesman, Whig; Home Secretary (1794-1801); Prime Minister (1783 and 1807-09). — 348
Potemkin, Grigorii Alexandrovich, Prince (1739-1791) Russian statesman, field marshal-general from 1784; directed the colonisation of the Southern territories incorporated into Russia. — 404
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865) — French writer, economist and sociologist, founder of anarchism. — 625
Pulszky, Ferenc (1814-1897) — Hungarian politician, writer and archaeologist, a Pole by birth; took part in the
Pierse. — 598
Hungarian revolution of 1848-49; emigrated after its suppression; contributed to the *New-York Daily Tribune* in the 1850s; returned to Hungary in 1867 after an amnesty, deputy to the Diet (1867-76 and 1884-97).—478

**R**

*Radetzky, Josef, Count of Radetz* (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal; commander of the Austrian forces in North Italy from 1831; suppressed the Italian national liberation movement in 1848-49; Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venice (1850-56).—37, 39, 459

*Raffles, Sir Thomas Stamford* (1781-1826)—British colonial official; governor of Java from 1811 to 1816; author of *The History of Java*.—126, 131

*Ramorino, Gerolamo* (1792-1849)—Italian general, commander of the Piedmontese army during the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; his tactics contributed to the victory of the Austrian counter-revolutionary army. —459

*Raymond, Louis Anne Xavier* (b. 1812)—French journalist; contributed to the *Journal des Débats*.—105

*Redcliffe—see Stratford de Redcliffe*

*Reeve, Henry* (1813-1895)—English journalist and official; in 1853 Registrar in the Privy Council.—310, 318, 321

*Reichenbach, Oskar, Count of* (b. 1815)—Silesian landowner, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848-49; emigrated to England in 1850, then to America.—489

*Reid, Thomas Mayne* (1818-1883)—English writer.—84

*Rempel, Rudolph* (1815-1868)—German manufacturer, a “true socialist” in the mid-1840s.—501

*Reshid Pasha* (1802-1858)—Turkish statesman; repeatedly held the posts of Grand Vizier and Foreign Minister.—105, 109, 174, 211, 228, 229, 246, 257, 261, 267, 268, 278, 279, 292, 313, 325, 407, 417, 523, 528, 575, 576

*Reuter, Max*—Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.—482

*Reventlow-Criminil, Heinrich Anna, Count* (1798-1869)—Danish statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (1842-48); Minister for Holstein (1852-54).—574

*Ricardo, David* (1772-1823)—English economist.—161, 162, 448, 627

*Richard I (Coeur de Lion)* (1157-1199)—King of England (1189-99).—105

*Richard III* (1452-1485)—King of England (1483-85).—103

*Richards, Alfred Bate* (signed himself ‘An Englishman’) (1820-1876)—English playwright and journalist; opposed Cobden and the Manchester School. —68, 146, 212, 240, 536, 594

*Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis, duc de* (1585-1642)—French cardinal and statesman during the period of absolutism.—230

*Richmond, Charles Gordon-Lennox, 15th Duke of* (1791-1860)—British politician; Tory, protectionist.—598

*Rifaat Pasha, Sadik* (1798-1855)—Turkish statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (March to May 1853).—18, 110

*Riza Pasha* (1809-1859)—Turkish general and statesman; repeatedly held the post of War Minister in the 1840s and 1850s.—576

*Robinson, Frederick John, Viscount Goderich, afterwards 1st Earl of Ripon* (1782-1859)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1823-27); Prime Minister (1827-28).—348, 525

*Roden, Robert Jocelyn, 3rd Earl of* (1788-1870)—English aristocrat, Conservative.—252

*Roebuck, John Arthur* (1801-1879)—British politician and journalist, radical M. P.—390, 401, 577

*Ronalds, Charles*—English lawyer.—533

*Ronge, Johannes* (1813-1887)—German clergyman, petty-bourgeois democrat,
a founder of the “German-Catholics” movement; participated in the revolution of 1848-49; after its defeat emigrated to Britain.—488

