The British commercial revulsion seems to have worn throughout its immense development the three distinct forms of a pressure on the money and produce markets of London and Liverpool, a bank panic in Scotland, and an industrial breakdown in the manufacturing districts. The facts were stated at length in our pages on Friday, in the form of copious extracts from the British journals, but their importance and prospective consequences require a still further exposition.

Though, as we anticipated in a former article, the Government was finally compelled to suspend the Bank Act of 1844, this was not done till after the Bank had bravely swamped a host of its customers in the endeavor to save itself. But finally, on the evening of Nov. 11, the chiefs of the Bank held a war council, which resulted in an appeal to the Government for help, which was answered by the suspension of the provisions of the Act. This ordinance of the Ministry will at once be submitted to Parliament for approval, that body having been convoked to meet at the close of the month. The effect of the suspension must be one of comparative relief, as we have previously shown. It does away with an artificial stringency, which the Act adds to the natural stringency of the money market in times of commercial revulsion.

In the progress of the present crisis the Bank had five times raised its rate of discount, in the vain hope of checking the rush of the current which was sweeping all away. On the 8th ult. the rate
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\(^{a}\) November 27, 1857.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) See this volume, pp. 382-83.—\textit{Ed.}
was advanced to 6 per cent; on the 12th to 7; on the 22d to 8; on the 5th inst. to 9; and on the 9th to 10.\(^a\) The rapidity of this movement offers a remarkable contrast to that which attended the crisis of 1847. Then the minimum rate of discount was raised to 5 per cent in April; to 5 \(\frac{1}{2}\) in July; and to 8, its highest point, on the 23d of October. Thence it sank to 7 per cent on Nov. 20; to 6 on Dec. 4; and to 5 on Dec. 25. The five years next following form an epoch of continual decline in the rate, as regular, indeed, as if guided by a sliding scale. Thus, on June 26, 1852, it had reached its lowest point—being 2 per cent. The next five years, from 1852 to 1857, exhibit an opposite movement. On January 8, 1853, the rate stood at 2 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent; on October 1, 1853, it was 5 per cent, whence, through many successive variations, at last it has attained its present elevation. So far, the oscillations of the rate of interest during the period of ten years now concluded have exhibited only the phenomena usual to the recurring phases of modern commerce. These phases are, briefly, an utter contraction of credit in the year of panic, followed by a gradual expansion, which reaches its maximum when the rate of interest sinks to its lowest point; then again a movement in the opposite direction, that of gradual contraction, which reaches its highest point when the interest has risen to its maximum, and the year of panic has again set in. Yet, on a closer examination, there will be discovered in the second part of the present period some phenomena which broadly distinguish it from all its predecessors. During the years of prosperity from 1844 till 1847, the rate of interest in London fluctuated between 3 and 4 per cent, so that the whole period was one of comparatively cheap credit. When the rate of interest reached 5 per cent, on April 10, 1847, the crisis had already set in and its universal explosion was, by a series of stratagems, put off for a few months only. On the other hand, the rate of interest which on May 6, 1854, had already mounted to 5 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent, went down again successively to 5 per cent, 4 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent, 4 per cent, and 3 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent at which latter figure it continued to stand from June 16, 1855, to September 8, 1855. Then it ran again through the identical variations in the opposite direction, increasing to 4 per cent, 4 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent, 5 per cent, until, in October, 1855, it had reached the very point from which it had started in May, 1854, namely, 5 \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent. Two weeks later, on October 20, 1855, it

\(^a\) Here and below Marx used figures from “Dates and Duration of Bank of England Minimum Rates of Discount from 1844”, The Economist, No. 741, November 7, 1857.—Ed.
rose to 6 per cent for short bills, and to 7 per cent for long ones. But again a reaction set in. During the course of 1856 it went down and up until in October, 1856, it had anew reached 6 and 7 per cent, the points from which it had started in the October of the previous year. On November 15, 1856, it rose to 7 per cent, but with irregular and often interrupted fluctuations of decline, which brought it for three months as low as $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It did not recover the original height of 7 per cent till October 12 of the present year, when the American crisis had begun to bear upon England. From that moment its movement of increase was rapid and constant, resulting at last in an almost complete stoppage of discount.

In other words, during the second half of the period from 1848 to 1857, the vicissitudes in the rate of interest were intensified at more frequently recurring intervals, and from October, 1855 to October, 1857, two years of dear money elapsed, when its fluctuations were circumscribed between the limits of $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 per cent. At the same time, in the face of this high rate of interest, production and exchange went on unabated at a pace never before thought of. On the one hand these exceptional phenomena may be traced back to the opportune arrivals of gold from Australia and the United States, which allowed the Bank of England to relax its grip at intervals; while on the other hand it is evident that the crisis was already due in October, 1855, that it was shifted off through a series of temporary convulsions, and that, consequently, its final explosion, as to the intensity of symptoms as well as the extent of contagion, will exceed every crisis ever before witnessed. The curious fact of the recurrence of the rate of 7 per cent on Oct. 20, 1855, on Oct. 4, 1856, and on Oct. 12, 1857, would go far to prove the latter proposition, if we did not know besides that, in 1854, a premonitory collapse had already taken place in this country, and that on the continent of Europe all the symptoms of panic had already repeated themselves in October, 1855 and 1856. On the whole, however, leaving these aggravating circumstances out of view, the period of 1848 to 1857 bears a striking resemblance to those of 1826 to 1836, and of 1837 to 1847.

It is true we were told that British Free Trade would change all this, but if nothing else is proved it is at least clear that the Free-Trade doctors are nothing but quacks. As in former periods, a series of good harvests has been followed by a series of bad ones. In spite of the Free-Trade panacea in England the average price of wheat and all other raw produce has ruled even higher from
1853 to 1857 than from 1820 to 1853; and, what is still more remarkable, while industry took an unprecedented start in the face of the high prices of corn, now, as if to cut off every possible subterfuge, it has suffered an unprecedented collapse in the face of a plentiful harvest.

Our readers will of course understand that this Bank of England rate of 10 per cent is merely nominal, and that the interest really paid by first-class paper in London, greatly exceeds that figure.

"The rates charged in the open market," says The Daily News, "are considerably above those of the Bank."

"The Bank of England itself," says The Morning Chronicle, "does not discount at the rate of 10 per cent, except in a very few cases—the exception, not the rule; while out of doors charges are notoriously disproportionate to the alleged quotation."

"The inability of second and third-class paper to obtain accommodation on any terms," says The Morning Herald, "is already producing immense mischief."

"In consequence of this," as says The Globe, "affairs are being brought to a deadlock; firms are falling whose assets exceed their liabilities; and there seems to be a general mercantile revolution."

What with this pressure on the money market, and with the influx of American products, all articles in the produce market have gone down. In the course of a few weeks cotton has fallen at Liverpool 20 to 25 per cent, sugar 25 per cent, corn 25 per cent, and coffee, salt peter, tallow, leather, and the like, have followed in the wake.

"Discounts and advances upon produce," says The Morning Post, "are almost unattainable." a

"In Mincing Lane,423" says The Standard, "business has been turned inside out. It is no longer possible to sell any goods except in the shape of barter, money being out of the question."

All this distress, however, would not have so soon brought the Bank of England to her knees if the Bank panic in Scotland had not occurred. At Glasgow, the fall of the Western Bank was followed by that of the City of Glasgow Bank, producing in its turn a general run of depositors among the middle class and of noteholders among the working classes, and finally resulting in riotous disturbances which induced the Lord Provost of Glasgow to obtain the aid of bayonets. The City of Glasgow Bank, which
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a "The market for the English funds has fluctuated...", The Morning Post, No. 26168, November 12, 1857.— Ed.
had the honor of being governed by no less a personage than the Duke of Argyll, had a paid-up capital of one million sterling, a reserved fund of £90,595, and ninety-six branches spread through the country. Its authorized issues amounted to £72,921, while those of the Western Bank of Scotland were £225,292, making together £298,213 sterling, or nearly one-tenth of the entire authorized circulating medium of Scotland. The capital of these Banks was to a great extent furnished in small sums by the agricultural population.

The Scotch panic naturally recoiled on the Bank of England; and £300,000 were taken from its vaults on Nov. 11, and £600,000 to £700,000 on the 12th, for transmission to Scotland. Other sums were also withdrawn on behalf of the Irish Banks, while large deposits were called in by the Provincial English Banks; so that the Banking Department of the Bank of England found itself driven to the very verge of bankruptcy. It is probable that for the two Scotch Banks above named the general crisis merely afforded a pretext for effecting a decent exit, they having long been rotten to the core. Still, the fact remains that the celebrated Scotch Banking system which in 1825-26, 1836-37, and in 1847 weathered the hurricanes that swept away the English and Irish Banks, for the first time, under the auspices of Peel's Bank Act, which was forced upon Scotland in 1845, has met with a general run; that for the first time the cry of “gold against paper” has been heard there; and that at Edinburgh, for the first time, even Bank of England notes have been refused. The idea of the defenders of Peel's Act, that if it was unable to ward off monetary crises in general, it would at least secure the convertibility of the notes in circulation, has now been exploded, the note holders sharing the fate of the depositors.

The general state of the British manufacturing districts cannot be better described than by two extracts, the one from a Manchester trade circular, printed in *The Economist*, the latter from a private letter from Macclesfield in the *The London Free Press*. The Manchester circular, after giving a comparative statement of the cotton trade for the last five years, proceeds as follows:

"Prices have this week been falling with, day by day, more summary acceleration. For numerous descriptions, no prices can be given, because none could find a buyer, and generally where prices are given, they depend more on the position or apprehensions of the holder than on demand. *No current demand exists.* The home trade have laid in more stock than Winter prospects now give hope of clearing."

That foreign markets have been overstocked, the circular does, of course, not say.

"Short time has now been currently adopted as a necessity; the amount of its adoption is computed at present to exceed one-fifth of the whole production. The exceptions to extending its adoption are daily becoming less, and the expediency is now debated of rather closing the mills for a time wholly."\(^a\)

The Macclesfield writer tells us:

"At least 5,000 persons, consisting of skilled artisans and their families, who get up each morning and know not where to get food to break their fast, have applied for relief to the Union, and as they come under the class of able-bodied paupers, the alternative is of either going to break stones at about four pence per day, or going into the House, where they are treated like prisoners, and where unhealthy and scanty food is given to them through a hole in the wall; and as to the breaking of stones, to men that have hands only capable of handling the finest of materials, viz: silk, [that] is a complete refusal."\(^b\)

What English writers consider an advantage of their present crisis, as compared with that of 1847—that there is no paramount channel of speculation, like the railways, for instance, absorbing their capital—is by no means a fact. The truth is the English have very largely participated in speculations abroad, both on the Continent of Europe and in America, while at home their surplus capital has been mainly invested in factories, so that, more than ever before, the present convulsion bears the character of an industrial crisis, and therefore strikes at the very roots of the national prosperity.

On the Continent of Europe the contagion has spread from Sweden to Italy in one direction, and from Madrid to Pesth in the other. Hamburg, forming the great commercial center of the exports and imports of the Zollverein,\(^424\) and the general money market of Northern Germany, has had, of course, to bear the first shock. As to France, the Bank of France has screwed up its rate of discount to the English standard; the decrees for the prohibition of the export of corn have been revoked\(^425\); all the Paris papers have received confidential warnings to beware of gloomy views; the bullion dealers are being frightened by gens d'armes, and

---

\(^a\) "Markets of the manufacturing districts. Manchester, Thursday Evening, Nov. 5", The Economist, No. 741, November 7, 1857.— Ed.

\(^b\) "Macclesfield, November 5th, 1857", The Free Press, No. 20, November 11, 1857.— Ed.
Louis Bonaparte himself, in a rather coxcombical letter, condescends to inform his subjects that he does not feel himself prepared for a financial coup d'état, and that, consequently, "the evil only exists in the imagination." \(^{426}\)

Written on November 13, 1857  Reproduced from the newspaper
First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5183, November 30, 1857

\(^{a}\) Napoléon III, "Lettre à S. Exc. le ministre des finances. Le 10 novembre 1857", Le Moniteur universel, No. 315, November 11, 1857.— Ed.
Frederick Engels

[THE CAPTURE OF DELHI] 427

We will not join in the noisy chorus which, in Great Britain, is now extolling to the skies the bravery of the troops that took Delhi by storm. No people, not even the French, can equal the English in self-laudation, especially when bravery is the point in question. The analysis of the facts, however, very soon reduces, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the grandeur of this heroism to very commonplace proportions; and every man of common sense must be disgusted at this overtrading in other people's courage, by which the English paterfamilias who lives quietly at home, and is uncommonly averse to anything that threatens him with the remotest chance of obtaining military glory, attempts to pass himself off as a participator in the undoubted, but certainly not so very extraordinary, bravery shown in the assault on Delhi.

If we compare Delhi with Sevastopol, we of course agree that the Sepoys were no Russians; that none of their sallies against the British cantonment was anything like Inkermann 428; that there was no Todtleben in Delhi, and that the Sepoys, bravely as every individual man and company fought in most instances, were utterly without leadership, not only for brigades and divisions, but almost for battalions; that their cohesion did not therefore extend beyond the companies; that they entirely lacked the scientific element without which an army is now-a-days helpless, and the defense of a town utterly hopeless. Still, the disproportion of numbers and means of action, the superiority of the Sepoys over the Europeans in withstanding the climate, the extreme weakness to which the force before Delhi was at times reduced, make up for many of these differences, and render a fair parallel between the two sieges (to call these operations sieges) possible. Again we do
not consider the storming of Delhi as an act of uncommon or extra-heroic bravery, although as in every battle individual acts of high spirit no doubt occurred on either side, but we maintain that the Anglo-Indian army before Delhi has shown more perseverance, force of character, judgment and skill, than the English army when on its trial between Sevastopol and Balaklava.\textsuperscript{429} The latter, after Inkermann, was ready and willing to re-embark, and no doubt would have done so if it had not been for the French. The former, when the season of the year, the deadly maladies consequent upon it, the interruption of the communications, the absence of all chance of speedy re-enforcements, the condition of all Upper India, invited a withdrawal, did indeed consider the advisability of this step, but for all that, held out at its post.

When the insurrection was at its highest point, a movable column in Upper India was the first thing required. There were only two forces that could be thus employed—the small force of Havelock, which soon proved inadequate, and the force before Delhi. That it was, under these circumstances, a military mistake to stay before Delhi, consuming the available strength in useless fights with an unassailable enemy; that the army in motion would have been worth four times its value when at rest; that the clearing of Upper India, with the exception of Delhi, the re-establishing of the communications, the crushing of every attempt of the insurgents to concentrate a force, would have been obtained, and with it the fall of Delhi as a natural and easy consequence, are indisputable facts. But political reasons commanded that the camp before Delhi should not be raised. It is the wiseacres at headquarters who sent the army to Delhi that should be blamed—not the perseverance of the army in holding out when once there. At the same time we must not omit to state that the effect of the rainy season on this army was far milder than was to be anticipated, and that with anything like an average amount of the sickness consequent upon active operations at such a period, the withdrawal or the dissolution of the army would have been unavoidable. The dangerous position of the army lasted till the end of August. The re-enforcements began to come in, while dissensions continued to weaken the rebel camp. In the beginning of September the siege train arrived, and the defensive position was changed into an offensive one. On the 7th of September the first battery opened its fire, and on the evening of the 13th two practicable breaches were opened. Let us now examine what took place during this interval.

If we were to rely, for this purpose, on the official dispatch of
Gen. Wilson, we should be very badly off indeed. This report is quite as confused as the documents issued from the English headquarters in the Crimea ever were. No man living could make out from that report the position of the two breaches, or the relative position and order in which the storming columns were arranged. As to the private reports, they are, of course, still more hopelessly confused. Fortunately one of those skillful scientific officers who deserve nearly the whole credit of the success, a member of the Bengal Engineers and Artillery, has given a report of what occurred, in The Bombay Gazette, as clear and business-like as it is simple and unpretending. During the whole of the Crimean war not one English officer was found able to write a report as sensible as this. Unfortunately he got wounded on the first day of the assault, and then his letter stops. As to later transactions, we are, therefore, still quite in the dark.

The English had strengthened the defenses of Delhi so far that they could resist a siege by an Asiatic army. According to our modern notions, Delhi was scarcely to be called a fortress, but merely a place secured against the forcible assault of a field force. Its masonry wall, 16 feet high and 12 feet thick, crowned by a parapet of 3 feet thickness and 8 feet height, offered 6 feet of masonry beside the parapet, uncovered by the glacis and exposed to the direct fire of the attack. The narrowness of this masonry rampart put it out of the question to place cannon anywhere, except in the bastions and martello towers. These latter flanked the curtain but very imperfectly, and a masonry parapet of three feet thickness being easily battered down by siege guns (field pieces could do it), to silence the fire of the defense, and particularly the guns flanking the ditch, was very easy. Between wall and ditch there was a wide bern or level road, facilitating the formation of a practicable breach, and the ditch, under these circumstances, instead of being a coupe-gorge for any force that got entangled in it, became a resting place to re-form those columns that had got into disorder while advancing on the glacis.

To advance against such a place, with regular trenches, according to the rules of sieges, would have been insane, even if the first condition had not been wanting, viz, a force sufficient to invest the place on all sides. The state of the defenses, the
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a [A. Wilson,] "Despatch from General Wilson", The Times, No. 22839, November 16, 1857.—Ed.
b The Times, same issue, "India".—Ed.
c Cut-throat place.—Ed.
disorganization and sinking spirit of the defenders, would have rendered every other mode of attack than the one pursued an absolute fault. This mode is very well known to military men under the name of the forcible attack (*ataque de vive force*). The defenses, being such only as to render an open attack impossible without heavy guns, are dealt with summarily by the artillery; the interior of the place is all the while shelled, and as soon as the breaches are practicable the troops advance to the assault.

The front under attack was the northern one, directly opposite to the English camp. This front is composed of two curtains and three bastions, forming a slightly re-entering angle at the central (the Cashmere) bastion. The eastern position, from the Cashmere to the Water bastion, is the shorter one, and projects a little in front of the western position, between the Cashmere and the Moree bastions. The ground in front of the Cashmere and Water bastions was covered with low jungle, gardens, houses, &c, which had not been leveled down by the Sepoys, and afforded shelter to the attack. (This circumstance explains how it was possible that the English could so often follow the Sepoys under the very guns of the place, which was at that time considered extremely heroic, but was in fact a matter of little danger so long as they had this cover.) Besides, at about 400 or 500 yards from this front, a deep ravine ran in the same direction as the wall, so as to form a natural parallel for the attack. The river, besides, giving a capital basis to the English left, the slight salient formed by the Cashmere and Water bastions was selected very properly as the main point of attack. The western curtain and bastions were simultaneously subjected to a simulated attack, and this maneuver succeeded so well that the main force of the Sepoys was directed against it. They assembled a strong body in the suburbs outside the Cabool gate, so as to menace the English right. This maneuver would have been perfectly correct and very effective, if the western curtain between the Moree and Cashmere bastions had been the most in danger. The flanking position of the Sepoys would have been capital as a means of active defense, every column of assault being at once taken in flank by a movement of this force in advance. But the effect of this position could not reach as far eastward as the curtain between the Cashmere and Water bastions; and thus its occupation drew away the best part of the defending force from the decisive point.

The selection of the places for the batteries, their construction and arming, and the way in which they were served, deserve the greatest praise. The English had about 50 guns and mortars,
concentrated in powerful batteries, behind good solid parapets. The Sepoys had, according to official statements, 55 guns on the attacked front, but scattered over small bastions and martello towers, incapable of concentrated action, and scarcely sheltered by the miserable three-feet parapet. No doubt a couple of hours must have sufficed to silence the fire of the defense, and then there remained little to be done.

On the 8th, No. 1 battery, 10 guns, opened fire at 700 yards from the wall. During the following night the ravine aforesaid was worked out into a sort of trench. On the 9th, the broken ground and houses in front of this ravine were seized without resistance; and on the 10th, No. 2 battery, 8 guns, was unmasked. This latter was 500 or 600 yards from the wall. On the 11th, No. 3 battery, built very boldly and cleverly at 200 yards from the Water bastion in some broken ground, opened fire with six guns, while ten heavy mortars shelled the town. On the evening of the 13th the breaches—one in the curtain adjoining the right flank of the Cashmere bastion, and the other in the left face and flank of the Water bastion—were reported practicable for escalade, and the assault was ordered. The Sepoys on the 11th had made a counter-approach on the glacis between the two menaced bastions, and threw out a trench for skirmishers about three hundred and fifty yards in front of the English batteries. They also advanced from this position outside the Cabool gate to flank attacks. But these attempts at active defense were carried out without unity, connection or spirit, and led to no result.

At daylight on the 14th five British columns advanced to the attack. One, on the right, to occupy the force outside the Cabool gate and attack, in case of success, the Lahore gate. One against each breach, one against the Cashmere gate, which was to be blown up, and one to act as a reserve. With the exception of the first, all these columns were successful. The breaches were but slightly defended, but the resistance in the houses near the wall was very obstinate. The heroism of an officer and three sergeants of the Engineers (for here there was heroism) succeeded in blowing open the Cashmere gate, and thus this column entered also. By evening the whole northern front was in the possession of the English. Here Gen. Wilson, however, stopped. The indiscriminate assault was arrested, guns brought up and directed against every strong position in the town. With the exception of the storming of the magazine, there seems to have been very little actual fighting. The insurgents were dispirited and left the town in masses. Wilson advanced cautiously into the town, found scarcely
any resistance after the 17th, and occupied it completely on the 20th.

Our opinion on the conduct of the attack has been stated. As to the defense—the attempt at offensive counter movements, the flanking position at the Cabool gate, the counter-approaches, the rifle-pits, all show that some notions of scientific warfare had penetrated among the Sepoys; but either they were not clear enough, or not powerful enough, to be carried out with any effect. Whether they originated with Indians, or with some of the Europeans that are with them, is of course difficult to decide; but one thing is certain: that those attempts, though imperfect in execution, bear a close resemblance in their ground-work to the active defense of Sevastopol and that their execution looks as if a correct plan had been made for the Sepoys by some European officer, but that they had not been able to understand the idea fully, or that disorganization and want of command turned practical projects into weak and powerless attempts.

Written on November 16, 1857

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5188, December 5, 1857 as a leading article
Karl Marx

[THE TRADE CRISIS IN ENGLAND]

While on this side of the ocean we were indulging in our little prelude to that great symphonious crash of bankruptcy which has since burst upon the world, our eccentric cotemporary *The London Times* was playing triumphant rhetorical variations, with the "soundness" of British commerce as its theme. Now, however, it tunes another and a sadder chord. In one of its latest impressions, that of Nov. 26, brought to these happy shores by the *Europa* yesterday, that journal declares "the trading classes of England to be unsound to the core." Then proceeding to work itself up to the highest pitch of moral indignation, it exclaims:

"It is the demoralizing career pursued through eight or ten years of prosperity, before the consummation arrives, that works the deepest ruin. It is in calling into existence gangs of reckless speculators and fictitious bill drawers, and elevating them as examples of successful British enterprise, so as to discourage reliance upon the slow profits of honest industry, that the poison is infused. [...] Each point of corruption thus created forms an ever-extending circle."⁴

We shall not now inquire whether the English journalists who, for a decade, propagated the doctrine that the era of commercial convulsions was finally closed with the introduction of Free Trade, are now warranted in turning all at once from sycophantic encomiasts into Roman censors of modern money-making. The following statements submitted to recent meetings of creditors in Scotland, may serve, however, as matter-of-fact comment on the "soundness" of British commerce.
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³ *The Times*, No. 22848, November 26, 1857, "Money-Market and City Intelligence".— Ed.
John Monteith & Co., liabilities in excess of the 
assets .................................................. £430,000
D. & T. Macdonald ........................................ 334,000
Godfrey, Pattison & Co .................................. 240,000
William Smith & Co ....................................... 104,000
T. Trehes, Robinson & Co ................................ 75,000
Total .................................................. £1,183,000

"It appears from this statement", as The North British Mail says, "that on the 
bankrupts' own showing, £1,183,000 have been lost to the creditors of five houses."

Still the very recurrence of crises despite all the warnings of the past, in regular intervals, 
forbids the idea of seeking their final causes in the recklessness of single individuals. If speculation 
toward the close of a given commercial period appears as the 
immediate forerunner of the crash, it should not be forgotten that 
speculation itself was engendered in the previous phases of the 
period, and is therefore, itself a result and an accident, instead of 
the final cause and the substance. The political economists who 
pretend to explain the regular spasms of industry and commerce 
by speculation, resemble the now extinct school of natural 
philosophers who considered fever as the true cause of all 
maladies.

The European crisis has so far maintained its center in England, 
and in England herself, as we anticipated, it has changed aspects. 
If the first reaction on Great Britain of our American collapse 
manifested itself in a monetary panic, attended by a general 
depression in the produce market, and followed more remotely by 
manufacturing distress, the industrial crisis now stands at the top 
and the monetary difficulty at the bottom. If London was for a 
moment the focus of the conflagration, Manchester is so now. The 
most serious convulsion which English industry ever sustained, 
and the only one which produced great social changes, the 
industrial distress from 1838 to 1843, was, for a short period 
during 1839, accompanied by a contraction of the money market, 
while during the greater part of the same epoch the rate of 
interest ruled low, and even sunk down to 2 1/2 and 2 per cent. We 
make this remark, not because we consider the relative improve-
ment of the London money market as a symptom of its final 
recovery, but only to note the fact, that in a manufacturing 
country like England, the fluctuations of the money market are far
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See this volume, p. 390.— Ed.
from indicating either the intensity or the extent of a commercial crisis. Compare, for instance, the London and the Manchester papers of the same date. The former, watching but the efflux and influx of bullion, are all brightness when the Bank of England, by a new purchase of gold, has “strengthened its position.” The latter are all gloom, feeling that strength has been bought at their expense, by a rise in the rate of interest and a fall in the price of their products. Hence, even Mr. Tooke, the writer of the History of Prices, well as he handles the phenomena of the London money and colonial markets, has proved unable not only to delineate, but even to comprehend, the contractions in the heart of English production.

As to the English money market, its history during the week ending Nov. 27 shows, on the one hand, a continuous alternation between a day of failures and a day marked by the absence of failures; on the other hand, the recovery of the Bank of England and the downfall of the Northumberland and Durham District Bank. The latter bank, founded 21 years ago, numbering 408 shareholders, and disposing of a paid-up capital of £562,891, had its head office at Newcastle and its branch establishments at Alnwick, Berwick, Hexham, Morpeth, North and South Shields, Sunderland and Durham. Its liabilities are stated to amount to three millions sterling, and the weekly wages alone, paid through its instrumentality, to £35,000. The stoppage of the great collieries and iron-works carried on by the advances of this bank will, of course, be the first consequence of its collapse. Many thousand workingmen will thus be thrown out of employment.

The Bank of England is stated to have increased her metallic reserve by about £700,000, an influx of bullion to be accounted for partly by the cessation of the drain to Scotland, partly by shipments from this country and from Russia, and lastly by the arrival of Australian gold. There is nothing remarkable in this movement, since it is perfectly understood that the Bank of England, by screwing up the rate of interest, will curtail imports, force exports, draw back a portion of the British capital invested abroad, and consequently turn the balance of trade and effect an influx of bullion to a certain amount. It is no less sure that on the least relaxation of the terms of discount gold will again begin to flow abroad. The only question is how long the Bank will be able to maintain these terms.

---

\( ^a \) The United States of America.—Ed.
The official reports of the Board of Trade for October, a month during which the minimum rate of discount was successively advanced to 6, 7, and 8 per cent, prove evidently that the first effect of that operation was not to stop manufactures, but to force their products into foreign markets and to curtail the importation of foreign produce.

In spite of the American crisis, the exports for October, 1857, exhibit a surplus of £318,838, as compared with October, 1856, while the considerable decrease in the consumption of all articles of food and luxuries exhibited by the same returns proves that this surplus manufacture was far from being remunerative, or the natural consequence of thriving industry. The recoil of the crisis on English industry will become apparent in the next Board of Trade returns. A comparison of the returns for the single months from January, 1857, to October, 1857, will show that English production attained its maximum in the month of May, when the surplus export over that of May, 1856, amounted to £2,648,904. In June, consequent upon the first news of the Indian mutinies, the total production sank down beneath that of the corresponding month in 1856, and exhibited a relative decrease in the exports of £30,247. In July, despite the contraction of the Indian market, the production had not only recovered the standard of the corresponding month in 1856, but exceeded it by no less a sum than £2,233,306. It is, therefore, clear that in that month the other markets had to absorb beyond their ordinary consumption not only the portion usually sent to India, but a great surplus over the usual English production. In that month, therefore, the foreign markets seem to have been so far overstocked that the increase in the exports was successively forced down from about two and one third millions to £885,513 in August, £852,203 in September, and £318,838 in October. The study of the English trade reports affords the only trustworthy clue to the mystery of the present convulsion in that country.

Written on November 27, 1857

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5196, December 15, 1857 as a leading article

---

* Here and below Marx used the data from *The Economist*, Nos. 718, 722, 727, 731, 736, 740, 744; May 30, June 27, August 1, August 29, October 3, October 31, November 28, 1857.— *Ed.*
The arrival yesterday morning\(^a\) of the mails of the Canada and the Adriatic puts us in possession of a week's history of the European financial crisis. This history may be summed up in a few words. Hamburg still formed the center of the convulsion, which reacted more or less severely on Prussia, and was gradually reducing the English money market to the unsettled state which it seemed to be recovering from. Some distant echoes of the storm had reverberated from Spain and Italy. Through the whole of Europe the palsy of industrial activity and the consequent distress of the laboring classes are rapidly spreading. On the other hand, the comparative resistance which France still opposed to the contagion puzzled the political economists as a riddle harder to be solved than the general crisis itself.

The Hamburg crisis was thought to have passed its climax after Nov. 21, upon the establishment of the Guarannted Discount Association, the total subscriptions for which amounted to 12,000,000 marks banco, destined to secure the circulation of such bills and notes as should receive the stamp of the Association. Still, some days later, the recurrence of some failures, and events like the suicide of the bill broker Gowa, foreshadowed new disasters. On Nov. 26, the panic again had full swing; and as at first the Discount Association, so now the Government itself stepped forward to stem its current. On the 27th, the Senate proposed, and obtained leave from the freehold burgesses of the city, to issue securities bearing interest (exchequer notes), to the amount of 15,000,000 marks banco, for the purpose of making advances

\(^a\) December 3, 1857.—*Ed.*
upon goods of a permanent description, or upon State securities—such advances to amount to from 50 to $66\frac{2}{3}$ per cent of the respective value of the pawned commodities. This second effort to right the course of commerce foundered like the first—both resembling the vain cries of distress which precede a shipwreck. The guaranty of the Discount Association itself was found to need another guaranty in its turn, and the advances of the State, limited in their amount as well as the description of commodities to which they applied, became, moreover, by dint of the very conditions under which they were made, relatively useless, at the same ratio that prices were going down. To uphold prices, and thus ward off the active cause of the distress, the State must pay the prices ruling before the outbreak of the commercial panic, and realize the value of bills of exchange which had ceased to represent anything but foreign failures. In other words, the fortune of the whole community, which the Government represents, ought to make good for the losses of private capitalists. This sort of communism, where the mutuality is all on one side, seems rather attractive to the European capitalists.

On November 29, twenty great commercial Hamburg firms, beside numerous Altona houses, broke down, the discount of bills had ceased, the prices of merchandise and securities became nominal, and all business arrived at a dead lock. From the list of failures it appears that five of them occurred in banking operations with Sweden and Norway—the liabilities of Messrs. Ullberg & Cramer, amounting to 12,000,000 marks banco, five in the Colonial produce trade, four in the Baltic produce trade, two in the export of manufactures, two in insurance agencies, one in the Stock Exchange, one in the ship-building trade. Sweden depends so entirely on Hamburg as her exporter, bill-broker and banker, that the history of the Hamburg market is that of the Stockholm market. Consequently, two days after the collapse a telegram announced that the failures in Hamburg had led to failures in Stockholm, and that there too Government support had proved unavailable. What in this respect holds good for Sweden is still more true for Denmark, whose commercial center, Altona, is but a suburb of Hamburg. On the 1st of December extensive stoppages occurred, including two very old firms, viz.: Conrad

---

a Here and below Marx used the reports from Hamburg of November 30 and December 1, 1857. See *The Times*, Nos. 22854, 22855, December 3, 4, 1857.—*Ed.*

b A telegram from Hamburg, dated the 2nd of December, was published in *The Times*, No. 22855, December 4, 1857.—*Ed.*
Warneke, in the Colonial trade, especially sugar, with a capital of 2,000,000 marks banco, and extensively connected with Germany, Denmark and Sweden; and Lorent am Ende & Co., carrying on business with Sweden and Norway. One ship-owner and general merchant committed suicide in consequence of his embarrassments.

The general extent of Hamburg commerce may be inferred from the fact that at this very moment about 500,000,000 m. b. in goods of all kinds are held in warehouses and in port, on account of its merchants. The republic is now recurring to the only remedy against the crisis, that of relieving its citizens from the duty of paying their debts. A law granting a respite of one month on all bills payable at maturity is likely to be passed. As to Prussia, the distress of the manufacturing districts of the Rhine and Westphalia is hardly noticed by the public papers, since it has not yet resulted in extensive failures, the latter having been limited to the corn exporters at Stettin and Danzig, and to about forty manufacturers at Berlin. The Prussian Government has interfered by authorizing the Berlin Bank to advance loans on goods deposited and by suspending the usury laws. The former measure will prove as vain at Berlin as at Stockholm and Hamburg, and the latter puts Prussia only on a footing of equality with other commercial countries.

The Hamburg collapse is a conclusive answer to those imaginative minds which presume the present crisis to have originated in prices artificially enhanced by a paper currency. In regard to currency, Hamburg forms the opposite pole to this country. There, there is no money but silver. There exists no paper circulation at all, but a medium of exchanges purely metallic is boasted of. Still the present panic not only rages there most severely, but since the appearance of general commercial crises—the discovery of which is not so old as that of the comets—Hamburg has been their favorite arena. Twice during the last third of the eighteenth century it exhibited the same spectacle as at present; and if it is distinguished by one characteristic feature from other great commercial centers of the world, it is by the frequency and violence of the fluctuations in the rate of interest.

Turning from Hamburg to England, we find that the tone of the London money market was progressively improving from
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*a* See the reports from Berlin of November 28 and 29 in *The Times*, No. 22853, December 2, 1857.—*Ed.*
Nov. 27 to Dec. 1, when again an opposite current set in. On November 28 the price of silver had actually declined, but after Dec. 1 it again recovered and will probably advance, large amounts being required for Hamburg. In other words, gold will again be withdrawn from London to buy Continental silver, and this renewed drain of bullion will call for the renewed action of the Bank of England screw. Beside the sudden demand at Hamburg, there is looming in a not remote future the Indian loan, which the Government, however it may try to shift off the evil day, must necessarily resort to. The occurrence of fresh failures had also contributed after the 1st inst. to dispel the delusion that the money market had seen its worst. As Lord Overstone (the banker Lloyd) remarked in the opening session of the House of Lords:

"The next occasion of pressure upon the Bank will probably occur before the exchanges are rectified, and then the crisis will be greater than that which we have shrunk from meeting on the present occasion. There are serious and formidable difficulties hanging over this country."  

The catastrophe at Hamburg has not yet been felt at London. The greater easiness of the loan market had favorably affected the produce market; but, irrespective of the eventual new contraction of money, it is evident that the great fall in the prices of produce in Stettin, Dantzig and Hamburg cannot but bring down the London quotations. The French decree rescinding the prohibition of the export of corn and flour immediately compelled the London millers to reduce their quotations by three shillings per 280 pounds, in order to stem the influx of flour from France. Several failures in the corn-trade have been reported, but they have been confined to smaller houses and operators in grain for distant delivery.

The English manufacturing districts exhibit no novelty, except that cotton goods adapted to the Indian demand, such as brown shirtings, jacquets, madapolams, as well as yarns suitable for the same market, fetch, for the first time since 1847, remunerative prices in India. Since 1847, the profits made by the Manchester manufacturers in that trade have been derived, not from the price realized on the sale of their goods in East India, but only on the sale in England of their East Indian returns. The almost total suppression of Indian export since June, 1857, occasioned by the revolt, has allowed the Indian market to absorb the floating

---

* S. Overstone's speech in the House of Lords, December 3, 1857, *The Times*, No. 22855, December 4, 1857.—*Ed.*
English goods and even to open itself for new supplies at enhanced prices. Under ordinary circumstances such an event would have given extraordinary liveliness to the Manchester trade. At present, as we are informed by private letters, it has hardly raised the prices of the privileged articles, while it turned such an amount of employment seeking productive power to the manufacture of these particular articles as would suffice to overstock three Indias on the shortest notice. Such has been the general enlargement of productive power in the British manufacturing districts during the last ten years, that even the reduction of labor to less than two-thirds its previous amount can only be sustained by the mill-owners accumulating in their warehouses a large surplus stock of fabrics. Messrs. Du Fay & Co., in their monthly Manchester trade report, say that "there was a pause in business during the month; very few transactions took place, and prices were altogether nominal. Never before was the sum total of a month's transactions so small as in November."

It is, perhaps, proper here to call attention to the fact that in the year 1858 the repeal of the British Corn Laws will first be put to a serious test. What with the influence of Australian gold and industrial prosperity, what with the natural results of bad harvests, the average price of wheat during the epoch from 1847 to 1857 ruled higher than during the epoch from 1826 to 1836. A keen competition of foreign agriculture and produce will now have to be sustained concurrently with a decline in the home demand; and agricultural distress, which seemed buried in the annals of British history from 1815 to 1832, is likely to appear again. It is true that the advance in the price of French wheat and flour, following upon the Imperial decrees, has proved but temporary, and vanished even before any extensive export to England took place. But with a further pressure on the money market of France she will be forced to throw her corn and flour into England, which will be at the same time assailed by forced sales of German produce. Then in the spring the shipments from the United States will come forward, and give the British corn market its finishing blow. If, as the whole history of prices warrants us in supposing, several good harvests are now to follow each other in succession, we shall see fully worked out the true consequences of the repeal of the Corn Laws for the agricultural laborers in the first instance,

---

the farmers in the second, and the whole framework of British landed property in the last.

Written on December 4, 1857

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5202, December 22, 1857 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
The mails of the Niagara reached us yesterday, and a careful examination of our files of British journals only confirms the views we have lately had to express with regard to the probable course of the crisis in England. The London money market is decidedly improving; that is to say, gold is accumulating in the vaults of the Bank of England; the demand for discount at the Bank is decreasing; first-class paper may be discounted in Lombard street at \(9\frac{1}{2}\) to \(9\frac{3}{4}\) per cent; the public funds are firm, and the share market participates to some degree in this movement. This agreeable aspect of things is, however, badly impaired by great failures, recurring every two or three days in London; by daily dispatches, sad messengers of provincial disasters; and by the thunder of The London Times, inveighing more than ever against the general and helpless corruption of the British mercantile classes. In fact, the comparative easiness with which unexceptionable paper is discounted, seems to be more than balanced by the growing difficulty of finding paper which can pass as unexceptionable. Consequently, we are told in the London money articles of the latest date, that at Threadneedle street the applications are extremely "limited," and that at Lombard street but little business is doing. Still, as the supply on the part of the Bank and the discount houses is increasing—while the pressure upon them, the demand on the part of their customers, is decreasing—the money market must be said to be comparatively easy. Nevertheless the Bank of England Directors have not yet dared to lower the rate of discount, convinced as it would appear

---

\(a\) See this volume, pp. 406-09.—\(Ed.\)
that the renewal of the monetary crisis is not a question of time, but of percentage, and that, consequently, as the rate of discount sinks, the monetary crisis is sure to rise again.

While the London money market, one way or the other, has thus got more easy, the stringency of the English produce market is increasing in intensity, a continuous fall in prices not being able to overcome the growing disinclination to purchase. Even such articles as tallow, for instance, which had previously formed an exception to the general rule, have now, by dint of forced sales, been obliged to give way. On comparing the price current of the week ending December 18 with the weekly price current of November, it appears that the extreme depression in prices which prevailed in the latter month has again been reached; this time, however, not in the shape of a panic, but the methodic form of a sliding scale. As to the manufacturing markets, an earnest of the industrial crisis which we predicted\(^a\) has now been given in half a dozen failures of spinners and weavers in Lancashire, of three leading houses in the woolen trade in the West Riding, and an important firm in the carpet trade of Worcester.