Rose, Hugh Henry, Baron Strathnairn (1801-1885)—British officer, later field marshal; chargé d’affaires in Constantinople (1852-53); took part in the Crimean war; organised the suppression of the national liberation movement in India (1857-59).—5, 145, 261, 266

Rohlacker, Wilhelm—German democrat, member of the Communist League; emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution of 1848-49.—486, 487

Roussin, Albin Reine, baron (1781-1854)—French admiral, Minister of the Navy (1840, 1843); ambassador to Constantinople (1832-34).—372

Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880)—German radical journalist, Young Hegelian; left-wing deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848; a leader of German petty-bourgeois émigrés in Britain in the 1850s; national-liberal after 1866.—488, 624

Ruriks—dynasty of Russian princes and subsequently tsars (912-1598), descended from Rurik, a semi-legendary Varangian leader.—230

Russell, Sir Henry (1751-1836)—English lawyer, judge in India (1798-1813).—198


Ruston, Benjamin (d. 1853)—English worker, Chartist.—172, 173

Sadleir, John (1814-1856)—Irish banker and politician, a leader of the Irish group in Parliament; Junior Lord of Treasury (1853).—120, 560

Saint-Marc, Girardin (1801-1873)—French journalist and literary critic, Orleanist.—117

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—628

Salt, Sir Titus (1803-1876)—English manufacturer.—327, 414

Sand, George (pen-name of Amandine Aurore Lucie Dupin, baronne Dudevant) (1804-1876)—French novelist, representative of the democratic trend in romanticism.—284, 285

Sardanapalus—see Assurbanipal

Saunders, John—London police-sergeant.—83

Schapper, Karl (c. 1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; a leader of the sectarian group during the split in the Communist League in 1850; again became a close associate of Marx in 1856; member of the General Council of the First International.—482, 485, 493, 497, 505

Schärttner, August—a Hanau cooper, participant in the 1848 revolution and the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; emigrated to London; member of the Communist League; after its split in 1850 joined the Willich-Schapper sectarian group, and became a member of its Central Committee.—489

Schiller, Charles—French journalist.—109, 236, 240, 407

Schily, Viktor (1810-1875)—German lawyer, democrat; participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849, then a refugee in France; member of the First International.—486, 502

Schimmelpfennig, Alexander (1824-1865)—Prussian army officer, democrat; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849 and later
emigrated to the USA; adhered to theWillich-Schapper sectarian group; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—501, 505

Schläger, Eduard—German journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; a refugee in the USA in the 1850s-1870s; editor of the Neu-England-Zeitung.—623, 630

Schlick, Franz Heinrich, Count (1789-1862)—Austrian general; took part in suppressing the revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary; commanded the Austrian forces in Galicia and Bukovina (1854-59).—587

Schneider II, Karl—German lawyer, democrat, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; defence counsel at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—485, 493, 494, 496, 502

Schramm, Konrad (c. 1822-1858)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement, member of the Communist League; a refugee in London from 1849; responsible editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—492, 493, 494, 496, 503

Schwarzenberg, Friedrich, Prince (1800-1870)—Austrian army officer and later general; took part in suppressing the peasant riots in Galicia (1846) and the revolution in Hungary (1849).—366

Sidmouth, Henry Addington, 1st Viscount (1757-1844)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer (1801-04); Home Secretary (1812-21).—348

Sidney—see Herbert, Sidney

Sidney, Sir Philip (1554-1586)—English poet and diplomat.—276

Shafi Khan—Persian diplomat; envoy to London in 1853.—444

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—103, 272, 276, 327, 345, 373, 385, 508

Shamyl (c. 1798-1871)—leader of the Daghestan and Chechen mountain-people's struggle against the Tsarist colonisers from the 1830s to the 1850s.—146, 422, 446, 455, 456, 584

Sheil, Richard Lalor (1791-1851)—Irish playwright and politician; Whig M. P.—381, 382, 390

Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph, comte de (1748-1836)—French abbot, took an active part in the French Revolution; moderate constitutionalist (Feuillant).—70

Sigel, Franz (1824-1902)—Baden army officer; democrat, one of the military leaders of the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849; then a refugee in Switzerland, Britain, and from 1852 in the USA; took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—486, 491