Since the phenomena of this double crisis, in the produce market and among the manufacturing classes, will by and by become more palpable, we shall content ourselves, for the present, with quoting the following passage of a private letter from Manchester, which has been communicated for our columns:

"Of the continuous pressure on the market and its disastrous effects you can hardly form any notion. No one can sell. Every day you hear of lower quotations. Things are come to that pass that respectable people prefer not to offer their commodities at all. Spinners and weavers are weighed down by utter despondency. No yarn commissioners sell yarn to the weavers except on cash or double securities. It is impossible for this state of things to go on without ending in a frightful collapse."\(^b\)

The Hamburg crisis has scarcely abated.\(^c\) It is the most regular and classical example of a monetary crisis that ever existed. Everything except silver and gold had become worthless. Firms of old standing have broken down, because they are unable to pay in cash some single bill that had fallen due, although in their tills

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 390, 401-02.— Ed.
\(^b\) Marx paraphrases Engels's letter to him of December 17, 1857 (present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 222-23). In this article he also uses other data from that letter.— Ed.
\(^c\) See this volume, pp. 404-06.— Ed.
there lay bills to a hundred times its value, which, however, for the moment were valueless, not because they were dishonored, but because they could not be discounted. Thus, we are informed that the old and wealthy firm of Ch. M. Schröder, before its bankruptcy, had offered to it two millions in silver, on the part of L. H. Schröder, the brother, of London, but replied by telegraph: “Three millions or nothing.” The three millions did not come forward, and Ch. M. Schröder went to the wall. A different instance is that of Ullberg & Co., a firm much spoken of in the European press, which, with liabilities amounting to 12,000,000 marks banco, including 7,000,000 of bills of exchange, had, as now appears, a capital of only 300,000 marks banco as the basis of such enormous transactions.a

In Sweden, and especially in Denmark, the crisis has rather increased in violence.b The revival of the evil after it appeared to have passed away is to be explained by the dates on which the great demands on Hamburg, Stockholm and Copenhagen fall due. During December, for instance, nine millions of bills drawn on Hamburg by Rio de Janeiro houses for coffee fell due, were all protested, and this mass of protests created a new panic. In January the drafts for the cargoes of sugar shipped from Bahia and Pernambuco will probably meet with a similar fate, and cause a similar revival of the crisis.

Written on December 18, 1857
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5213, January 5, 1858 as a leading article, and reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1316, January 5, 1858

---

b See this volume, pp. 405-06.—Ed.
The successive reduction by the Bank of France of its rate of discount from 10 per cent, at which it stood after Nov. 12, to 9 per cent on Nov. 26, 8 per cent on Dec. 5, and 6 per cent on Dec. 17, is, of course, pointed out by the Imperialist organs as irrefutable proof that the commercial revulsion has entered its decreasing stage, and that "France will go through the severe trial without any catastrophe." The financial system of Napoleon III. is said to have created "this evident superiority of the commercial state of France over that of all other nations," and to insure the fact that France is, and always will be, "less injured in a time of crisis than the countries competing with it." Now, 6 per cent is a rate of bank discount which, since the beginning of the present century, has never occurred in France save in February, 1800, some days after the foundation of the Bank by the uncle, until under the nephew, in the critical period of 1855 and 1856. But if the Bank of France continues to lower its rate of interest, say to 4 per cent, what then? The rate of discount was reduced to 4 per cent on Dec. 27, 1847, when the general crisis still lasted and the French crisis had not yet reached its climax. Then, as now, the Government congratulated France on its privilege of escaping general crisis with nothing but scratches, and those not skin deep. Two months later the financial earthquake had overturned the throne and the wise man who sat upon it.

a Marsaud, "Banque de France", Le Moniteur universel, No. 352, December 18, 1857.—Ed.
b Napoleon I.—Ed.
c Napoleon III.—Ed.
d Louis Philippe.—Ed.
We do certainly not contest the fact that thus far the crisis has had less influence on French commerce than was expected. The reason is simply that in transactions with the United States, Great Britain, and the Hanseatic towns, the balance of trade is, and has been for a long time, in favor of France. Thus, in order that the disasters occurring in those countries should directly recoil on France, large credits must have been given to them, or commodities for export to them have been speculatively accumulated. Nothing of the sort has happened. The American, English and Hanseatic events could, consequently, produce no drain of bullion from France; and if its Bank for some weeks raised the rate of interest to the English standard, it did this only for fear lest French capital should seek more profitable employment abroad.

But it cannot be denied that the general crisis has, even in its present phase, told on France in a form agreeable to the commercial relations of that country with the United States, England and the Hanseatic towns, viz.: in the chronic form of distress. It has forced Bonaparte—who, in his letter of November 10, declared "the evil to exist in the imagination only"—to come out with another official message to the effect that "in spite of the prudence of French trade and the vigilance of the Government, the commercial crisis has obliged many branches of industry, if not to suspend work, at any rate to shorten their time or lower their wages," so that "many workmen suffer from forced idleness." He has consequently opened a credit of a million francs for the relief of the necessitous and finding them means of employment; he has ordered military precautions to be taken at Lyons; and, through his journals, has appealed to private charity. The withdrawals from the savings banks have begun by far to exceed the deposits. Heavy losses from failures in America and England have been sustained by many manufacturers, production is contracting to a disastrous degree at Paris, Lyons, Mühlhausen, Roubaix, Rouen, Lille, Nantes, St. Etienne, and other industrial centers, while serious embarrassments prevail at Marseilles, Havre and Bordeaux.

The general stagnation of trade throughout the country is most evident from the last monthly report of the Bank of France, which shows for the month of December a decrease in circulation of
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a Napoléon III, "Lettre à S. Exc. le ministre des finances...", Le Moniteur universel, No. 315, November 11, 1857.—Ed.
b A. Billault, "Rapport à l'Empereur", Le Moniteur universel, No. 346, December 12, 1857.—Ed.
73,040,000 francs, as compared with October, and of 48,955,900 francs as compared with November; while the aggregate of discounts has fallen about 100,000,000 francs, if compared with October, and 77,067,059 francs compared with November. In the present state of the French press it is, of course, not possible to ascertain the exact state of the failures occurring in provincial towns, but the Paris bankruptcies, although certainly not yet serious, exhibit a tendency to grow not only in quantity, but also in the quality of the concerns involved. In the fortnight from Nov. 17 to Dec. 1 thirty-four Paris bankruptcies only occurred, of which not fewer than twenty-four were of dealers in second-hand clothes, milk-dealers, tailors, artificial flower-makers, cabinet-makers, reticule-makers, gilders, leather dealers, jewelers, fringe-makers, vinegar-makers, cap-makers, fruiterers, &c. From the 1st of December up to the 8th the bankruptcies were no fewer than thirty-one, and from the 9th to the 15th the number amounted to thirty-four, including some of greater importance, such as Messrs. Bourdon, Dubuch & Co., bankers; the General Company of voitures de remise, a Company for Jacquard looms, an oil Company, &c. On the other hand, Bonaparte's attempt at checking the ruinous fall in the prices of wheat and flour by the abrogation of the prohibition decrees, has proved a failure, prices having progressively sunk from the 26th November to the 21st of December, and despite a fair margin of profit on sales in London, no more than 3,000 sacks (of 110 kilogrammes) being shipped thither up to the 22d of December.

If, however, the balance of trade is in favor of France in her dealings with the United States, England, and the Hanseatic towns, it is against her in her commerce with Southern Russia, the Zollverein, Holland, Belgium, the Levant and Italy. As to Switzerland, the temporary balance of trade is always against her, but France is so deeply indebted to her—most of the Alsatian manufactures being carried on by Swiss capital—that in times of monetary scarcity she may always heavily pull upon the French money market. At this period, as at every former one, there will be no active French crisis before the commercial difficulties in those countries have reached a certain height. That Holland cannot tide over the present storm; will be understood on the simple
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a “Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales”,* Le Moniteur universel*, Nos. 282, 317 and 345, October 9, November 13 and December 11 1857.—*Ed.*

b Hired carriages.—*Ed.*

c*The Economist*, No. 747, December 19, 1857.—*Ed.*
consideration that her still large commerce is almost limited to that
description of produce which has undergone and is progressively
undergoing the most fatal depreciation. In the industrial centers
of the Zollverein the premonitory symptoms of the crisis are
already visible. Apprehensions of a crash in the Black Sea and
Levantine trade are announcing themselves in the Trieste papers,
and its first precursory flashes have sufficed to bring down some
large houses at Marseilles. In Italy, finally, the monetary panic, at
the very moment that it seems subsiding in the North of Europe,
has burst out ablaze, as will be seen from the following extract
from the *Opinione* of Milan, of Dec. 18:

"The difficulties of the present time are very, very great; failures are occurring
on a frightful scale, and after those of Palleari, of Ballabio and Co., of Cighera, of
Redaelli, of Wechler and Mazzola, after the *contre-coup* of foreign cities, after the
suspension of payments by the best houses of Verona, Venice, Udine and
Bergamo, our strongest firms also begin to waver, and to make up their accounts.
And the accounts are very sad. Let it suffice to remark that among our great silk
houses there is not one that has in warehouse a less quantity than 50,000 pounds of
silk, whence it is easy to calculate that at present prices every one of them must lose
from half a million to two millions of francs—the stock of some of them exceeding
150,000 lb. The firm of Brambilla Brothers was supported by a loan of one million
and a half of francs; Battista Gavazzi is liquidating, and others are doing the same.
Every man asks himself what we have to look forward to; so many fortunes
vanished, so many reduced by one-half; so many families, lately in easy
circumstances, now at their last shift; so many workmen without work or bread, or
means of subsistence of any kind."\(^a\)

When the French crisis, consequent upon the growing pressure
from these countries, comes to maturity, it will have to grapple
with a nation of gamblers, if not of commercial adventurers, and
with a Government that has played the same part in France as
private commerce has done in this country,\(^b\) in England and
Hamburg. It will fall severely upon the stock market and
endanger the supreme security of that market—the State itself.
The natural result of the contraction of French commerce and
industry is to place money at the disposition of the Bourse,
especially as the Bank of France is bound to make advances upon
public funds and railway securities. Instead of checking stock
gambling, the present stagnation of French commerce and
industry has favored it. Thus we see from the last monthly report
of the Bank of France, that its advances on railway shares have
increased simultaneously with the decrease in discounts and

---

\(^a\) Quoted according to the report from Turin of December 19, 1857, published in
*The Times*, No. 22871, December 23, 1857.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The United States of America.—*Ed.*
circulation. Thus, in spite of the heavy decrease in the receipts of most of the French railways, their quotations are looking up, the receipts of the Orleans line, for instance, having decreased by 22½ per cent toward the close of November, as compared with the corresponding period of last year; yet Orleans was quoted on Dec. 22 at 1,355, while it stood on 1,310 francs only on Oct. 23.\(^a\)

When the depression of trade set in upon France some railway companies were at once compelled to interrupt their works, and a similar fate threatened almost all of them. To mend this the Emperor forced the Bank of France into a treaty with the companies, by dint of which it becomes in fact the real railway contractor. It has to advance the money upon the new bonds which the companies are authorized by the settlement of Nov. 30, 1856, to emit in 1858; and on that part which remained still to be issued for 1857; the authorized issue of bonds for 1858 amounting to forty-two and a half millions. The Crédit Mobilier\(^438\) seemed also destined to succumb before the first shock, and had on the 3d of December to sell at an enormous sacrifice part of its immense amount of securities. There is now a project afloat of amalgamating it with the Crédit Foncier and the Comptoir d'Escompte,\(^439\) in order to make it share in the privilege granted to those institutions of having their bills discounted and their securities received by the Bank of France. Thus the plan evidently is to weather the storm by making the Bank of France responsible for all these concerns—a maneuver which of course exposes the Bank itself to wreck. But what even Napoleon III cannot think of, is to make the Bank pay the calls the private shareholders of the different joint-stock companies will have to encounter. Excluding petty affairs, the calls to be met toward the close of December were: Mercantile and Industrial Company of Madrid (Messrs. Rothschild), $30 per share; Franco-American Navigation Company, $10 per share; Victor Emmanuel Railway Company, $30 per share; Herserange Iron Works Company, $20 per share; the Mediterranean, $30 per share; the Austrian Railway, $15; the Saragossa, $10; the Franco-Swiss, $10; the Société Générale de Tanneries, $10; the Companie de la Carbonisation de Houilles\(^b\) $10, &c. At the beginning of the year there is a payment of $20 per share on the

\(^a\) "Bourse du mardi 22 décembre 1857", Le Moniteur universel, No. 357, December 23, 1857; "Bourse du vendredi 23 octobre 1857", Le Moniteur universel, No. 297, October 24, 1857. The sum given in Le Moniteur is 1,320 francs.— Ed.

\(^b\) Company of the Carbonisation of Coal.—Ed.
Chimay and Marienburg Railway, of $12\frac{1}{2}$ on the Lombard-Venetian Railways, and $20$ on the Belgian and South American Steam Navigation Company. According to the settlement of Nov. 30, 1856, the calls for French railways alone will, in 1858, amount to about $50,000,000. There is certainly a great danger that France may founder on these heavy engagements in 1858, as England did in 1846-47. Moreover, capitalists in Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands, are large holders of French securities, the greater part of which, at the progress of the crisis in those countries, will be thrown upon the Paris Bourse to be turned into money at any price.

Written on December 25, 1857

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5219, January 12, 1858 as a leading article
The last mails from Calcutta brought some details, which have made their way to this country through the London journals, from which it is possible to form a judgment as to Sir Colin Campbell's performance at Lucknow. As the British press assert that this feat of arms stands forth in unrivaled glory in the history of warfare, the subject may as well be a little more closely examined.

The town of Lucknow is situated on the right bank of the River Goomtee, which at that locality runs in a south-easterly direction. At a distance of from two to three miles from the river a canal runs nearly parallel to it, intersects the town, and below it approaches the river, which it then joins about a mile further down. The banks of the river are not occupied by crowded streets, but by a succession of palaces, with gardens and insulated public buildings. At the junction of the canal and river, but on the right or southern bank of both, are situated, close together, a school, called La Martinière, and a hunting-palace and park, called Dilkhoosha. Crossing the canal, but remaining on the southern side of the river, and close to its bank, the first palace and garden is that of Secunderbagh; further west come barracks and Mess-house, and then the Motee Mahal (Pearl Palace), which is but a few hundred yards from the Residency. This latter building is erected on the only high ground in the neighborhood; it commands the town, and consists of a considerable inclosure with several palaces and out-houses within it. To the south of this line of buildings is the compact portion of the town, and two miles south of this is the park and palace of Alumbagh.

The natural strength of the Residency at once explains how it was possible for the English to hold out in it against far superior
numbers; but this very fact at once shows also what class of fighters the Oudians are. In fact, men who, partly drilled under European officers and provided plentifully with artillery, have never yet been able to overcome a single miserable inclosure defended by Europeans—such men are, militarily speaking, no better than savages, and a victory over them cannot add much to the glory of any army, however great the odds may be in favor of the natives. Another fact which classes the Oudians with the most contemptible opponents to be met with, is the manner in which Havelock forced his way through the very thickest portion of the town, in spite of barricades, loopholed houses, and the like. His loss, indeed, was great; but compare such an engagement with even the worst-fought street-battle of 1848! a Not one man of his weak column could have made good his way had there been any real fighting. The houses cannot have been defended at all; it would have required weeks to take as many of them as would have secured a clear passage. As to the judgment displayed by Havelock in thus taking the bull by the horns, we cannot form an opinion; it is said he was compelled to do so from the great strait to which the Residency was reduced, and other motives are mentioned; however, nothing authentic is known.

When Sir Colin Campbell arrived he had about 2,000 European and 1,000 Sikh infantry; 350 European and 600 Sikh cavalry; 18 horse-artillery guns, 4 siege guns, and 300 sailors with their heavy shipguns; in all, 5,000 men, among which were 3,000 Europeans. This force was about as strong in numbers as a very fair average of most Anglo-Indian armies that have accomplished great exploits; indeed, the field-force with which Sir C. Napier conquered Sinde 442 was scarcely half as large, and often less. On the other hand, its large admixture of the European element and the circumstance that all its native portion consisted of the best fighting nation of India, the Sikhs, give it a character of intrinsic strength and cohesion far superior to the generality of Anglo-Indian armies. Its opponents, as we have seen, were contemptible, for the most part rough militia instead of trained soldiers. True, the Oudians pass for the most warlike race of Lower Hindostan, but this is the case merely in comparison with the cowardly Bengalees, whose morale is utterly broken down by the most relaxing climate of the world and by centuries of oppression. The way in which they submitted to the “filibustering” annexation of their country to the Company’s dominions, and the whole of their

---

a The reference is to the revolution of 1848-49.— Ed.
behavior during the insurrection, certainly places them below the level of the Sepoys, as far as courage and intelligence are concerned. We are, indeed, informed that quantity made up for quality. Some letter-writers say there were as many as 100,000 in the town. They were, no doubt, superior to the British in the proportion of four or six to one, perhaps more; but with such enemies that makes little difference. A position can only be defended by a certain number, and if these are determined to run away it matters little whether four or five times that number of similar heroes are within half a mile. There is no doubt that many instances of individual bravery have been seen, even among these Oudians. Some among them may have fought like lions; but of what avail were these in a place which they were too weak to defend after the mere rabble among the garrison had run away? There appears to have never been among them any attempt at bringing the whole under a single command; their local chiefs had no authority except over their own men, and would not submit to anybody else.

Sir Colin Campbell advanced first on Alumbagh; then, instead of forcing his way through the town as Havelock had done, he profited by the experience gained by that General and turned toward Dilkhoosha and La Martinière. The ground in front of these inclosures was cleared of the Oudian skirmishers on Nov. 13. On the 15th the attack commenced. So neglectful had the enemy been that the preparations for intrenching the Dilkhoosha were not yet completed even then; it was taken at once, and without much resistance, and so was the Martinière. These two positions secured to the English the line of the canal. The enemy advanced once more across this obstacle to retake the two posts, lost in the morning, but they were soon routed, with heavy loss. On the 16th the British crossed the canal and attacked the Secunderbagh Palace. The intrenchments here were in a little better order, consequently Gen. Campbell wisely attacked the place with artillery. After the defenses had been destroyed, the infantry charged and took the place. The Samuck, another fortified position, was next cannonaded for three hours and then taken, "after one of the severest fights ever witnessed," says Sir C. Campbell—and, adds a wise correspondent from the seat of
war, “few men have seen more of hard fighting than he.” We should like to know where he saw it. Surely not in the Crimea, where, after the battle of the Alma, he had a very quiet life of it at Balaklava, only one of his regiments being engaged at the battle of Balaklava and none at Inkermann.

On the 17th the artillery was pointed on the barracks and Mess-house which formed the next position toward the Residency. This cannonade lasted till 3 o’clock, after which the infantry took the place by storm. The flying enemy was hotly pursued. One more position remained between the advancing army and the Residency—the Motee Mahal. Before dusk this, too, was carried, and the communication with the garrison was fully established.

Campbell should be praised for the judgment with which he took the easier route and with which he used his heavy artillery to reduce the intrenched positions before he launched his columns. But the British fought with all the advantages of skilled soldiers obeying one chief over half savages commanded by nobody; and, as we see, they fully availed themselves of these advantages. They did not expose their men more than was absolutely necessary. They used artillery as long as there was anything to be battered down. No doubt they fought with valor; but what they deserve credit for is discretion. The best proof of this is in the number of the killed and wounded. It has not yet been published as far as the men are concerned; but there were five officers killed and thirty-two wounded. The army must have had, with 5,000 men, at least 250 to 300 officers. The English officers are certainly never sparing of their lives. To show an example of bravery to their men is in too many cases the part of their duty which they only know. And when in three days' consecutive fighting, under circumstances and in positions which are known to cost more lives than any other to conquer, the loss is only one in eight or nine, it is out of the question to call it hard fighting. To take an example from British history alone, what is all this Indian fighting put together against the single defense of Hougoumont and La Haye Sainte at Waterloo? What would these writers who now turn every little skirmish into a pitched battle say of contests like Borodino, where one army lost one-half and the other one-third of its combatants?

Written on January 4, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5235, January 30, 1858 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
During the late extraordinary session of the British Parliament, Lord Derby declared in the House of Lords that, for the last three years the value of British imports had exceeded that of British exports to the amount of £160,000,000. This statement gave rise to a controversy, out of doors, some private individuals applying to Lord Stanley of Alderley, President of the Board of Trade, for information as to the correctness of Lord Derby's statement. The President of the Board of Trade, in a letter addressed to his interrogators, replied:

"The assertion made by Lord Derby in the House of Lords, that the value of our imports during the last three years had exceeded that of our exports by £160,000,000, is incorrect, and arises from Lord Derby having taken the total value of our imports, including our imports from the Colonies and foreign countries, while he has excluded the re-export of merchandise which has been received from the Colonies and foreign countries. Thus Lord Derby's calculation shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importations</td>
<td>£468,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>308,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>£160,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Whereas it should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importations</td>
<td>£468,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>371,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>£97,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\[a\] E. G. Derby's speech in the House of Lords, December 3, 1857, *The Times*, No. 22855, December 4, 1857.—*Ed.*

\[b\] J. Johnson's inquiry, made on the instructions of the Foreign Affairs Association, and J. G. Fanshawe's reply on behalf of the President of the Board of Trade were published in *The Free Press*, No. 26, December 23, 1857.—*Ed.*
The President of the Board of Trade substantiates this assertion by adding to it a comparative statement of the value of the exports and imports of the United Kingdom during the years 1855, 1856 and 1857. This highly interesting document, which is not to be found in the London newspapers, we reprint below. First it will be seen that the case might be put in a shape confirmatory of Lord Derby's assertion, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>468,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British exports</td>
<td>308,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of imports over British exports</td>
<td>160,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-exports of foreign produce</td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of trade against Great Britain</td>
<td>97,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, there is actually an excess of foreign imports over British exports of 160,000,000, and after the re-export of 63,000,000 of foreign productions, there remains a balance of trade against Great Britain, as stated by the President of the Board of Trade himself, of 97,000,000, or more than 32,000,000 for the average of the three years, 1855, 1856, and 1857. Hence, the recent complaint of The London Times:

"The actual losses sustained by the nation have been going on for the last five or six years, and it is only now that we have found them out."  

These losses, however, arise not from the excess of imports over exports, but from the specific character of a great part of the exports.

The fact is, one-half the re-exports consists of foreign raw materials used in manufactures serving to increase foreign rivalry against the British industrial interests, and, to some extent, returned to the Britishers in manufactured goods for their home consumption. The decisive point, however, to be kept in view, is this, that the large re-exports of raw materials, resulting from the competition of Continental manufactures, enhanced the price of the raw material so much as almost to absorb the profit left to the British manufacturer. On a former occasion, we made some statements in this sense with respect to the British Cotton industry.

---

[a] See this volume, pp. 428-29.— Ed.
As at the present moment the industrial crisis rages most violently in the British Woolen districts, where failure follows upon failure, anxiously concealed from the general public by the London press, it may be opportune to give at this place some figures showing into what effective competition for raw wool the manufacturers of the European Continent were entering with the British ones—a competition which led to the unparalleled enhancement in the price of that raw material, ruinous to the manufacturer, and fostering the now blown-up speculations in that article. The following statement comprises the first nine months of each of the last five years:

### Imports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>Colonial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>£37,586,199</td>
<td>£46,277,276</td>
<td>£83,863,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>27,006,173</td>
<td>50,187,692</td>
<td>77,193,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>17,293,842</td>
<td>53,896,173</td>
<td>71,190,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>22,377,714</td>
<td>62,148,467</td>
<td>84,526,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>27,604,364</td>
<td>63,053,100</td>
<td>90,657,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>Colonial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>£2,480,410</td>
<td>£5,243,166</td>
<td>£7,723,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>5,993,366</td>
<td>13,117,102</td>
<td>19,110,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>8,860,904</td>
<td>12,948,561</td>
<td>21,809,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>5,523,345</td>
<td>14,433,958</td>
<td>19,957,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>4,561,000</td>
<td>25,068,787</td>
<td>29,629,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantities of foreign and colonial wools returned for British home consumption appear, therefore, to have been, in the years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wool</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,139,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,083,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,380,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,568,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,027,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Here and below Marx quotes from "The Supply and Consumption of Wool", *The Economist*, No. 741, November 7, 1857.—*Ed.*
On the other hand, the quantities of British home-grown wool exported were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>4,755,443 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>9,477,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>13,592,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>11,539,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>13,492,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By deducting from the quantity of foreign wools imported into the United Kingdom, first the quantity re-exported and next the quantities of English wools exported, we find the following real quantities of foreign wool available for British home consumption:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>71,384,456 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>48,606,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>35,787,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>53,029,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>47,535,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While, therefore, the import into the United Kingdom of colonial wool increased from 46,277,276 lbs. in the first nine months of 1853 to 63,053,100 lbs. in the same period of 1857, and the total imports of all kinds from 83,863,475 lbs. to 90,657,464 lbs. during the same respective periods, such, in the mean time, had been the increase in the demand for the European Continent, that, in regard to the foreign and colonial wools, the quantities returned for British consumption diminished in the five years from 76,139,899 lbs. in 1853 to 61,027,677 lbs. in 1857; and taking into account the quantities of English wools exported, there took place an aggregate reduction from 71,384,456 lbs. in 1853 to 47,535,291 lbs. in 1857. The significance of these statements will be better understood when attention is called to the fact avowed by The London Times, in a money article, that, simultaneously with this increase in the export of wool from the United Kingdom, the import of Continental woolen manufactures, especially French ones, was increasing.

From the figures furnished by Lord Stanley of Alderley we have abstracted the following tabular statement, showing the degree in which the balance of trade with Great Britain was favorable or unfavorable to different countries:

*Balance of Trade against England for 1855, 1856, 1857.*

1. **United States** ............................... £28,571,764
2. **China** ..................................... 22,675,433
3. **East Indies** ............................... 19,605,742
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>16,642,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>12,842,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>8,214,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7,146,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br. West Indies</td>
<td>6,906,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>6,282,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5,027,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba &amp; Porto Rico</td>
<td>4,853,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>4,672,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Brunswick</td>
<td>3,431,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3,391,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>3,134,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,696,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,808,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1,686,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (Western)</td>
<td>1,432,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1,283,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sicilies</td>
<td>1,030,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chili</td>
<td>693,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Ayres</td>
<td>107,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Balance of Trade in favor of England for 1855, 1856, 1857.*

1. Hanse Towns            | 18,883,428 |
2. Australia             | 17,761,889 |
3. Turkey                | 6,947,220  |
4. Brazil                | 7,131,160  |
5. Belgium               | 2,214,207  |
6. Holland               | 1,600,904  |
7. Cape of G. Hope       | 59,661     |

The simple fact of the excess of British imports over exports, amounting in three years to £97,000,000 would by no means warrant the cry now raised by the Britishers "of carrying on their trade at a yearly sacrifice of £33,000,000," and benefiting by that trade foreign countries only. The enormous and increasing amount of British capital invested in all parts of the world must be paid for in interest, dividends and profits, all of which are to be remitted to a great extent in the form of foreign produce, and consequently go to swell the list of British imports. Beyond the imports corresponding to their exports, there must be a surplus of imports, remitted not in payment for commodities, but as revenue of capital. Generally speaking, the so-called balance of trade must,
therefore, always be in favor of the world against England, because the world has yearly to pay to England not only for the commodities it purchases from her, but also the interest of the debt it owes her. The really disquieting feature for England of the statements above made is this, that she is apparently at a loss to find at home a sufficient field of employment for her unwieldy capital; that she must consequently lend on an increasing scale, and similar, in this point, to Holland, Venice and Genoa, at the epoch of their decline, forge herself the weapons for her competitors. She is forced, by giving large credits, to foster speculation in other countries in order to find a field of employment for her surplus capital, and thus to hazard her acquired wealth in order to augment and conserve it. By being obliged to give large credits to foreign manufacturing countries, such as the Continent of Europe, she forwards herself the means to her industrial rivals to compete with her for the raw produce, and thus is herself instrumental in enhancing the raw material of her own fabrics. The small margin of profit thus left to the British manufacturer, still reduced by the constant necessity for a country the very existence of which is bound up with the monopoly of forming the workshop of the world, constantly to undersell the rest of the world, is then compensated for by curtailing the wages of the laboring classes and creating home misery on a rapidly-enlarging scale. Such is the natural price paid by England for her commercial and industrial supremacy.

A Comparative Statement
of the Value of the Imports and Exports of the United Kingdom
from and to the Principal Foreign Countries
and British Possessions in 1854, 1855, and 1856.a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries.</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Value of Produce</th>
<th>Real Value of Foreign Produce &amp; Colonial</th>
<th>Total.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computed of Imports</td>
<td>Declared Value of Produce of the United Kingdom</td>
<td>Computed Real Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>4,252,288</td>
<td>54,301</td>
<td>19,738</td>
<td>74,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>478,169</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>11,561,924</td>
<td>1,595,237</td>
<td>1,775,617</td>
<td>3,370,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The data given here and below are taken from The Free Press, No. 26, December 23, 1857.—Ed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Computed real value of Imports</th>
<th>Declared Value of Produce of the United Kingdom</th>
<th>Computed Real Value of Foreign &amp; Colonial Produce</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>2,509,539</td>
<td>334,518</td>
<td>249,792</td>
<td>584,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2,325,171</td>
<td>545,384</td>
<td>279,515</td>
<td>824,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>2,031,861</td>
<td>629,697</td>
<td>300,795</td>
<td>930,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,369,440</td>
<td>402,290</td>
<td>106,244</td>
<td>508,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,099,642</td>
<td>487,400</td>
<td>102,551</td>
<td>589,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>947,934</td>
<td>488,489</td>
<td>143,080</td>
<td>631,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>2,706,186</td>
<td>758,228</td>
<td>230,010</td>
<td>988,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>3,086,979</td>
<td>756,967</td>
<td>260,624</td>
<td>1,017,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>2,201,831</td>
<td>1,033,142</td>
<td>352,173</td>
<td>1,385,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>9,055,503</td>
<td>798,434</td>
<td>1,717,285</td>
<td>2,515,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>10,242,862</td>
<td>1,100,021</td>
<td>2,016,650</td>
<td>3,116,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>4,534,815</td>
<td>933,715</td>
<td>624,908</td>
<td>1,558,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanse Towns</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>6,221,524</td>
<td>7,413,715</td>
<td>2,720,274</td>
<td>10,133,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>4,816,298</td>
<td>8,350,228</td>
<td>3,344,416</td>
<td>11,694,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>5,302,739</td>
<td>10,134,813</td>
<td>3,260,543</td>
<td>13,395,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>6,731,141</td>
<td>4,573,034</td>
<td>2,320,877</td>
<td>6,893,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>6,460,932</td>
<td>4,558,210</td>
<td>2,611,767</td>
<td>7,169,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>7,433,442</td>
<td>5,728,253</td>
<td>2,434,278</td>
<td>8,162,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3,631,161</td>
<td>1,406,932</td>
<td>1,948,740</td>
<td>3,555,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2,533,732</td>
<td>1,707,693</td>
<td>2,239,514</td>
<td>3,947,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>2,936,796</td>
<td>1,689,975</td>
<td>2,323,042</td>
<td>4,013,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>10,447,774</td>
<td>3,175,290</td>
<td>3,216,175</td>
<td>6,391,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>9,146,418</td>
<td>6,012,658</td>
<td>4,409,223</td>
<td>10,421,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>10,386,522</td>
<td>6,432,650</td>
<td>4,038,427</td>
<td>10,471,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3,594,501</td>
<td>1,270,464</td>
<td>165,642</td>
<td>1,436,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>4,799,728</td>
<td>1,158,800</td>
<td>135,192</td>
<td>1,293,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>3,645,083</td>
<td>1,734,483</td>
<td>377,820</td>
<td>2,112,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba and Porto Rico</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3,369,444</td>
<td>1,073,861</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>1,078,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2,332,753</td>
<td>1,077,745</td>
<td>22,933</td>
<td>1,100,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>2,654,580</td>
<td>1,398,837</td>
<td>25,190</td>
<td>1,424,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries.</td>
<td>Years.</td>
<td>IMPORTS.</td>
<td>VALUE OF EXPORTS.</td>
<td>TOTAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£2,101,126</td>
<td>£1,370,603</td>
<td>£148,997</td>
<td>£1,519,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£1,962,044</td>
<td>£1,350,791</td>
<td>£184,580</td>
<td>£1,535,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£2,164,090</td>
<td>£1,455,754</td>
<td>£433,470</td>
<td>£1,889,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sicilies</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£1,411,457</td>
<td>£563,033</td>
<td>£109,258</td>
<td>£672,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£1,281,940</td>
<td>£921,220</td>
<td>£175,221</td>
<td>£1,096,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£1,505,582</td>
<td>£1,202,183</td>
<td>£197,925</td>
<td>£1,400,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Proper</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£2,219,298</td>
<td>£2,758,605</td>
<td>£317,476</td>
<td>£3,076,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£2,294,571</td>
<td>£5,659,898</td>
<td>£419,119</td>
<td>£6,059,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£2,383,029</td>
<td>£4,416,029</td>
<td>£291,991</td>
<td>£4,708,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£3,355,928</td>
<td>£1,253,353</td>
<td>£113,895</td>
<td>£1,367,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£3,674,682</td>
<td>£1,454,371</td>
<td>£117,235</td>
<td>£1,571,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£5,753,518</td>
<td>£1,587,682</td>
<td>£43,151</td>
<td>£1,630,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (including California)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£29,795,302</td>
<td>£21,410,369</td>
<td>£923,034</td>
<td>£22,333,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£25,741,752</td>
<td>£17,318,086</td>
<td>£744,517</td>
<td>£18,062,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£36,047,773</td>
<td>£21,918,105</td>
<td>£698,772</td>
<td>£22,616,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£2,083,589</td>
<td>£2,891,840</td>
<td>£119,982</td>
<td>£3,011,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£2,273,819</td>
<td>£3,312,728</td>
<td>£128,550</td>
<td>£3,441,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£2,229,048</td>
<td>£4,084,537</td>
<td>£179,979</td>
<td>£4,264,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Ayres</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£1,285,186</td>
<td>£1,267,125</td>
<td>£32,565</td>
<td>£1,299,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£1,052,033</td>
<td>£742,442</td>
<td>£26,383</td>
<td>£768,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£981,193</td>
<td>£998,329</td>
<td>£43,892</td>
<td>£1,042,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chili</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£1,380,563</td>
<td>£1,421,855</td>
<td>£43,589</td>
<td>£1,465,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£1,925,271</td>
<td>£1,350,385</td>
<td>£56,688</td>
<td>£1,387,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£1,700,776</td>
<td>£1,396,446</td>
<td>£64,492</td>
<td>£1,460,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£3,138,527</td>
<td>£949,289</td>
<td>£22,236</td>
<td>£971,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£3,484,288</td>
<td>£1,285,160</td>
<td>£60,278</td>
<td>£1,345,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£3,048,694</td>
<td>£1,046,010</td>
<td>£26,154</td>
<td>£1,072,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (including Hong Kong)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£9,125,040</td>
<td>£1,000,716</td>
<td>£26,400</td>
<td>£1,027,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£8,746,590</td>
<td>£1,277,944</td>
<td>£26,052</td>
<td>£1,303,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>£9,421,648</td>
<td>£2,216,123</td>
<td>£70,611</td>
<td>£2,286,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>Value of Produce</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comput.</td>
<td>Decl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>real value</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>Real Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Imports</td>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>of Foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. C. of Africa (exclusive of)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,528,896</td>
<td>646,868</td>
<td>174,073</td>
<td>820,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br. &amp; Fr. Pos.</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,516,729</td>
<td>839,831</td>
<td>219,827</td>
<td>1,059,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,657,375</td>
<td>666,374</td>
<td>223,842</td>
<td>890,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>118,239,554</td>
<td>63,800,605</td>
<td>15,645,612</td>
<td>79,446,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>109,959,539</td>
<td>69,524,475</td>
<td>18,710,749</td>
<td>88,235,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>129,517,568</td>
<td>83,327,154</td>
<td>20,035,442</td>
<td>103,362,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Possessions</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>4,007,052</td>
<td>3,957,085</td>
<td>180,569</td>
<td>4,137,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2,296,277</td>
<td>1,515,823</td>
<td>90,298</td>
<td>1,606,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>3,779,741</td>
<td>2,418,250</td>
<td>123,591</td>
<td>2,541,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>2,079,674</td>
<td>863,704</td>
<td>40,273</td>
<td>903,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>4,379,041</td>
<td>370,560</td>
<td>27,718</td>
<td>398,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,891,707</td>
<td>572,542</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td>606,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British West India Islands</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3,977,271</td>
<td>1,870,674*</td>
<td>166,690</td>
<td>2,037,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>3,978,278</td>
<td>1,389,992</td>
<td>136,022</td>
<td>1,526,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>4,157,098</td>
<td>1,462,156</td>
<td>180,799</td>
<td>1,642,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Guiana</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,636,267</td>
<td>31,779</td>
<td>31,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,491,935</td>
<td>421,398</td>
<td>35,189</td>
<td>456,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,418,264</td>
<td>411,241</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td>452,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Settlements in Australia</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>4,301,868</td>
<td>11,931,352</td>
<td>1,474,634</td>
<td>13,405,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>4,500,200</td>
<td>6,278,966</td>
<td>942,659</td>
<td>7,221,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>5,736,043</td>
<td>9,912,575</td>
<td>1,759,814</td>
<td>11,672,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British East Indies</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>10,672,862</td>
<td>9,127,556</td>
<td>493,154</td>
<td>9,620,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>12,668,732</td>
<td>9,949,154</td>
<td>404,321</td>
<td>10,358,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>17,262,851</td>
<td>10,546,190</td>
<td>478,328</td>
<td>11,024,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,506,646</td>
<td>382,276</td>
<td>31,228</td>
<td>413,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,474,251</td>
<td>305,576</td>
<td>20,321</td>
<td>325,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,304,174</td>
<td>388,435</td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>411,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including British Guiana.
** Included with West Indies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Real Value</th>
<th>Value of Foreign &amp; Colonial Produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,677,533</td>
<td>383,210</td>
<td>17,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,723,807</td>
<td>303,173</td>
<td>14,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>2,427,007</td>
<td>420,180</td>
<td>16,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape of Good Hope &amp; Brit. Pos. in S. Afr'a</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>691,352</td>
<td>921,957</td>
<td>63,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>949,640</td>
<td>791,313</td>
<td>45,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,502,828</td>
<td>1,344,338</td>
<td>73,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of British Possessions</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>34,149,499</td>
<td>33,384,121</td>
<td>2,990,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>33,583,311</td>
<td>26,163,610</td>
<td>2,292,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>43,026,586</td>
<td>32,499,794</td>
<td>3,357,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign Countries and Br. Poss'sns</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>152,389,053</td>
<td>97,184,726</td>
<td>18,636,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>143,542,850</td>
<td>95,688,085</td>
<td>21,003,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>172,544,154</td>
<td>115,826,948</td>
<td>23,393,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written on about January 7, 1858
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5238, February 3, 1858
We have at last before us the official dispatch of Sir Colin Campbell on the relief of Lucknow. It confirms in every respect the conclusions we drew from the first non-official reports on this engagement. The contemptible character of the resistance offered by the Oudians is even more apparent from this document, while on the other hand Campbell himself appears to take more pride in his skillful generalship than in any uncommon bravery displayed either by him or his troops. The dispatch states the strength of the British troops at about 5,000, of whom some 3,200 were infantry, and 700 cavalry, the rest artillery, naval brigade, engineers, &c. The operations commenced, as stated, with the attack on Dilkhoosha. This garden was taken after a running fight. “The loss was very trifling; the enemy’s loss, too, was trifling, owing to the suddenness of retreat.” There was, indeed, no chance of displaying heroism on this occasion. The Oudians retreated in such a hurry that they crossed at once through the grounds of La Martinière without availing themselves of the new line of defense offered by this post. The first symptom of a more obstinate resistance was shown at the Secunderbagh, a high-walled, loop-holed inclosure 120 yards square, flanked by a loop-holed village about 100 yards distant. There Campbell at once displayed his less dashing but more sensible mode of warfare. The heavy and field artillery concentrated their efforts on the main inclosure, while

---

a See this volume, pp. 419-24.—Ed.
b Here and below see C. Campbell, “From His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to the Right Hon. the Governor-General”, *The Times*, No. 22889, January 13, 1858.—Ed.
one brigade attacked the barricaded village, and another drove back whatever bands of the enemy attempted the open field. The defense was lamentable. Two intrenched positions like those described flanking each other by their fire, in the hands of indifferent soldiers, or even of plucky undisciplined insurgents, would require a deal of fighting to take. But here there appears to have been neither pluck, nor concert, nor even a shadow of sense. We do not hear of any artillery used in the defense. The village (evidently a small cluster of houses) was taken at the first onset. The troops in the field were scattered without an effort. Thus in a few moments the Secunderbagh was quite isolated, and when, after an hour's cannonading, the walls gave way in one point, the Highlanders stormed the breach and killed every soul in the place; 2,000 natives are said by Sir C. Campbell to have been found dead in it.

The Shah Nujjeef was the next post—a walled inclosure prepared for defense, with a mosque for a redoubt; again one of those positions which a commander of brave but half-disciplined troops would exactly wish for. This place was stormed after a three hours' cannonade had opened the walls. On the next day, Nov. 17, the Mess-house was attacked. This was a group of buildings inclosed by a mud rampart and a scarped ditch twelve feet wide—in other words, a common field redoubt with a slight ditch and a parapet of problematical thickness and height. For some cause or other, this place appeared rather formidable to Gen. Campbell, for he at once resolved to give his artillery full time to batter it down before he stormed it. The cannonade accordingly lasted the whole morning, till 3 o'clock p.m., when the infantry advanced and took the position with a rash. No sharp fighting here, at all events. The Motee Mahal, the last post of the Oudians on the line toward the Residency, was cannonaded for an hour; several breaches were made and then taken without difficulty, and this ended the fighting for the relief of the garrison.