Slaney, Robert Aglionby (1792-1862)—British politician, M. P. (1826-35, 1837-41, 1847-62); advocate of reforms to improve the living conditions of the poor.—171

Soltykoff (Soltykov), Alexei Dmitrievich, Prince (1806-1859)—Russian travel-
ler, writer and painter; travelled in India (1841-43 and 1845-46).—221

Somerville, Alexander (1811-1885)—English radical journalist; signed his works “One who has whistled at the Plough”.—595, 596

Songeon—French democrat, member of secret revolutionary societies of Paris workers; a refugee in London in the 1850s; subsequently Chairman of the Paris Municipal Council.—496

Sophocles (c. 497-406 B.C.)—Greek dramatist.—371

Soulouque, Faustin (c. 1782-1867)—President of the Republic of Haiti (1849-59); proclaimed himself Emperor Faustin I in 1849.—261

Soult, Nicolas Jean de Dieu, Duke of Dalmatia (1769-1851)—French marshal and statesman; commanded the French troops in Spain in 1808-14; War Minister (1830-34 and 1840-45); Minister of Foreign Affairs (1839-40) and Prime Minister (1832-34, 1839-40, 1840-47).—205

Soymonoff (Soymonov), Fyodor Ivanovich (1800-1854)—Russian general; commanded Russian forces on the Danube and in the Crimea during the Crimean war; killed at the battle of Inkerman.—472

Spencer, Frederick, 4th Earl of (1798-1857)—British admiral; Lord Steward of the Household from January 1854.—560

Spencer, Herbert (1820-1903)—English positivist philosopher and sociologist.—161, 162

Stanley—see Derby, Edward George Geoffrey Smith

Stanley, Edward Henry, 15th Earl of Derby (1826-1893)—British statesman, son of Edward Derby; at the beginning of his career Tory, in the 1860s-1870s Conservative, and subsequently Liberal; Secretary of State for India (1858-59); Foreign Secretary (1866-68 and 1874-78); Secretary of State for the Colonies (1882-85).—138, 140, 141, 148, 157, 173

Stechan, Gottlieb Ludwig (born c. 1814)—Hanover joiner, member of the Communist League; belonged to the Willich-Schapper sectarian group after the split in the Communist League in 1850; rejoined the supporters of Marx and Engels in December 1851.—499

Steffen, Wilhelm—former Prussian army officer, witness for the defence at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); emigrated to Britain in 1853 and afterwards to the USA; closely associated with Marx and Engels in the 1850s.—504, 505

Steiger—Swiss chargé d'affaires in Vienna (1853).—108

Stephen I (István) (c. 975-1038)—Hungarian Prince (from 997), and King of Hungary (1001-1038).—496

Stephens, Joseph Rayner (1805-1879)—English clergyman; active in the Chartist movement in Lancashire (1837-39).—632

Stephenson, Robert (1803-1859)—English engineer and politician; Tory M.P.—597

Stewart, Patrick—British politician, radical M.P. (1835-36).—363, 394, 395, 398

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial (1852) and principal witness for the prosecution; jointly with Wermuth wrote Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Communist Conspiracies of the 19th Century).—28-30, 37, 82, 490

Stirbei, Barbu Demetrius Bibesco, Prince (1801-1869)—hospodar of Wallachia (1849-53 and 1854-56).—235, 240, 277, 313, 538

Stirling—see Stirling-Maxwell

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir William (1818-1878)—English historian and art critic; moderate Tory, M.P.—597