The character of the whole engagement is that of an attack by well-disciplined, well-officered European troops, inured to war and of average courage, upon an Asiatic rabble, possessing neither discipline nor officers, nor the habits of war, nor even adequate arms, and whose courage was broken by the consciousness of the double superiority possessed by their opponents, as soldiers over civilians and as Europeans over Asiatics. We have seen that Sir Colin Campbell nowhere appears to have been opposed by artillery. We shall see, further on, that Brigadier Inglis's report
leads to the conclusion that the great bulk of the insurgents must have been without fire-arms; and if it is true that 2,000 natives were massacred in the Secunderbagh, it is evident they must have been very imperfectly armed, otherwise the greatest cowards would have defended the place against one assaulting column.

On the other hand, the conduct of the fight by Gen. Campbell deserves the highest praise for tactical skill. From the want of artillery in his opponents, he must have known that his progress could not be resisted; accordingly he used this arm to its full extent, clearing first the way for his columns before he launched them. The attack upon Secunderbagh and its flanking defenses is a very excellent specimen of the mode of conducting such an affair. At the same time, having once ascertained the despicable nature of the defense, he did not treat such opponents with any unnecessary formality; as soon as there was a gap in the walls, the infantry advanced. Altogether, Sir C. Campbell ranks from the day of Lucknow as a general; hitherto he was known as a soldier only.

By the relief of Lucknow we are at last put in possession of a document describing the occurrences which took place during the siege of the Residency. Brigadier Inglis, the successor in command of Sir H. Lawrence, has made his report to the Governor-General; and, according to Gen. Outram and the unisono of the British press, here is a conspicuous case of heroism, indeed—for such bravery, such perseverance, such endurance of fatigue and hardships, have never been seen at any time, and the defense of Lucknow stands unparalleled in the history of sieges. The report of Brigadier Inglis informs us that on the 30th of June the British made a sortie against the natives, who were then just concentrating, but were repulsed with such heavy loss that they had at once to confine themselves to the defense of the Residency, and even to abandon and blow up another group of buildings in the vicinity, containing 240 barrels of powder and 6,000,000 musket cartridges. The enemy at once invested the Residency, taking possession of and fortifying the buildings in its immediate vicinity, some within 50 yards of the defenses, and which, against the advice of the engineers, Sir H. Lawrence had refused to raze. The British parapets were still partly unfinished, and only two batteries

---

a Here and below Engels used the report “From Brigadier Inglis, Commanding Garrison of Lucknow, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Calcutta”, published in The Times, No. 22889, January 13, 1858.— Ed.
b Charles John Canning.— Ed.
c The Times, No. 22889, January 13, 1858, leading article.— Ed.
were in working order, but, in spite of the terrific and incessant fire "kept up by" 8,000 men firing "at one time into the position," they were enabled to complete them very soon, and have 30 guns in battery. This terrific fire must have been a very wild and random kind of firing, not at all deserving the name of sharp-shooting with which Gen. Inglis adorns it; how otherwise could a man have lived in the place, defended as it was by perhaps 1,200 men? The instances related to show the terrific nature of this fire, that it killed women and children, and wounded men in places considered well sheltered, are very poor examples, as they occur never oftener than when the enemy's fire, instead of being aimed at different objects, is directed toward the fortification at large, and consequently never hits the actual defenders. On the 1st of July Lawrence was mortally wounded, and Inglis took the command. The enemy had by this time 20 or 25 guns in position, "planted all round our post." Very lucky for the defense, for if they had concentrated their fire on one or two places of the ramparts, the position would in all likelihood have been taken. Some of these guns were posted in places "where our own heavy guns could not reply to them." Now, as the Residency is on commanding ground, these places can only have been so situated that the guns of the attack could not fire at the rampart, but merely at the tops of the buildings inside; which was very fortunate for the defense, as that did no great harm, and the same guns might have been far more usefully employed in firing at the parapet or barricades. Upon the whole, the artillery on both sides must have been miserably served, as otherwise a cannonade at such short range must have been very shortly put a stop to by the batteries mutually dismounting each other; and that this did not take place, is still a mystery.

On July 20, the Oudians exploded a mine under the parapet, which, however, did no damage. Two main columns immediately advanced to an assault, while sham attacks were attempted at other places; but the mere effect of the garrison's fire drove them back. On the 10th of August another mine exploded, and opened a breach,

"through which a regiment could have advanced in perfect order. A column charged this breach, flanked by the subordinate attacks; but at the breach only a few of the enemy advanced with the utmost determination."

These few were soon disposed of by the flank fire of the garrison, while at the flank attacks hand-grenades and a little firing drove the undisciplined masses back. The third mine was sprung on the 18th August; a new breach was formed, but the
assault was even more spiritless than before, and was easily repelled. The last explosion and assault took place on the 5th September, but again hand-grenades and musketry drove them back. From that time to the arrival of relief, the siege appears to have been converted into a mere blockade, with a more or less sustained fire of muskets and artillery.

This is, indeed, an extraordinary transaction. A mob of 50,000 men or more, composed of the inhabitants of Lucknow and the surrounding country, with perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 drilled soldiers among them, blockade a body of some 1,200 or 1,500 Europeans in the Residency of Lucknow and attempt to reduce them. So little order reigned among the blockading body, that the supplies of the garrison appear never to have been completely cut off, though their communications with Cawnpore were. The proceedings of what is called “the siege” are distinguished by a mixture of Asiatic ignorance and wildness, with here and there a glimpse of some military knowledge introduced by European example and rule. There were evidently some artillerymen and sappers among the Oudians who knew how to construct batteries; but their action appears to have been confined to the construction of shelter from the enemy’s fire. They even appear to have brought this art of sheltering themselves to great perfection, so much so that their batteries must have been very safe, not only for the gunners but also for the besieged; no guns could have been worked in them with any effect. Nor were they; or how is this unparalleled fact to be explained, that 30 guns inside and 25 outside worked against each other at exceedingly short ranges, some not more than 50 yards, and yet we hear nothing of dismounted guns or one party silencing the artillery of the other? As to the musketry fire, we first have to ask how it is possible that eight thousand natives could take position within musket range from the British batteries without being sent to the right about by the artillery? And if they did, how is it possible that they did not kill and wound every soul on the place? Still we are told that they did hold their own, and did fire day and night, and that in spite of all this the 32d Regiment, which could at the very outside count 500 men after June 30, and had to bear the brunt of the whole siege, still was 300 strong at its end? If this is not an exact counterpart of the “last surviving ten of the Fourth (Polish) Regiment,” which marched into Prussia 88 officers and 1,815 rank and file strong, what then is it? The British are perfectly right that such fighting was never seen as there was at Lucknow—indeed it was not. In spite of the unassuming, apparently simple tone of Inglis’s report,
yet his queer observation about guns placed so that they could not be fired at, about 8,000 men firing day and night, without effect, about 50,000 insurgents blockading him, about the hardships of bullets going into places where they had no business to go, and about assaults carried out with the utmost determination, yet repulsed, without any effort—all these observations compel us to acknowledge the whole of this report is full of the most glaring exaggerations, and will not stand cool criticism for a moment.

But then surely the besieged underwent uncommon hardships? Listen:

"The want of native servants has also been a source of much privation. Several ladies have had to tend their children, and even to wash their own clothes as well as to cook their scanty meals entirely unaided."

Pity the sorrows of a poor Lucknow lady! True, in these times of ups and downs, when dynasties are made and unmade in a day, and revolutions and commercial crashes combine to render the permanency of all creature comforts most splendidly insecure, we are not called upon to show any great sympathy if we hear of some ex-queen having to darn her own stockings, and even to wash them, not to speak of her cooking her own mutton-chop. But an Anglo-Indian lady, one of that vast number of sisters, cousins, or nieces to half-pay officers, Indian Government writers, merchants, clerks, or adventurers, who are, or rather were, before the mutiny, sent out every year, fresh from the boarding-school, to the large marriage-market in India, neither more nor less ceremoniously, and often far less willingly, than the fair Circassians that go to the Constantinople market—the very idea of one of these ladies having to wash her own clothes and cook her scanty meals entirely unaided—entirely! One's blood boils at it. Completely without "native servants"—ay, having actually to tend their own children! It is revolting—Cawnpore would have been preferable!*

The rabble investing the Residency may have counted 50,000 men; but then the large majority cannot have had any firearms. The 8,000 "sharp-shooters" may have had firearms; but of what description both arms and men were, the effect of their fire is there to tell. The twenty-five guns in the battery have been proved to have been most despicably served. The mining was as much at random as the firing. The assaults do not deserve the name even of reconnaissances. So much for the besiegers.

The besieged deserve full credit for the great strength of character with which they have held out for nearly five months,

---

*a See this volume, pp. 346-47. — Ed.*
the greater portion of which time they were without any news whatever from the British forces. They fought, and hoped against hope, as it behooves men to do when they have their lives to sell as dearly as they can, and women and children to defend against Asiatic cruelty. Again, full credit do we give them for their watchfulness and perseverance. But, after the experiences of Wheeler’s surrender at Cawnpore, who would not have done the same?

As to the attempt to turn the defense of Lucknow into a piece of unparalleled heroism, it is ridiculous, especially after the clumsy report of Gen. Inglis. The privations of the garrison were confined to scanty shelter and exposure to the weather (which, however, did not produce any serious disease), and as to provisions, the very worst they had consisted in “coarse beef and still coarser flour!” far more comfortable fare than besieged soldiers are accustomed to in Europe! Compare the defense of Lucknow against a stupid and ignorant barbarian rabble with that of Antwerp, 1832, and the Fort of Malghera near Venice, in 1848 and '49, not to speak of Todtelen at Sevastopol, who had far greater difficulties to contend with than Gen. Inglis. Malghera was attacked by the best engineers and artillerymen of Austria, and defended by a weak garrison of raw levies; four-fifths of them had no bomb-proof shelter; the low soil created malaria more dangerous than an Indian climate; a hundred guns played upon them, and during the last three days of the bombardment, forty rounds were fired every minute; still the fort held out a month, and would have held out longer, if the Austrians had not taken hold of a position necessitating their retreat. Or take Dantzig, where Rapp, with the sick remnants of the French regiments returned from Russia, held out eleven months. Take in fact any respectable siege of modern days, and you will find that more skill, more spirit, and quite as much pluck and endurance were shown against quite as great odds as in this Lucknow affair.

The Oude insurgents, however, though contemptible in the field, proved, immediately after the arrival of Campbell, the strength of a national insurrection. Campbell saw at once that he could neither attack the City of Lucknow with his forces, nor hold his own. This is quite natural, and will appear so to any one who has attentively read the French invasion of Spain under Napoleon. The strength of a national insurrection does not lie in pitched battles, but in petty warfare, in the defense of towns, and in the interruption of the enemy’s communications. Campbell accordingly prepared for the retreat with the same skill with which he had
arranged the attack. A few more positions about the Residency were carried. They served to deceive the enemy as to Campbell's intentions, and to cover the arrangements for the retreat. With a daring perfectly justified in front of such an opponent, the whole army, a small reserve excepted, was employed to occupy an extensive line of outposts and pickets, behind which the women, the sick and wounded, and the baggage were evacuated. As soon as this preliminary operation was performed the outlying pickets fell back, concentrating gradually into more solid masses, the foremost of which then retreated through the next line, again to form as a reserve to the rear. Without being attacked, the whole of this maneuver was carried out with perfect order; with the exception of Outram and a small garrison left at Alumbai (for what purposes we do not at present see), the whole army marched to Cawnpore, thus evacuating the Kingdom of Oude.

In the mean time unpleasant events had taken place at Cawnpore. Windham, the "hero of the Redan," another of those officers of whose skill we are told that they have proved it by being very brave, had on the 26th defeated the advanced guard of the Gwalior contingent, but on the 27th he had been severely beaten by them, his camp taken and burned, and he himself compelled to retreat into Wheeler's old intrenchment at Cawnpore. On the 28th they attacked this post, but were repulsed, and on the 6th Campbell defeated them with scarcely any loss, taking all their guns and train, and pursuing them for fourteen miles. The details of all these affairs are so far but scanty; but this much is certain, that the Indian Rebellion is as yet far from being quelled, and that, although most or all British re-enforcements have now landed, yet they disappear in an almost unaccountable manner. Some 20,000 men have landed in Bengal, and still the active army is no larger than when Delhi was taken. There is something wrong here. The climate must make terrible havoc among the newcomers.

Written on January 14, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5236, February 1, 1858
The buoyancy in the London money market, resulting from the withdrawal of an enormous mass of capital from the ordinary productive investments, and its consequent transfer to the security markets, has, in the last fortnight, been somewhat lessened by the prospects of an impending Indian loan to the amount of eight or ten million pounds sterling. This loan, to be raised in England, and to be authorized by Parliament immediately on its assembling in February, is required to meet the claims upon the East India Company by its home creditors, as well as the extra expenditure for war materials, stores, transport of troops, &c., necessitated by the Indian revolt. In August 1857, the British Government had, before the prorogation of Parliament, solemnly declared in the House of Commons that no such loan was intended, the financial resources of the Company being more than sufficient to meet the crisis. The agreeable delusion thus palmed on John Bull was, however, soon dispelled when it oozed out that by a proceeding of a very questionable character, the East India Company had laid hold on a sum of about £3,500,000 sterling, intrusted to them by different companies, for the construction of Indian railways; and had, moreover, secretly borrowed £1,000,000 sterling from the Bank of England, and another million from the London Joint Stock banks. The public being thus prepared for the worst, the Government did no longer hesitate to drop the mask, and by semi-official articles in The Times, Globe, and other governmental organs, avow the necessity of the loan.

It may be asked why a special act on the part of the legislative power is required for launching such a loan, and then, why such an event does create the least apprehension, since, on the
contrary, every vent for British capital, seeking now in vain for profitable investment, should, under present circumstances, be considered a windfall, and a most salutary check upon the rapid depreciation of capital.

It is generally known that the commercial existence of the East India Company was terminated in 1834, when its principal remaining source of commercial profits, the monopoly of the China trade, was cut off. Consequently, the holders of East India stock having derived their dividends, nominally, at least, from the trade-profits of the Company, a new financial arrangement with regard to them had become necessary. The payment of the dividends, till then chargeable upon the commercial revenue of the Company, was transferred to its political revenue. The proprietors of East India stocks were to be paid out of the revenues enjoyed by the East India Company in its governmental capacity, and, by act of Parliament, the Indian stock, amounting to £6,000,000 sterling, bearing ten per cent interest, was converted into a capital not to be liquidated except at the rate of £200 for every £100 of stock. In other words, the original East India stock of £6,000,000 sterling was converted into a capital of £12,000,000 sterling, bearing five per cent interest, and chargeable upon the revenue derived from the taxes of the Indian people. The debt of the East India Company was thus, by a Parliamentary sleight of hand, changed into a debt of the Indian people. There exists, besides, a debt exceeding £50,000,000 sterling, contracted by the East India Company in India, and exclusively chargeable upon the State revenues of that country; such loans contracted by the Company in India itself having always been considered to lay beyond the district of Parliamentary legislation, and regarded no more than the debts contracted by the Colonial Governments in Canada or Australia for instance.

On the other hand, the East India Company was prohibited from contracting interest-bearing debts in Great Britain herself, without the especial sanction of Parliament. Some years ago, when the Company set about establishing railways and electric telegraphs in India, it applied for the authorization of Indian Bonds in the London market, a request which was granted to the amount of £7,000,000 sterling to be issued in Bonds bearing 4 per cent

---

\(^a\) An Act for effecting an Arrangement with the East India Company...— Ed.

\(^b\) Here and below Marx draws on “The financial obligations of the East India Company”, *The Economist*, No. 749, January 2, 1858.— Ed.
interest, and secured only on the Indian State revenues. At the commencement of the outbreak in India, this bond-debt stood at £3,894,400 sterling, and the very necessity of again applying to Parliament shows the East India Company to have, during the course of the Indian insurrection, exhausted its legal powers of borrowing at home.

Now it is no secret that before recurring to this step, the East India Company had opened a loan at Calcutta, which, however, turned out a complete failure. This proves, on the one hand, that Indian capitalists are far from considering the prospects of British supremacy in India in the same sanguine spirit which distinguishes the London press; and, on the other hand, exacerbates the feelings of John Bull to an uncommon pitch, since he is aware of the immense hoardings of capital having gone on for the last seven years in India, whither, according to a statement recently published by Messrs. Haggard & Paxley, there has been shipped in 1856 and 1857, from the port of London alone, bullion to the amount of £21,000,000. The London Times, in a most persuasive strain, has taught its readers that

"of all the incentives to the loyalty of the natives, that of making them our creditors was the least doubtful; while, on the other hand, among an impulsive, secretive and avaricious people no temptation to discontent or treachery could be stronger than that created by the idea that they were annually taxed to send dividends to wealthy claimants in other countries."b

The Indians, however, appear not to understand the beauty of a plan which would not only restore English supremacy at the expense of Indian capital, but at the same time, in a circuitous way, open the native hoards to British commerce. If, indeed, the Indian capitalists were as fond of British rule as every true Englishman thinks it an article of faith to assert, no better opportunity could have been afforded them of exhibiting their loyalty and getting rid of their silver. The Indian capitalists shutting up their hoards, John Bull must open his mind to the dire necessity of defraying himself in the first instance, at least, the expenses of the Indian insurrection, without any support on the part of the natives. The impending loan constitutes, moreover, a precedent only, and looks like the first leaf in a book, bearing the title Anglo-Indian Home Debt. It is no secret that what the East India Company wants are not eight millions, or ten millions, but
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a “Indian loans”, The Economist, No. 750, January 9, 1858.— Ed.
b The Times, No. 22883, January 6, 1858, “Money-Market and City Intelligence”.— Ed.
twenty-five to thirty millions pounds, and even these as a first installment only, not for expenses to be incurred, but for debts already due. The deficient revenue for the last three years amounted to £5,000,000; the treasure plundered by the insurgents up to the 15th October last, to £10,000,000, according to the statement of the Phoenix, an Indian governmental paper; the loss of revenue in the Northeastern provinces, consequent upon the rebellion, to £5,000,000, and the war expenses to at least £10,000,000.

It is true that successive loans by the Indian Company, in the London Money Market, would raise the value of money and prevent the increasing depreciation of capital; that is to say, the further fall in the rate of interest; but such a fall is exactly required for the revival of British industry and commerce. Any artificial check put upon the downward movement of the rate of discount is equivalent to an enhancement in the cost of production and the terms of credit, which, in its present weak state, English trade feels itself unable to bear. Hence the general cry of distress at the announcement of the Indian loan. Though the Parliamentary sanction adds no imperial guarantee to the loan of the Company, that guarantee, too, must be conceded, if money is not to be obtained on other terms; and despite all fine distinctions, as soon as the East India Company is supplanted by the British Government its debt will be merged into the British debt. A further increase of the large national debt seems, therefore, one of the first financial consequences of the Indian Revolt.

Written on January 22, 1858

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3243, February 9, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper
While during the Crimean war all England was calling for a man capable of organizing and leading her armies, and while incapables like Raglan, Simpson and Codrington were intrusted with the office, there was a soldier in the Crimea endowed with the qualities required in a general. We mean Sir Colin Campbell, who is now daily showing in India that he understands his profession with a master's mind. In the Crimea, after having been allowed to lead his brigade at the Alma where from the rigid line-tactics of the British army, he had no chance to show his capacities, he was cooped up in Balaklava and never once allowed to participate in the succeeding operations. And yet, his military talents had been clearly established in India long before, by no less an authority than the greatest general England has produced since Marlborough, by Sir Charles James Napier. But Napier was an independent man, too proud to stoop to the reigning oligarchy—and his recommendation was enough to make Campbell marked and distrusted.

Other men, however, gained distinctions and honors in that war. There was Sir William Fenwick Williams of Kars, who now finds it convenient to rest on the laurels acquired by impudence, self-puffing, and by defrauding Gen. Kmetty of his well-earned fame. A baronetcy, a thousand a year, a comfortable berth at Woolwich, and a seat in Parliament, are quite sufficient to prevent him risking his reputation in India. Unlike him, "the hero of the Redan," Gen. Windham, has set out to command a division against the Sepoys, and his very first act has settled him forever. This same Windham, an obscure colonel of good family connections, commanded a brigade at the assault of the Redan, during
which operation he behaved extremely phlegmatically, and at last, no re-enforcement arriving, twice left his troops to shift for themselves, while he went to inquire about them himself. For this very questionable act, which in other services would have been inquired into by a court-martial, he was forthwith made a General, and shortly afterward called to the post of Chief of the Staff.

When Colin Campbell advanced to Lucknow, he left the old intrenchments, the camp and the town of Cawnpore, together with the bridge over the Ganges, in charge of General Windham and a force sufficient for the purpose. There were five regiments of infantry, whole or in part, many guns of position, 10 field guns and two naval guns, beside 100 horse; the whole force above 2,000. While Campbell was engaged at Lucknow, the various bodies of rebels hovering about the Doab drew together for an attack on Cawnpore. Beside a miscellaneous rabble, collected by insurgent Zemindars, the attacking force counted of drilled troops (disciplined they cannot be called), the remainder of the Dinapore Sepoys and a portion of the Gwalior contingent. These latter were the only insurgent troops, the formation of which can be said to go beyond that of companies, as they had been officered by natives almost exclusively, and thus, with their field-officers and captains, retained something like organized battalions. They were consequently regarded with some respect by the British. Windham had strict orders to remain on the defensive, but getting no replies to his dispatches from Campbell, the communication being interrupted, he resolved to act on his own responsibility. On the 26th November, he advanced with 1,200 infantry, 100 horse and 8 guns to meet the advancing insurgents. Having easily defeated their vanguard, he saw the main column approaching and retired close to Cawnpore. Here he took up a position in front of the town, the 34th Regiment on the left, the Rifles (5 companies) and two companies of the 82d on the right. The line of retreat lay through the town, and there were some brick-kilns in rear of the left. Within four hundred yards from the front, and on various points still nearer to the flanks, were woods, and jungle, offering excellent shelter to the advancing enemy. In fact, a worse position could not well have been chosen—the British exposed in the open plain, while the Indians could approach under shelter to within three or four hundred yards! To bring out Windham's "heroism" in a still stronger light, there was a very decent position close by, with a plain in front and rear, and with the canal as an obstacle before the front; but, of course, the worse position was insisted on. On the 27th November, the enemy opened a cannonade, bringing
up his guns to the edge of the cover afforded by the jungle. Windham, who, with the modesty inherent in a hero, calls this a "bombardment," says his troops stood it for five hours; but after this time, there happened some things which neither Windham, nor any man present, nor any Indian or British newspaper, has as yet dared to relate. From the moment the cannonade was turned into a battle, all our direct sources of information cease, and we are left to draw our own conclusions from the hesitating, prevaricating and incomplete evidence before us. Windham confines himself to the following incoherent statement:

"In spite of the heavy bombardment of the enemy, my troops resisted the attack [rather novel to call a cannonade against field-troops an attack] for five hours, and still held the ground, until I found from the number of men bayonetted by the 88th, that the mutineers had fully penetrated the town; having been told that they were attacking the fort, I directed Gen. Dupuis to fall back. The whole force retired into the fort, with all our stores and guns, shortly before dark. Owing to the flight of the camp-followers, I was unable to carry off my camp equipage and some of the baggage. Had not an error occurred in the conveyance of an order issued by me, I am of opinion that I could have held my ground, at all events until dark." *a

Gen. Windham, with that instinct shown already at the Redan, moves off to the reserve (the 88th occupying the town, as we must conclude), and finds, not the enemy alive and fighting, but a great number of the enemy bayonetted by the 88th. This fact leads him to the conclusion that the enemy (he does not say whether dead or alive) has fully penetrated the town! Alarming as this conclusion is both to the reader and to himself, our hero does not stop here. He is told that the fort is attacked. A common general would have inquired into the truth of this story, which of course turned out to be false. Not so Windham. He orders a retreat, though his troops could have held the position at least until dark, had not an error been committed in the conveyance of one of Windham's orders! Thus, first you have Windham's heroic conclusion, that where there are many dead Sepoys there must be many live ones; secondly, the false alarm respecting the attack on the fort; and thirdly, the error committed in the conveyance of an order; all of which mishaps combined made it possible for a very numerous rabble of natives to defeat the hero of the Redan and to beat the indomitable British pluck of his soldiers.

Another reporter, an officer present, says:

"I do not believe any one can accurately describe the fight and retreat of this forenoon. A retreat was ordered. Her Majesty's 34th foot being directed to fall
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*a C. A. Windham, "Major-General C. A. Windham to the Commander-in-Chief", The Times, No. 22904, January 30, 1858.—Ed.
back behind the brick kiln, neither officers nor men knew where to find it! The news flew rapidly about the cantonments that our force was worsted and on the retreat, and an overwhelming rush was made at the inner intrenchments, as resistless as the mass of water at the Falls of Niagara. Soldiers and Jacks, Europeans and natives, men, women and children, horses, camels and oxen, poured in in countless numbers from 2 p.m. By nightfall the intrenched camp, with its motley assemblage of men and beasts, baggage, luggage, and ten thousand nondescript incumbrances, rivaled the chaos that existed before the fiat of creation went forth."\(^a\)

Finally, *The Times's* Calcutta correspondent states that evidently the British suffered on the 27th "what almost amounts to a repulse,"\(^b\) but that from patriotic motives the Anglo-Indian press covers the disgrace with the impenetrable vail of charity. Thus much, however, is also admitted, that one of Her Majesty's regiments, composed mostly of recruits, one moment got into disorder, without however giving way, and that at the fort the confusion was extreme, Windham having lost all control over his men, until in the evening of the 28th Campbell arrived and "with a few haughty words" brought everybody to his place again.

Now, what are the evident conclusions from all these confused and prevaricating statements? No other than that, under the incapable direction of Windham, the British troops were completely, though quite unnecessarily defeated; that when the retreat was ordered, the officers of the 34th Regiment, who had not even taken the trouble to get in any way acquainted with the ground they had fought on, could not find the place they were ordered to retreat to; that the regiment got into disorder and finally fled; that this led to a panic in the camp, which broke down all the bounds of order and discipline, and occasioned the loss of the camp-equipage and part of the baggage; that finally, in spite of Windham's assertion about the stores, 15,000 Minie cartridges, the Paymaster's chests, and the shoes and clothing for many regiments and new levies, fell into the hands of the enemy.

English infantry, when in line or column, seldom run away. In common with the Russians, they have a natural cohesion which generally belongs to old soldiers only, and which is in part explained by the considerable admixture of old soldiers in both services, but it in part also evidently belongs to national character. This quality, which has nothing whatever to do with "pluck," but is on the contrary rather a peculiar development of the instinct of self-preservation, is still very valuable, especially in defensive
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\(^a\) "Cawnpore, Dec. 7", *The Times*, No. 22902, January 28, 1858.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) *The Times*, No. 22902, January 28, 1858.—*Ed.*
positions. It also, in common with the phlegmatic nature of Englishmen, prevents panic; but it is to be remarked that when Irish troops are once disordered and brought to panic, they are not easy to rally. Thus it happened to Windham on Nov. 27. He will figure henceforth among that not very large but distinguished list of English generals who have succeeded in making their troops run away under a panic.

On the 28th the Gwalior contingent were re-enforced by a considerable body from Bithoor, and closed up to within four hundred yards of the British intrenched outposts. There was another engagement, conducted on the part of the assailants without any vigor whatever. During it an example of real pluck occurred on the part of the soldiers and officers of the 64th, which we are glad to relate, although the exploit itself was as foolish as the renowned Balaklava charge.\footnote{461} The responsibility of it, too, is shifted upon a dead man—Col. Wilson of that regiment. It appears that Wilson advanced with one hundred and eighty men against four guns of the enemy, defended by far superior numbers. We are not told who they were; but the result leads to the conclusion that they were of the Gwalior troops. The British took the guns with a rush, spiked three of them, and held out for some time, when, no re-enforcement arriving, they had to retreat, leaving sixty men and most of their officers on the ground. The proof of the hard fighting is in the loss. Here we have a small force, which, from the loss they suffered, must have been pretty well met, holding a battery till one-third of their numbers are down. This is hard fighting indeed, and the first instance of it we have since the storming of Delhi. The man who planned this advance, however, deserves to be tried by court-martial and shot. Windham says it was Wilson. He fell in it, and cannot reply.

In the evening the whole British force was pent up in the fort, where disorder continued to reign, and the position with the bridge was in evident danger. But then Campbell arrived. He restored order, drew over fresh troops in the morning, and so far repelled the enemy as to secure the bridge and fort. Then he made all his wounded, women, children and baggage cross, and held a defensive position until all these had a fair start on the road to Allahabad. As soon as this was accomplished, he attacked the Sepoys on the 6th, and defeated them, his cavalry and artillery following them up for fourteen miles the same day. That there was little resistance offered is shown from Campbell's report; he merely describes the advance of his own troops, never mentioning any resistance or maneuvers on the part of the enemy; there was
no check, and it was not a battle, but a *battue*. Brigadier Hope Grant, with a light division, followed the fugitives, and caught them on the 8th in the act of passing a river; thus brought to bay, they turned round and suffered severe loss. With this event Campbell's first campaign, that of Lucknow and Cawnpore, is brought to a close, and a fresh series of operations must begin, whose first developments we may expect to hear of within a fortnight or three weeks.

Written on about February 2, 1858

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5253, February 20, 1858 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
Quos deus vult perdere prius dementat a seems the judgment pretty generally passed in Europe on the French usurper, whom, but a few weeks ago, the numberless sycophants of success in all countries, and of all languages, concurred to magnify into a kind of sublunary providence. Now, all at once, on the first approach of real danger, the demi-god is supposed to have run mad. To those, however, who are not to be carried away by first impressions, nothing will appear more evident than that the hero of Boulogne 463 is to-day what he was yesterday—simply a gambler. If he stakes his last card and risks all, it is not the man that has changed, but the chances of the game. There had been attempts on Bonaparte’s life before without producing any visible effect on the economy of the Empire. Why did the quicksilver which exploded on the 14th of January 464 not only kill persons, but a state of things? It is with the hand-grenades of the Rue Lepelletier as it was with the greased cartridges dealt out at Barrackpore. b They have not metamorphosed an empire, but only rent the veil which concealed a metamorphosis already accomplished.

The secret of Bonaparte’s elevation is to be found on the one hand in the mutual prostration of the antagonist parties, and on the other in the coincidence of his coup d’état with the entrance of the commercial world upon a period of prosperity. The commercial crisis, therefore, has necessarily sapped the material basis of the Empire, which never possessed any moral basis, save the

a “Those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad” (Sophocles, Antigone, 620).—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 298.—Ed.
temporary demoralization of all classes and all parties. The working classes reassumed their hostile attitude to the existing Government the very moment they were thrown out of employment. A great part of the commercial and industrial middle classes were placed by the crisis in exactly the same position which spurred Napoleon to hasten his coup d'état; it being well known that the fear of the debtors' prison at Chichy put an end to his vacillations. The same motive hurried the Paris bourgeois to the barricades in 1848, and would make him regard a political convulsion at this moment as a godsend. It is now perfectly understood that, at the height of the panic, the Bank of France, on Government order, renewed all bills due—an accommodation which, by the by, it was again compelled to afford on the 31st of January; but this suspense in the liquidation of debts, instead of restoring commercial activity, has only imparted a chronic character to panic. Another very large portion of the Paris middle classes, and a very influential one too—the petits rentiers, or men of small fixed incomes—have met with wholesale ruin, consequent upon the enormous fluctuations of the Bourse, which were fostered by, and contributed to enrich, the Imperial dynasty and its adventurous retainers. That portion, at least, of the French higher classes which pretends to represent what is called French civilization never accepted the Empire, except as a necessary makeshift, never concealed their profound hostility to the "nephew of his uncle," and of late have seized upon every pretext to show their anger at the attempt to transform a mere expedient, as they considered it, into a lasting institution. Such was the general state of feeling to which the attempt of the Rue Lepelletier afforded an occasion of manifesting itself. This manifestation, on the other hand, has roused the pseudo Bonaparte to a sense of the gathering storm, and compelled him to play out his last card. Much has been said in the Moniteur as to the shouts and cries and the "public enthusiasm" lavished on the Imperial party at their exit from the Opera. The value of this street enthusiasm is shown by the following anecdote emanating from a chief actor in the scene and the authenticity of which is vouched for by a highly respectable English paper:

"On the night of the 14th a person high in the Imperial household, but not that night on service, was crossing the Boulevards, when he heard the explosions, and saw people running toward the Opera. He ran thither also, and was present at the whole scene. Being recognized directly, one of the persons most nearly concerned

\[^{a}\text{Napoleon III, Napoleon I.---Ed.}\]
\[^{b}\text{"Paris, le 14 janvier", Le Moniteur universel, No. 15, January 15, 1858.---Ed.}\]
in all that had occurred said, 'Oh, Mr.—, for God's sake, find some one belonging to the Tuileries, and send off for fresh carriages. If you can find none, go yourself.' The person thus addressed set to work immediately to find some of the household servants, which was no easy task—all, from high to low, chamberlains to footmen, having, with one or two admirable exceptions, taken to their heels with incredible alacrity. However, at the end of a quarter of an hour, he laid hands on a messenger, and sent him post-haste to the palace with the necessary orders. About five and twenty minutes or half an hour had elapsed, when he returned to the Rue Lepelletier, and made his way back to the peristyle of the theater with great difficulty, on account of the crowd. The wounded were still lying about on all sides, and apparently disorder reigned everywhere. At a little distance the gentleman alluded to espied M. Pietri, the Prefect of Police, and called to him, in order to attract his attention, and prevent him from going away until he could rejoin him. When he did so, he instantly exclaimed, 'Let me implore of you to get the street closed without loss of time. The fresh carriages will be here soon, and they cannot drive up to the door. Besides, see what confusion ensues. Let me entreat of you, get the streets cleared.' M. Pietri looked at him with surprise. 'The street cleared!' he echoed; 'why, the street is cleared; it was cleared in five minutes.' His interlocutor stared at him. 'But, then, what is all that crowd? What is that dense mass of men that one cannot elbow one's way through?' 'Those are all my people,' was M. Pietri's reply; 'there is not a stranger at this moment in this portion of the Rue Lepelletier; all those you see belong to me.'"

If such was the secret of the street enthusiasm paraded by the Moniteur, its paragraphs on the "spontaneous illuminations of the Boulevards after the attempt" could certainly not mislead the Parisians who had witnessed that illumination, which was limited to the shops of the tradespeople employed by the Emperor and the Empress. Even these individuals were not backward in saying that half an hour after the explosion of the "infernal machine," police agents paid them a visit, to suggest the propriety of instantly illuminating, in order to prove how enchanted they were at the Emperor's escape.

Still more the character of the congratulatory addresses and the public protestations of devotion to the Emperor bears witness to his complete isolation. There is not a single man who signed them who does not, one way or the other, belong to the Administration, that ubiquitous parasite feeding on the vitals of France, and put in motion like a mannikin by the touch of the Minister of the Interior. The Moniteur was obliged, day after day, to register these monotonous congratulations, addressed by the Emperor to the Emperor, as so many proofs of the unbounded love of the people for the coup d'état. Some efforts were, indeed, made to

---

a “Paris, le 14 janvier”, Le Moniteur universel, No. 15, January 15, 1858.— Ed.
b Adolphe Billault.— Ed.
c “Adresses présentées à l'Empereur”, Le Moniteur universel, No. 17, January 17, 1858; see also the following issues.— Ed.
obtain an address from the Paris population, and for that purpose an address was carried about by the agents of the police; but as it was found that the mass of signatures would not be sufficiently imposing, the plan was abandoned. Even the Paris shopkeepers dared to decline signing the address, on the pretext that the police was not the proper source for it to emanate from. The attitude of the Paris press, as far as it depends on the public, and not on the public purse, entirely responded to the attitude of the people. Either, like the unfortunate Spectateur, it muttered some half-suppressed words on hereditary rights, or, like the Phare de la Loire, quoted semi-official papers as its authorities for the reported enthusiasm, or, like the Journal des Débats, kept its congratulations within the rigid bounds of conventional courtesy, or limited itself to reprinting the articles of the Moniteur. In one word, it became evident that if France was not just yet prepared to take up arms against the Empire, it was certainly resolved to get rid of it on the first occasion.

"According to my informants," writes the Vienna correspondent of The London Times, "who have recently arrived from Paris, the general opinion in that city is, that the present dynasty is nodding to its fall." 3465

Bonaparte himself, till then the only man in France believing in the final victory of the coup d'état, became at once aware of the hollowness of his delusions. While all public bodies and the press were swearing that the crime of the Rue Lepelletier, perpetrated as it was by Italians solely, but served to put in relief the love of France for Louis Napoleon, Louis Napoleon himself hastened to the Corps Législatif,466 there publicly to declare that the conspiracy was a national one, and that France consequently wanted new "repressive laws" to keep her down.467 Those laws already proposed, at the head of which figure the lois des suspects,467 are nothing but a repetition of the identical measures employed in the first days of the coup d'état. Then, however, they were announced as temporary expedients, while they are now proclaimed as organic laws. Thus it is declared by Louis Napoleon himself, that the Empire can be perpetuated only by the very infamies through which it was produced; that all its pretensions to the more or less respectable forms of a regular Government must be dropped, and that the time of the sullen acquiescence of the

---

3465 See the report from Vienna of January 29 in The Times, No. 22906, February 2, 1858.— Ed.

466 Napoleon III's speech at the opening of the Corps Législatif, January 18, 1858, published in Le Moniteur universel, No. 19, January 19, 1858.— Ed.
nation in the rule of the Society of the perjured usurper\textsuperscript{468} has definitively passed away.

Shortly before the execution of the \textit{coup d'état}, Louis Napoleon contrived to gather from all departments, and principally from the rural districts, addresses leveled at the National Assembly, and expressive of unlimited confidence in the President. This source being now exhausted there remained nothing but to appeal to the army. The military addresses, in one of which the Zouaves\textsuperscript{469} "almost regret not to have had an opportunity to manifest in a striking manner their devotion to the Emperor,"\textsuperscript{a} are simply the undisguised proclamation of pretorian rule\textsuperscript{470} in France. The division of France into five great military pashalics, with five marshals at their head, under the supreme control of Pelissier as marshal general,\textsuperscript{471} is a simple consequence of that premise. On the other hand, the installation of a Privy Council, which is at the same time to act as Council during the eventual Regency of a Montijo, composed of such grotesque fellows as Fould, Morny, Persigny, Baroche and the like, shows France at the same time what sort of regime the newly-installed statesmen have in store for her. The installation of this Council, together with the family reconciliation, denoted to the astounded world by Louis Napoleon's letter in the \textit{Moniteur}, by virtue of which Jerome, the ex-King of Westphalia, is nominated President of the State Councils in the Emperor's absence\textsuperscript{b}—all this, it has been justly remarked, "looks like the pilgrim about to set out on a perilous journey."\textsuperscript{c} On what new adventure is the hero of Strasbourg then to embark?\textsuperscript{472} Some say that he means to relieve himself by a campaign in Africa; others that he intends an invasion of England. As to the first plan, it reminds one of his former notion of going to Sevastopol\textsuperscript{473}; but now, as then, his discretion might prove the better part of his valor.\textsuperscript{d} As to any hostility against England, it would only reveal to Bonaparte his isolation in Europe, as the attempt of the Rue Lepelletier revealed his isolation in France. Already the threats held out to England in the addresses of the soldiery have put the final extinguisher upon the Anglo-French

\textsuperscript{a} "Le régiment de zouaves de la garde imperiale", \textit{Le Moniteur universel}, No. 26, January 26, 1858.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Napoleon III's decree on the appointment of Prince Jerome President of the State Council, February 1, 1858, \textit{Le Moniteur universel}, No. 34, February 3, 1858.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} J. Bunyan, \textit{The Pilgrim's Progress}.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{d} Shakespeare, \textit{King Henry IV}, Part I, Act V, Scene IV.—\textit{Ed.}
alliance, long since struggling in *articulo mortis*. Palmerston’s Alien bill will only contribute to exasperate the already wounded pride of John Bull. Whatever step Bonaparte may take—and he must try to restore his prestige in some way or other—will only precipitate his ruin. He approaches the end of his strange, wicked and pernicious career.