St. Leonards—see Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw

Stowe, Harriet Elizabeth Beecher (1811-1896)—American novelist, author of Uncle Tom’s Cabin.—80, 181
Strassoldo-Grafenberg, Michael, Count (1800-1873)—Austrian official; governor of Milan in 1850-53.—308
Stratford de Redcliffe, Stratford Canning, 1st Viscount (1786-1880)—British diplomat; envoy to Constantinople (1810-12, 1825-28, 1841-58).—21, 109, 110, 194, 228, 266, 310, 318, 321, 356, 363, 377, 390, 405, 532, 537, 560, 563, 575, 588, 609, 610, 615, 619
Straw, David Friedrich (1808-1874)—German philosopher and writer; Young Hegelian.—624
Streckfuss, Adolf (1823-1895)—German democratic writer and politician; charged with high treason for his book *Die grosse Französische Revolution*.—28
Stuart, Lord Dudley Coutts (1803-1854)—British politician, Whig M.P.; connected with conservative-monarchist Polish emigrants.—84, 240, 272, 274, 280, 358, 364, 390, 392, 403, 610, 619
Stuart-Wortley, James Archibald (1805-1881)—British politician, M.P. (1835-37, 1842-59); Solicitor-General (1856-57).—363
Sturge, Charles (1802-1888)—brother and partner of Joseph Sturge.—249
Sturge, Joseph (1793-1859)—English farmer and politician, Free Trader; headed an agricultural company with his brother Charles.—249
Sugar, Edward Burtenshaw, Baron St. Leonards (1781-1875)—British lawyer and statesman, Tory; Lord Chancellor (1852).—252, 369
Sutherland, Elizabeth Leveson-Gower, Marchioness of Stafford, Countess of (1765-1839)—big Scottish landowner, wife of Marquis of Stafford.—188, 414
Sutherland, George Granville William Leveson-Gower, Duke of (1828-1892).—598
Sutzo, John (Soutzo, Johann)—228
Suwaroff (Suvorov), Alexander Vasilyevich, Count Suworov Rimnitsky, Prince Italisky (1729 or 1730-1800)—Russian general.—339, 455
Svetoslav Igorevich (d. 972 or 973)—Grand Prince of Kiev (c. 945-972).—230, 631
Swift, Jonathan (1667-1745)—Irish satirist; wrote in English.—226
Szemere, Bertalan (1812-1869)—Hungarian politician and writer; Minister of the Interior (1848) and head of the revolutionary government (1849); emigrated after the defeat of the revolution.—42, 496, 559
Szirma—Hungarian refugee, Kossuth's emissary in Paris in the early 1850s.—42

T
Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de, Prince et Duc de Bénenvent (1754-1838)—French diplomat; Foreign Minister (1797-99, 1799-1807, 1814-15); represented France at the Vienna Congress (1814-15); ambassador to London (1830-34).—361, 402
Tatistcheff (Tatishchev), Dmitry Pavlovich (1767-1845)—Russian diplomat, ambassador to Vienna (1826-41).—175, 193
Taylor, Sir Herbert (1775-1839)—British general; private secretary of King William IV (1830-37).—387, 390
Techow, Gustav Adolph (1813-1893)—Prussian army officer, democrat; participant in the revolutionary events of 1848 in Berlin; Chief of General Staff of the Palatinate revolutionary army; emigrated to Switzerland after the defeat of the revolution; one of the leaders of the émigrés' organisation "Revolutionary Centralisation" in Switzerland; left for Australia in 1852.—486, 487, 494, 496, 505
Thalberg, Sigismund (1812-1871)—Austrian pianist and composer.—632
Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman; Prime Minister (1836, 1840); head of the Orleanist monarchist party after
1848; crushed the Paris Commune; President of the Republic (1871-73).—208

Thompson—British diplomat, chargé d'affaires in Persia.—573, 587

Thugut, Johann Amadeus Francis de Paula, Baron (1736-1818)—Austrian diplomat and statesman; envoy to Constantinople (1771-76); Foreign Minister (1794-1800).—229

Timur (Timour, Tamerlane) (1336-1405)—Mongol conqueror; founded a large state in the East.—199, 594

Tippoo Saib (Tipu Sahib) (1750-1799)—Sultan of Mysore (1782-99); waged wars against the British conquerors of India in the 1780s and 1790s.—151

Titoff (Titov), Vladimir Pavlovich (1805-1891)—Russian diplomat, envoy to Constantinople (1843-53).—269

Tooke, Thomas (1774-1858)—English economist of the classical school.—524

Tscherning, Anton Frederick (1795-1874)—Danish army officer and politician; Liberal; War Minister (1848).—445