Written on February 5, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5254, February 22, 1858 as a leading article

---

\textsuperscript{a} At the point of death.— *Ed.*
No argument can be required to prove that the precarious tenure of power by which Louis Napoleon still calls himself the Emperor of the French, must be seriously affected by the culmination in France of the commercial crisis which has already spent its fury in other parts of the world. The symptoms of this culmination are now chiefly to be found in the condition of the Bank of France and of the French markets for agricultural produce. The returns of the Bank, for the second week of February, as compared with those of the last week in January, exhibit the following features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease of circulation</td>
<td>8,766,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in deposits</td>
<td>29,018,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease of discounts at the Bank</td>
<td>47,746,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease of discounts at the Branches</td>
<td>23,264,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total decrease in discounts</td>
<td>71,010,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in bills overdue</td>
<td>2,761,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in bullion</td>
<td>31,508,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in premium on purchases of gold and silver</td>
<td>3,284,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the whole of the commercial world the metallic reserve of the banks has increased as the activity of trade has diminished. At the same ratio that industrial life has grown fainter, the position of the banks has, generally, grown stronger;

---

\(\text{a}\) Here and below see “Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales”, *Le Moniteur universel*, Nos. 15 and 43, January 15 and February 12, 1858.—*Ed.*
and so far the bullion increase in the vaults of the Bank of France would seem but one more instance of an economical phenomenon observed here in New-York as well as in London and Hamburg. Yet there is one feature distinctive of the bullion movement in France, viz.: the increase to the amount of 3,284,691 francs of the premium on purchases of gold and silver, while the total sum spent in this way by the Bank of France for the month of February reaches the figure of 4,438,549 francs. The gravity of this fact becomes evident from the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premiums paid by the Bank of France on purchases of gold and silver.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February, 1858 ................................................. francs 4,438,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1858 ................................................. 1,153,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1857 .................................................. 1,176,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 1857 .................................................. 1,327,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 1857 ................................................... 949,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st January to 30th June, 1856 .................................. 3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st July to 11th December, 1856 ................................ 3,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st July to 31st December, 1855 ................................ 4,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus we see that the premium paid in February to procure temporary artificial additions to the bullion reserve of the Bank amounts to a sum almost equal to that expended for the same purpose during the four months from October, 1857, to January, '58, and exceeds the aggregate half-yearly premiums paid during the years 1856 and 1855; while the total amount of premiums paid from October, 1857, to February, 1858, reaching the figure of 9,045,535f., exceeds the premium paid during the whole year of 1856 by almost one-half. Despite this apparent plethora, the metallic reserve of the Bank is, consequently, really weaker than for the last three years. So far from the Bank being incumbered with bullion, the influx is only artificially raised to its necessary level. This single fact proves at once that in France the commercial crisis has not yet entered the phase already passed in the United States, England, and the North of Europe. In France, a general depression of commerce exists, as is shown by the simultaneous decrease in circulation and discounts; but the crash is still impending, as is shown by the decrease of deposits simultaneously with an increase of premium on bullion bought, and of bills overdue.

The Bank has also been forced to announce that a great part of its own new shares, on which the installments have not been duly paid up, will be sold. It has also been converted by the
Government into the general railway contractor of France, and compelled to make within fixed periods large advances to the railway companies—advances which for January and February alone amounted to the sum of 50,000,000 francs. It is true that in return for these advances it has received the bonds of the companies, which it may sell when it can. The present moment, however, is peculiarly unfavorable to such a sale, and the weekly railway returns, testifying to a constant falling off in receipts, are far from warranting any sanguine expectations in this line. For the month of January, for instance, the Orleans presented a decline of 21 per cent, the Eastern of 18 per cent, the Lyons of about 11 per cent, and the Western of 14 per cent, compared with the corresponding receipts in 1857.\(^a\)

It is a well-known fact that the resistance, on the side of the seller or the buyer, against a change from low prices to high ones, and still more from high prices to low, is always very considerable; and that frequently there occur intervals, of longer or shorter duration, during which sales are heavy and prices nominal, until at last the tendency of the market declares itself one way or the other with irresistible force. Such a transitory struggle between the holders and buyers of merchandise is nothing extraordinary; but the protracted contest, lasting from the beginning of November to the present day, between French merchants and French consumers, is perhaps unparalleled in the history of prices. While French industry is stagnant, great numbers of workmen unemployed, and the means of everybody stinted, prices, which have elsewhere declined on an average from 30 to 40 per cent, are still maintained in France at the speculative range of the period preceding the general crisis. If we are asked by what means this economical miracle has been worked, the answer is simply that the Bank of France, under Government pressure, has twice been obliged to renew the bills and loans which had fallen due, and that thus, more or less directly, the means of the French people, accumulated in the Bank vaults, have been employed to keep up inflated prices against that very people. The Government seems to imagine that by this exceedingly simple process of distributing bank notes wherever they are wanted, the catastrophe can be definitively warded off. Yet the real result of this contrivance has been, on the one hand, an aggravation of distress on the part of the consumers, whose diminished means have not been met by diminished prices; on the other hand, an enormous accumulation

---

\(^a\) _The Economist_, No. 754, February 6, 1858.—Ed.
of commodities in the Customs entrepots, which, when ultimately, as they must be, they are forced upon the market, will collapse under their own weight. The following statement, extracted from an official French paper, of the comparative quantities of merchandise stored up in the French Customs entrepots at the end of December, 1857, 1856 and 1855, will leave no doubt as to the violent self-adjustment of prices still looming in the future for France:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1857 Metrical qts.</th>
<th>1856 Metrical qts.</th>
<th>1855 Metrical qts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>19,419</td>
<td>17,799</td>
<td>10,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>210,741</td>
<td>100,758</td>
<td>57,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>156,006</td>
<td>76,322</td>
<td>28,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>15,377</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Iron</td>
<td>132,924</td>
<td>102,202</td>
<td>76,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleaginous Seeds</td>
<td>253,596</td>
<td>198,982</td>
<td>74,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallow</td>
<td>25,299</td>
<td>15,292</td>
<td>11,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>3,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>72,150</td>
<td>31,560</td>
<td>38,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>23,448</td>
<td>18,442</td>
<td>10,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (colonial)</td>
<td>170,334</td>
<td>56,735</td>
<td>55,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (foreign)</td>
<td>89,607</td>
<td>89,807</td>
<td>71,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the trade in bread-stuffs, however, the contest has already terminated with disastrous consequences for the holders. Still their losses are of far less importance than the general state of the agricultural population of France at the present juncture. At a recent meeting of French agriculturists it was stated that the average price of wheat for all France was 31fr. 94c. the hectolitre (about 2 3/4 bushels) at the end of January, 1854; 27fr. 24c. at the same epoch in 1855; 32fr. 46c. in January, 1856; 27fr. 9c. in January, 1857, and 17fr. 38c. in January, 1858. The unanimous conclusion arrived at was that

"this state of prices must prove ruinous to French agriculture, and that at 17fr. 38c. the present average price, the producers in some parts of France have an extremely narrow margin of profit left them, while in others they sustain a serious loss."

---

a The Economist, No. 754, February 6, 1858. (The Paris correspondent said that the information had been taken by him "from an official paper").— Ed.
b Metrical quintal—a unit of weight equal to 100 kilograms.— Ed.
c The Economist, No. 755, February 13, 1858.— Ed.
One would think that in a country like France, where the greater part of the soil belongs to the cultivators themselves, and but a relatively small portion of the aggregate produce finds its way to market, a superabundance of grain ought to be considered a blessing instead of a bane. Yet, as Louis XVIII. told us in a crown speech on Nov. 30, 1821: "No law can prevent the distress resulting from a superabundant harvest." The fact is that the large majority of the French peasantry are owners in name only—the mortgagees and the Government being the real proprietors. Whether the French peasant be able to meet the heavy engagements weighing on his narrow strip of soil depends not on the quantity, but on the price of his produce.

This agricultural distress, taken together with the depression of trade, the stagnation of industry, and the commercial catastrophe still in suspense, must tend to bring the French people into that state of mind in which they are wont to embark in fresh political ventures. With the disappearance of material prosperity and its regular appendage of political indifference, every pretext for the prolongation of the second Empire also disappears.

Written on February 12, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5270, March 12, 1858 as a leading article

---

*Louis XVIII's speech in the Chamber of Deputies on November 30, 1821, Le Moniteur universel, No. 335, December 1, 1821.—Ed.*
Paris, Feb. 22, 1858

"When is Gérard the lion-killer to be named Minister of Public Instruction?" Such is the cant phrase current in the faubourgs of Paris since the appointment of Gen. Espinasse of Dobrudja memory as Minister of the Interior and Public Safety. In Russia, it is well known, a general of cavalry presides over the Holy Synod. Why not Espinasse over the French Home-Ministry, since France has become the home of Pretorians only? By such apparent incongruities the rule of the naked sword is proclaimed in most unmistakable terms, and Bonaparte wants France to clearly understand that the imperial rule does rest not on her will but on 600,000 bayonets. Hence the Pretorian addresses cut out by the colonels of the different regiments, after a pattern supplied from the Tuileries—addresses in which the slightest allusion to the so-called "will of the people" is anxiously shunned; hence the parceling out of France into five pashalics; hence the transformation of the Home-Ministry into an appendage of the Army. Here the change is not to stop. About 60 prefects are said to be on the eve of being disgraced, and to be replaced, for the most part, by military men. Prefectorial administration is to devolve upon half-pay colonels and lieutenant-colonels. The antagonism between the Army and the population is to be organized as the guarantee of "Public Safety," viz: the safety of the hero of Satory and his dynasty.

A great modern historian has told us that, disguise the fact as you like, France, since the days of the Great Revolution, has been

---

a A. P. Tolstoi.—Ed.
always disposed of by the army. There have certainly ruled different classes under the Empire, the Restoration, Louis Philippe, and the Republic of 1848. Under the first the peasantry, the offspring of the revolution of 1789, predominated; under the second, the great landed property; under the third, the bourgeoisie; and the last, not in the intention of its founders but in fact, proved an abortive attempt at dividing dominion in equal shares among the men of the legitimate monarchy and the men of the monarchy of July. Still, all these regimes rested alike on the army. Has not even the Constitution of the Republic of 1848 been elaborated and proclaimed under a state of siege—that is, the rule of the bayonet? Was that Republic not personated by Gen. Cavaignac? Was it not saved by the army in June, 1848, and again saved in June, 1849, to be finally dropped by the same army in December, 1851? What then forms the novelty in the regime now openly inaugurated by Louis Bonaparte? That he rules by the instrumentality of the army? So did all his predecessors since the days of Thermidor. Yet, if in all the bygone epochs the ruling class, the ascendency of which corresponded to a specific development of French society, rested its *ultima ratio* against its adversaries upon the army, it was nevertheless a specific social interest that predominated. Under the second Empire the interest of the army itself is to predominate. The army is no longer to maintain the rule of one part of the people over another part of the people. The army is to maintain its own rule, personated by its own dynasty, over the French people in general.

It is to represent the *State* in antagonism to the *society*. It must not be imagined that Bonaparte is not aware of the dangerous character of the experiment he tries. In proclaiming himself the chief of the Pretorians, he declares every Pretorian chief his competitor. His own partisans, with Gen. Vaillant at their head, demurred against the division of the French Army into five Marshalships, saying that if it was good for the cause of order, it was not so for that of the Empire, and would one day end in civil war. The treacheries of Napoleon’s Marshals, with Berthier at their head, were ransacked by the Palais Royal, which feels extremely vexed at the new turn of Imperial policy.

The future conduct of the five Marshals, who hate each other cordially, at a critical juncture, may be best judged from their past. Magnan betrayed Louis Philippe; Baraguay d’Hilliers betrayed Napoleon; Bosquet betrayed the Republic, to which he owed

---

* Final reason or argument.—*Ed.
his advancement, and to the principles of which he is known to be partial. Castellane has not even awaited a real catastrophe to betray Louis Bonaparte himself. During the Russian War a telegraphic dispatch reached him to this effect: "The Emperor is dead." He instantly drew up a proclamation in favor of Henri V. and sent it to be printed. The Préfet of Lyons had received the real dispatch, which ran thus: "The Emperor of Russia is dead." The proclamation was hushed, but the story got abroad. As to Canrobert, he may be an Imperialist, but then he is but a fraction, and, above all, lacks the capability of being a whole number. The five Marshals themselves, feeling the arduous task they were called upon to undertake, hesitated so considerably at accepting their respective commands that nothing could be settled with their consent; which seeing, Bonaparte wrote out himself the names of their separate destinations, gave the note to Mr. Fould to be filled up and sent to the Moniteur, and thus they were all gazetted at last, whether they would or not. Bonaparte, on the other hand, dared not complete his plan by Pelissier's nomination of Marshal-General. Of his pentarchy of Marshals, we may say what Prince Jérôme Napoleon is stated to have answered to Fould, sent by Bonaparte to present his uncle with his nomination to the first place in the Council of Regency. After having declined the offer in most impolite terms, the ex-King of Westphalia, as Paris gossip has it, bowed Mr. Fould out with the words, "Du reste, your Council of Regency is so framed as for you all to have but one object; that, namely, of arresting each other as promptly as possible." We repeat that it is impossible to suppose Louis Bonaparte ignorant of the dangers with which his new-fangled system is fraught. But he has no choice left. He understands his own situation and the impatience of French society to get rid of him and his Imperial mummeries. He knows that the different parties have recovered from their paralysis, and that the material basis of his stock-jobbing regime has been blown up by the commercial earthquake. Consequently, he is not only preparing for war against French society, but loudly proclaims the fact. It tallies with his resolution to take up a warlike attitude against France that he confounds the most heterogeneous parties. Thus,

---

a The Crimean war, 1853-56.—Ed.
b Nicholas I.—Ed.
c Napoleon III's decree on the nomination of the five Marshals, February 13, 1858, Le Moniteur universel, No. 45, February 14, 1858.—Ed.
d However.—Ed.
when Cassagnac, in the *Constitutionnel,*\(^a\) denounced Mr. Villetmain as a “provoker of hatred” to the Empire, and accused the *Journal des Débats* of “complicity” in the *attentat* “through its silence,” this was at first considered to be an act of foolish zeal on the part of the man whom Guizot has described as the *roi des drôles.*\(^b\) Soon, however, it oozed out that the article had been imposed upon the *Constitutionnel* by Mr. Rouland, the Minister of Public Instruction, who had himself corrected the proofs of it. This explanation, by the by, was given to Mr. De Sacy of the *Débats* by Mr. Mirès, the proprietor of the *Constitutionnel,* who did not choose to bear the responsibility of the article. The denunciation of *all parties* as his personal enemies enters, therefore, into the game of Bonaparte. It forms part of his system. He tells them, in so many words, that he indulges no delusion as to the general aversion his rule is the subject of, but that he is ready to encounter it with grape and musketry.

Written on February 22, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune,* No. 5270, March 12, 1858

---

\(^a\) A. Granier de Cassagnac, “La palinodie des honnêtes gens”, *Le Constitutionnel,* No. 31, January 31, 1858.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) King of fools. The description has been cited by E. Dupont in “Chronique de l’Intérieur”, *La Voix du Proscrit,* No. 8, December 15, 1850.— *Ed.*
Karl Marx

THE DERBY MINISTRY.—
PALMERSTON'S SHAM RESIGNATION

If Orsini did not kill Louis Napoleon,\textsuperscript{482} he certainly killed Palmerston. Made dictator of England by a Chinese Mandarin at Canton,\textsuperscript{a} it is historically appropriate that this political gamester should finally be ruined by an Italian Carbonaro at Paris.\textsuperscript{483} But that he should be succeeded by Lord Derby is something above the range of mere historical propriety, and approaches the dignity of a historical law. It is in accordance with the traditional working of the British Constitution. Pitt was followed by Fox; Fox by Perceval, a weaker Pitt; Wellington by Grey, a weaker Fox; Grey by Wellington; Wellington by Melbourne, a weaker Grey; Melbourne by Wellington again, under the name of Peel; Peel by Melbourne again, under the name of Russell; Russell by Derby, the substitute of Peel; Derby again by Russell. Why should not Palmerston, the usurper of Russell's place, be followed by Derby in his turn?

If there be in England any new force able to put an end to the ancient routine exemplified by this last change of places between right honorable gentlemen on one side of the House and right honorable gentlemen on the other side; if there be any man or body of men able to confront and supplant the traditional governing class, the world has not yet found it out. But of one thing there can be no doubt; and that is, that a Tory Administration is far more favorable to every kind of progress than any other. For the last fifty years, all popular movements have either been initiated or consummated under Tory rule. It was a Tory Ministry which passed the Catholic Emancipation

\textsuperscript{a} Yeh Ming-chin.—\textit{Ed.}
It was under a Tory Ministry that the Reform movement grew irresistible. The imposition of an Income tax, which, however incongruous in its present state, contains the germ of proportional taxation, is the work of a Tory Ministry. The Anti-Corn-Law League, weak and timid under the Whig Administration, assumed revolutionary dimensions under the Tories; and while Russell, in his most audacious flights, never ventured beyond the limit of a fixed duty, as moderate as himself, Peel could not but consign the Corn Laws to the grave of all the Capulets. So, too, it is the Tories who have, so to say, popularized the aristocracy by bringing plebeian vigor and talent to re-enforce its energies. Through the Tories, Canning, the son of an actress, l lorded it over the old landed aristocracy of England; so did Peel, the son of a parvenu cotton spinner, who had originally been a hand-loom weaver; so does Disraeli, the son of a simple literary man, and a Jew into the bargain. Lord Derby himself converted the son of a small shopkeeper of Lewes into a Lord High Chancellor of England, under the name of Lord St. Leonards. The Whigs, on the other hand, have always proved strong enough to bury their plebeian tools in vain decorations, or to drop them by dint of haughty insult. Brougham, the soul of the Reform movement, was nullified by being made over to the Lords; and Cobden, the chief of the Anti-Corn-Law League, was offered the place of Vice President of the Board of Trade by the very Whigs he had reinstalled in office.

In point of mere intellectual ability, the new Cabinet can easily bear comparison with its predecessor. Men like Disraeli, Stanley, and Ellenborough, suffer no harm when matched against people of the stamp of Mr. Vernon Smith, late of the Board of Control, of Lord Panmure, a War Minister, whom nothing but his "Take care of Dowb," can ever make immortal, and of Sir G. C. Lewis, of Edinburgh Review dullness, or even against such moral grandeurs as Clanricarde of the Privy Seal. In fact Palmerston had not only replaced the Ministry of all parties by a Ministry of no party, but also the Cabinet of all the talents by a Cabinet of no talent except his own.

There can be no question that Palmerston had no idea of the finality of his ruin. He believed Lord Derby would decline the

---

a Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet.—Ed.
b Mary Anne Castello.—Ed.
c Robert Peel.—Ed.
d Isaac D'Israeli.—Ed.
e Richard Sugden.—Ed.
Premiership now as he had done during the Crimean war. Russell would then have been summoned to the Queen; but with the bulk of his own troops serving under Palmerston, and the bulk of the hostile army arrayed under Disraeli, he would have despaired of forming a Cabinet, especially as he, a Whig, could not resort to the “ultimate reason” of dissolving a Parliament elected under the Whig banners. Palmerston’s return to office, after a week’s oscillation, would thus have become inevitable. This fine bit of calculation has been nullified by Derby’s acceptance. The Tory Ministry may hold office for a longer or shorter period. They may go on for several months before they are compelled to resort to a dissolution—a measure they are sure to employ before they finally resign their power. But we may be certain of two things, namely: that their career will be marked by the introduction of exceedingly liberal measures in regard to social reforms (Lord Stanley’s course thus far, and Sir John Pakington’s education bill, are a pledge of this); and above all, that in foreign policy they bring with them a most beneficial and cheering change. It is true, many shallow thinkers and writers argue that Palmerston’s fall is not a damaging blow to Louis Napoleon, because several of the new Tory Ministry are personally on good terms with the French despot, and England [is] in no condition to wage war with a giant Continental power. But it is precisely because England is in no state to embark in a new war that we deem the answer given by Great Britain to the bullying menaces and exactions of Louis Napoleon’s satraps most significant. It was not because Malmesbury and Disraeli were to come into the Ministry that the independent Liberals in Parliament, reflecting the undoubted and emphatic sentiment of the Nation, answered the dispatch of Walewski by throwing out Palmerston’s Conspiracy bill. Lord Derby may stumble and fall, but the vote which carried Milner Gibson’s amendment will live and bear fruit, nevertheless.

We do not believe in any cordial and lasting alliance between British Toryism and French Bonapartism. The instincts, traditions, aspirations of both parties revolt at it. We do not believe it possible that the new Cabinet will take up and press Palmerston’s Conspiracy bill, as the Paris journals so confidently anticipate. If they do, it will not be till after they shall have answered Walewski and De Morny, and answered them in the spirit of Pitt and

---

\(^a\) Victoria.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) A. Walewski’s dispatch to the French Ambassador in London of January 20, 1858, *Le Constitutionnel*, No. 41, February 10, 1858.—*Ed.*
Castlereagh. Toryism, with all its faults, must have changed its nature to be ready to change the laws of England at the beck of a Bonaparte.