Tucker—London publisher.—546

Turner, James Aspinall (1797-1867)—English cotton manufacturer, President of the Manchester Commercial Association.—592

U

Ungern-Sternberg, Ernst Wilhelm, Baron—Russian diplomat; envoy to Copenhagen in the 1850s.—237, 594

Ure, Andrew (1778-1857)—English chemist and economist, Free Trader.—82

Urquhart, David (1805-1877)—British diplomat, writer and politician, Turkophile; carried out diplomatic missions in Turkey in the 1830s; Tory M.P. (1847-52).—26, 118, 257, 279, 309, 312, 325, 326, 387, 388, 389, 390, 396, 398, 404, 477, 545, 562, 567, 607, 614, 615

Urquhart, William Pollard (1815-1871)—British economist and Liberal politician; M.P.—597

Usener (Usner), August (b. 1818)—Prussian army officer, participant in the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Hungary, subsequently a refugee in London; worked at W. Hale's factory.—83, 84

V

Vicari, Hermann von (1773-1868)—German Catholic prelate; Archbishop of Freiburg (Baden) from 1842.—510

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—179, 196, 254, 255, 280, 282, 364, 405, 538, 544, 559, 560, 577, 590-92, 601

Vidil, Jules—French army officer, socialist; member of the Blanquist Société des proscrits démocrates et socialistes in London; adhered to the Willich-Schapper group after the split of the Communist League in 1850.—494, 496, 506

Vidocq, François Eugène (1775-1857)—French secret police agent; presumed author of the Memoirs; his name was used to denote a cunning sleuth and rogue.—40, 349

Villèle, Jean Baptiste Séraphin Joseph, comte de (1773-1854)—French statesman of the Restoration, Legitimist; Prime Minister (1822-28).—163, 203, 386

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—Roman poet.—567

Voinovich, Marko Ivanovich, Count (d. 1807)—Russian naval officer, of Dalmatian descent; from 1801 admiral.—112

W

Waldeck Benedikt Franz Leo (1802-1870)—German lawyer and radical politician; in 1848 a Left-wing leader and Vice-President of the Prussian
National Assembly; subsequently a Progressist.—28, 30

Walewski, Alexandre Florian Joseph Colonna, comte (1810-1868)—French diplomat and statesman, son of Napoleon I and Polish Countess Marie Walewska; participant in the insurrection of 1830-31 and later an émigré in France; Foreign Minister (1855-60).—361

Walmsley, Sir Joshua (1794-1871)—British politician, radical M.P.—211

Walter the Penniless (d. 1097)—French knight, a leader of the French peasants in the First Crusade (1096-1099).—481

Warren, Sir Charles (1798-1866)—English army officer, general from 1858; served in India (1816-19 and 1830-38); took part in the Crimean war.—219

Wayland, Francis (1796-1865)—American clergyman, author of popular textbooks on ethics and political economy.—626

Week, Louis—participant in the 1853 putsch in Fribourg (Switzerland).—85

Weckbecker—Austrian consul-general in Smyrna (1853).—193, 211, 278

Weerth, Georg (1822-1856)—German poet and writer; member of the Communist League; founder of proletarian poetry in Germany; editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—42

Weitling, Wilhelm Christian (1808-1871)—German tailor, one of the early leaders of the working-class movement in Germany; theoretician of utopian egalitarian communism.—623

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of (1769-1852)—British general and statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1828-30).—166, 198, 348, 351, 369, 376, 381, 386, 392, 398, 400, 426, 433

Westminster, Richard Grosvenor, 2nd Marquis of (1795-1869)—big English landowner, Whig M.P.—598
Winkelried, Arnold von (d. 1386)—semi-legendary hero of the Swiss war of liberation against the Habsburgs; according to legend he secured the victory over the Austrian Duke Leopold in the battle of Sempach at the price of his life.—488

Wise, John Ayshford—British M.P. (1853).—256

Wiseman, Nicholas (1802-1865)—English Catholic priest; became first Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal in 1850.—302
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