But the significance of the late vote is unaffected by any presumption of speedy feud between the two Governments. It is as a proclamation to Europe that Britain has ceased to play second to French Imperialism that we deem it most important. Thus it is understood at Brussels, at Turin, and even at Vienna; thus it will soon be understood at Berlin, at Madrid, at St. Petersburg. England, so long the jailer of the first Napoleon, has pointedly refused to be longer the jackal of his successor.493

Written on February 26, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5272, March 15, 1858 as a leading article; reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1337, March 19, 1858, under the title "The End of Palmerston"

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx

PORTENTS OF THE DAY

Paris, March 11, 1858

At Chalons-sur-Saone, on the night of Saturday, March 6, there was a Republican outbreak on a small scale; on Wednesday night, March 10, there was a seditious gathering in this city; since the 24th of February, the tenth anniversary of the Revolution of February, wholesale arrests have been carried on in such an Algerian razzia style⁴⁹⁴ that, as The London Punch says, there will soon be left but two classes in France, prisoners and jailers⁴; there has appeared a semi-official pamphlet, “Napoleon III. and England,”⁵ and at the same time the Moniteur published extracts from the correspondence of Napoleon I⁶; and, lastly, half Paris has been on its legs to make sure of places to witness Orsini’s execution, which has not yet taken place. Commencing with the concluding article in this Imperial bill of fare, it ought to be remarked that by a concurrence of circumstances, not generally known, the question of Orsini’s “launching into eternity,” as the cynical Cockney phrase runs, has assumed proportions more fatal than even the execution of the Buzançais rioters in Louis Philippe’s time.⁴⁹⁵ In the latter case, a storm of popular indignation was roused because that bloody act, although judicial and in accordance with all the formalities of French law, laid bare the most disgusting features of Louis Philippe’s hypocritical reign. The Duke of Praslin had poison administered to him, in order to spare him the ignominy of a felon’s death,⁴⁹⁶ while these émeutiers
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⁴ “A Bad Look Out”, Punch, March 13, 1858.— Ed.
⁵ [A. La Guéronnière,] L’Empereur Napoléon III et l’Angleterre.— Ed.
⁶ Napoléon I, “Correspondance de Napoléon Ier”, Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 66, 70, 71, 73 and 78, March 7, 11, 12, 14 and 19, 1858.— Ed.
of famine, half-starved peasants who had committed manslaughter in an affray caused by the export of grain, were mercilessly surrendered to the executioner. Orsini, on his part, has manfully avowed his participation in the attempt, and taken all the responsibility upon himself. He has been condemned according to law, and whatever sympathy the mass of the Paris population may feel for him, there can be nothing in his doom, considered in itself, particularly damaging to the second Empire. Yet the whole face of the affair is completely changed by the circumstances accompanying it. Throughout the whole of the judicial proceedings, the curiosity of Paris was stirred by their exceptional management, unheard of in the annals of French political trials.

In the act of accusation, mild and moderate expressions were used. The facts elicited by the Juge d'Instruction were only vaguely alluded to, while the long and repeated interrogatories of the police authorities, which used to play a principal part in that sort of trials, were altogether dropped. The less you say of them the better, seemed the prevailing notion. For the first time, a prisoner was decently treated in an Imperial court of justice. There was, as an eye-witness says, "little or no bullying, brow-beating or attempt at declamation." Jules Favre, Orsini's advocate, was not even called to order when he ventured to give vent to this sentence:

"I hate force when not devoted to the service of right. If a nation existed miserable enough to be in the hands of a despot, the poniard would not sever its chains. God, who counts them, knows the hours of the despot's weakness, and reserves to tyrants catastrophes more inevitable than the dagger of the assassin."

Neither did the low murmur which approved this passage afford occasion for a legal ebullition on the part of Mr. Delangle, the President. This was not all. It oozed out that the letter written to the Emperor by Orsini was carried to the Tuileries by Jules Favre himself, examined by the Emperor, who is said to have struck out two phrases of it, and allowed to be published. Hardly, however, had sentence been passed on Orsini, when the extremest
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a F. Orsini's testimony at the court session on February 25, 1858, Le Moniteur universel, No. 57, February 26, 1858.— Ed.


c J. Favre's speech before the Jury on February 26, 1858, Le Moniteur universel, No. 58, February 27, 1858.— Ed.

d F. Orsini, "À Napoléon III, Empereur des Français, 11 février 1858," Le Moniteur universel, same issue.— Ed.
severity was shown to him, and, on his asking permission to "set
his papers in order," he was answered by the immediate
application of the *camisole de force.*

It thus becomes evident that an infernal double game was here
played. Orsini had revelations to make, and had made them to
Piétri, relating to Napoleon's participation in Carbonarism, and
the positive pledges which, even after the *coup d'état*, when still
undecided in the course to follow, he had given to the Italian
patriots.\textsuperscript{497} In order to give Orsini an interest in his own
moderation, and thus prevent a great public scandal, promises of
pardon were held out to him which were never meant to be kept.
This manner of proceeding is no novelty in the annals of the
second Empire. The reader will perhaps recollect the trial of
Berryer, the son of the celebrated French advocate and legitimist.
The question then at issue was frauds committed in regard to a
joint-stock company enterprise—the *Docks Napoléoniens*. Well,
Berryer, the father, had his hands full of documents proving
Prince Napoleon and Princess Mathilde to have been the gainers
largely by the same swindling tricks that had dragged his son to
the criminal's bench. If Berryer, the greatest artist in the French
way of oratory—a way altogether dependent on the action, the
tone, the eye, and the gesticulation of the performer, which turn
words, that appear dull when glanced at in print, into speaking
flames, into electric strokes when heard—if he had produced
these documents and commented upon them, the Imperial throne
would have tottered. Accordingly he was induced to abstain from
so doing, by the interference of those nearest about the Emperor,
who offered him his son's certain acquittal as the price of his
silence. He yielded; his son was condemned, and father and son
were duped. The same maneuver has been repeated, and with the
same success, in Orsini's case. But this is not all. He was not only
induced to spare Bonaparte a fearful scandal, but to break his
silence and commit himself in Bonaparte's interest. He received
intimations of the Emperor's secret leanings for Italian liberty, and
was thus instigated to write his letter. Then the scene with Jules
Favre was enacted. Orsini's letter was inserted in the *Moniteur.*
Austria was to be frightened into compliance with Bonaparte's
demands by showing her, unmistakably, how Bonaparte might still
wield the patriotic aspirations of the Italians. She was even
offended. Orsini's head is to soothe her anger, and in payment for
it she is to make herself still more detested in Italy, and to stifle

\textsuperscript{a} Straight jacket.—*Ed.*
the feeble germs of the liberty of the press at Vienna. Such, whether true or false, is the general interpretation put on the case of Orsini.

As to the Chalons émeute, it is but a premonitory symptom. If even all manhood was extinct in France, from a mere sense of self-preservation, men would resort to insurrection. To die in a street fight, or to rot at Cayenne,⁴⁹⁸ is the alternative left to them. The pretexts on which the imprisonments are carried on—and every arrest may lead to Cayenne, as every road leads to Rome—may be exemplified by one single instance. It is known that some time ago three Paris lawyers were arrested.⁴ The bar, or rather the council of the advocates, took up the business, and applied to the Minister of Justice⁵; the answer was, that no explanations could be given, but that these three gentlemen were taken up for "intrigues and maneuvers" during the late Paris elections, ten months back. If the Chalons émeute appears, therefore, fully due in the natural course of things, the behavior, on that occasion, of the officers of the garrison hardly tallies with the frantic addresses which the French army was ordered to send to the Moniteur:⁶ The barracks are situated on the right bank of the Saone, while the officers mostly live in lodgings on the left bank, where the rising took place. Instead of rushing to the head of their men in defense of the Empire, they cautiously adopted some diplomatic movements in order to ascertain whether or not the Republic was proclaimed at Paris. Even the Moniteur dares not altogether suppress the fact. It says:

"The officers of the garrison, who had hastened to the sub-prefecture to obtain some information relative to the rumors already in circulation, forced their passage sword in hand."⁷

The Patrie tries to turn the awkward incident that way, saying that those curious officers wanted "to arrest the sub-prefect, in case he should side with the Republic;"⁸ but the fact is that they ran to the sub-prefect to ask him if it was true that the Republic was proclaimed at Paris. It was only on his denial that they thought fit to exhibit their professional zeal. Castellane has already
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⁴ "(Correspondance particulière de L'Indépendance belge.) Paris, 4 mars", L'Indépendance belge, No. 65, March 6, 1858.— Ed.
⁵ Paul de Royer.— Ed.
⁶ See addresses of the French army men, Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 26 and 27, January 26 and 27, 1858, and also the following issues.— Ed.
⁷ "À Châlon-sur-Saône, dans la soirée...", Le Moniteur universel, No. 68, March 9, 1858.— Ed.
⁸ Quoted from L'Indépendance belge, No. 71, March 12, 1858.— Ed.
Karl Marx started from Lyons to investigate their behavior. In one word, the army shows symptoms of disaffection. The manner in which it was paraded in the Moniteur, and made the laughing-stock of Europe, then to be simply thrown overboard out of deference to John Bull; Bonaparte's breaking it up into five armies, for fear of abdicating its supreme command into Pelissier's hands, who has now become cold toward his master; the disdainful letters in which Changarnier and Bedeau have declined the permission to return to France; the raising of L'Espinasse, generally detested in the barracks since the Dobrodja affair, to a post of exceptional trust; and lastly, that dark presentiment of an impending turn in the tide which has always distinguished the "intelligent bayonets" of France; all this has contributed to estrange the calculating chiefs of the army. Beside the Chalons affair, there is Gen. M'Mahon's conduct in the French Senate to bear witness to this strange and rather unexpected change. His remarks on the loi des suspects were most outspoken, and his was the one adverse vote among Bonaparte's embroidered liverymen.

Written on March 11, 1858
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a Changarnier's letter to the editor of L'Indépendance belge of March 1, 1858, L'Indépendance belge, No. 61, March 2, 1858; Bedeau's letter to the editor of L'Indépendance belge of March 3, 1858, L'Indépendance belge, No. 65, March 6, 1858.—Ed.

b MacMahon's speech in the French Senate on February 25, 1858. Le Moniteur universel, No. 57, February 26, 1858; also quoted in L'Indépendance belge, No. 59, February 28, 1858.—Ed.
Karl Marx

BONAPARTE'S PRESENT POSITION

Paris, March 18, 1858

"Risorgerò nemico ognor piu crudo
Cenere anco sepolto e spirto ignudo."

(I shall revive from the dead a still more cruel foe, though but buried ash and a naked spirit.) These two lines of Tasso’s Jerusalem, which Orsini, after Favre’s speech, with a strange smile, whispered to his defender, are already beginning to be fulfilled. The attitude of the crowd witnessing the death of the Italian patriot is thus described by an eye-witness:

"Such had been the alarm of the Government that an entire division was had out, under the personal command of a general officer, who assisted at the execution. Fifteen thousand soldiers were ready to act on the slightest signal, and every issue and outlet was guarded as in times of insurrection. In my estimation, between 90,000 and 100,000 men of the Faubourgs, workmen in blouses, were assembled in the spaces and in the streets near the Place de la Roquette; but they were so grouped by the way in which the troops were stationed, that they could see little or nothing. When the dead, dull sound of the falling of the knife upon Orsini was heard, it was responded to by an immense but smothered reply of ‘Vive la République.’ I cannot properly describe this; it was like a gigantic mutter; it was not a cry or a shout, but it sounded like the breath or the sigh of thousands of human beings. It was well appreciated by the authorities, for, on the instant, the soldiers raised the most disorderly clutter imaginable, struck their horses, so as to make them plunge and kick, shook their arms, and contrived that the popular whisper should be stifled without being literally put down. But the words ‘Vive la République’ must have been clearly audible to every one. I purposely went home on foot, threading my way slowly through the groups wherever I found them thickest. I am bound to admit that everywhere I heard expressions of sympathy and admiration for Orsini, whose crime seems utterly forgotten, while only the effect produced by his courage and generosity toward his associates remains. Pieri’s name I did not hear once. The attitude of the populace was, I should say, extremely menacing, for it had the marks of a hate and a thirst for vengeance.
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a Torquato Tasso. Gerusalemme liberata, canto nono, stanza XCIX.—Ed.
b J. Favre’s speech before the Jury on February 26, 1858, Le Moniteur universel, No. 58, February 27, 1858.—Ed.
seated too deep for words. All the remarks I heard were made in an undertone, as though a police spy were dreaded at every instant."

It seems, then, that the measures of "general safety" intended to weed out the Republican element, the wholesale imprisonments and transportation, prove no more successful than the cités ouvrières,¹ the newly-established workshops, and other attempts to purchase the conscience of the French working classes. The circumstances dwelt upon on a former occasion,² which accompanied Orsini's trial, have now become the general topic of Paris conversation. It has even oozed out that when the voluminous correspondence of Orsini and Pieri came to be examined, letters written by Louis Napoleon, and signed by himself, dated many years ago, came to light. If the French Constitutionnel was still in the agreeable position it held in Mr. Guizot's time, we should, day after day, be treated with the solemn phrase, "L'horizon politique s'obscureît."³ And so it does, indeed. Great was the consternation at the Tuileries on ascertaining the conduct of the officers of the garrison at Chalons, and excessive the anger at the naïveté of the Moniteur informing France and Europe that, instead of on the instant laughing at the whole affair, ordering out their men, or declaring that, even were the Republic proclaimed in Paris, they would fight against it for the Empire, the officers at Chalons first ran to the sub-prefect⁴ and declined to risk their skins and their commissions for the Emperor, before having made sure whether or not the Republic was proclaimed. The fact proves that the mass of the army cannot be relied upon. Save its heads, which are too deeply compromised or have received too brilliant rewards to separate their destinies from that of the Empire, there is perhaps but one single portion of it altogether trustworthy, namely, the Guards. This corps is indeed very strong, and must be aware that, under any other government, it would be merged into the line, or altogether disbanded. Its infantry force consists of four regiments of grenadiers, two regiments of voltigeurs, one regiment of gens d'armes, one regiment of Zouaves⁵ and one battalion of chasseurs—altogether seventeen battalions of infantry. It musters, besides, two regiments of cuirassiers, two regiments of dragoons, one regiment of mounted grenadiers, one regiment of hussars,

⁠¹ Workers' settlements.—Ed.
⁠² See this volume, pp. 474-76.—Ed.
⁠³ The political horizon darkens.—Ed.
⁠⁴ "À Châlon-sur-Saône, dans la soirée...", Le Moniteur universel, No. 68, March 9, 1858. See this volume, p. 475.—Ed.
⁠⁵ See this volume, pp. 474-76.—Ed.
and one regiment of chasseurs, or twenty-one squadrons of cavalry; its artillery, too, being rather strong. Its whole numerical force amounts to about 20,000 men, with 40 to 50 cannons, a nucleus sufficiently powerful to counteract the tendencies to vacillation which might prevail in the line in the case of a serious struggle with the Paris people. Moreover, everything is provided for a sudden concentration of the troops from the provinces, as the most superficial glance at a railway map of France will prove, so that a movement which should not take the Government by surprise is sure to find arrayed against it the formidable force of from 60,000 to 80,000 men. But the very measures Bonaparte has taken to suppress an armed revolt make it quite improbable that it should occur except on some great unforeseen occasion, when the decidedly anti-Bonapartist attitude of the bourgeoisie, the secret societies undermining the lower strata of the army, the petty jealousies, venal treacheries and Orleanist or Legitimist leanings dividing its superior layers, are likely to turn the scale in favor of the revolutionary masses. The worst thing that could happen to the latter would be a successful attempt on Bonaparte's life. In that case the answer given by Morny, at the beginning of the Russian war, to Bonaparte's question, what they intended doing on his sudden death:

"Nous commencerions de jeter tous les Jerômes par la fenêtre, et puis nous tâcherions de nous arranger tant bien que mal avec les Orléans," [We shall begin by throwing all the Jeromes out of the window, and then we shall arrange matters as well as we can with the Orleans family.]

would perhaps turn out a prophecy. Before the men of the faubourgs could have decided upon the course to take, Morny might execute his palace-revolution, proclaim the Orleans, and thus draw over the middle classes to the anti-revolutionary camp.

Meanwhile Bonaparte's disappointments in the field of foreign policy vastly contribute to urge him on in his system of domestic terrorism. Every check he sustains from without, by betraying the weakness of his position, and giving new life to the aspirations of his antagonists, is necessarily followed up by new displays of what is called "governmental vigor." And these foreign miscarriages have rapidly accumulated during the last weeks. There was first the great failure with regard to England. Then even Switzerland, although she had made very cowardly concessions, took courage to demur at the further steps urged upon her in the most unceremonious manner. It was formally declared to the Confederation that, if necessary, regiments of French infantry would enter
and perform those police duties which the police of Switzerland could not do for themselves. At this point even Mr. Kern found it necessary to demand his passports, and the French Government to draw off. Belgium, having altered its law at Bonaparte's dictation,\textsuperscript{508} declined to comply with the demand for Gen. Changarnier's expulsion. The Commission of the Piedmontese Chamber charged with the duty of examining the bill\textsuperscript{a} to assimilate the Sardinian institutions to the \textit{Idées Napoléoniennes},\textsuperscript{b} by a majority of five against two, proposed the pure and simple rejection of the Bonapartist project. Austria, fully aware that Orsini's execution has bound over to her, hand and foot, the hero of Strasbourg,\textsuperscript{509} and that he can no longer alarm her through Italy, shows him the cold shoulder.

To expose itself to ridicule is the surest way for a French Government to annihilate itself. Bonaparte is conscious of the grotesque luster which his last baffled attempts at playing the dictator of Europe have shed upon him. The more contemptible his European position grows, the more keenly he feels the necessity of appearing formidable to France. Consequently, the reign of terror is progressively extending. Gen. Espinasse, at the head of the Ministry of the Interior, is now backed by Mr. Boitel, a former colonel in the hussars, at the head of the Prefecture of Police. The system adopted by these military myrmidons of the second Empire is thus described in \textit{The Continental Review}:

"They have taken the old lists of individuals who, after the troubles of 1848 and 1851, were designated by the police as dangerous, and they have arrested these persons \textit{en masse}, both in Paris and in the departments. All this was done without the slightest inquiry being made as to whether or not these persons had since that period given ground of complaint, and the most cruel effects have ensued. Thus, honest citizens, who, being carried away in 1848 by the whirlwind which agitated the whole nation, professed advanced ideas, but who have since abandoned politics, and many of whom are now fathers of families and industrious tradesmen, were carried off by the police from the midst of their affairs and from their families. These are known facts which show how little ground there was for the arrests, and with what an absence of even the semblance of legality or necessity these measures of terrorism were carried out. Among the persons whom the agents of the police attempted to arrest, there were some individuals who had been no less than six years out of France, and who consequently could not have committed any offense, but who, if they had been in France at the present moment, would inevitably have been thrown into prison on pretense of 'public safety.' Nay, more, the police went to the houses of several persons who had been dead for some years, for the

\textsuperscript{a} The bill submitted to the Turin Chamber of Deputies on February 17, 1858, \textit{Le Moniteur universel}, No. 54, February 23, 1858.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} An allusion to Louis Bonaparte's book \textit{Des idées napoléoniennes}.—\textit{Ed.}
purpose of arresting them. Their names figured on the lists of persons formerly
arrested (and many of these simply because they were among the crowd in the
streets, and that was their only crime). It is therefore clear that it is not against the
guilty that the police war, but against the suspected; and the manner in which the
law is executed is of itself a justification of the title conferred upon it by public
opinion. In the departments matters proceed pretty much as in Paris. The lists of
the suspected were drawn up by the administrative authorities, and woe to those
who, in the elections of June last, ventured to oppose the candidates supported by
the Prefect, and who, looking on the Constitution, the electoral law and the
circulars of the Minister of the Interior as serious realities, have believed that they
might take measures for the election of the candidates of their choice. These latter
are considered as the worst of culprits, and they must be either very rich, very
influential, or very well protected by their friends, to escape the vengeance of those
officials whose paths they had crossed. Among the persons arrested in the
provinces appears the name of Gen. Courtais, who, after having played a part in
1848 as Commander-in-Chief of the National Guard of Paris, lived for the last nine
years in the greatest retirement in a country house in the department of the Allier,
removed from society, and altogether a stranger to politics or public affairs."

What with this system of “general safety,” what with the pangs
of a commercial crisis that has become chronic, the French middle
classes will soon be worked up to the point where they will
consider a revolution necessary for the “restoration of confi-
dence.”

Written on March 18, 1858

First published unsigned in the New-York
Daily Tribune, No. 5287, April 1, 1858;
reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly
Tribune, No. 1341, April 2, 1858 and in the
New-York Weekly Tribune, No. 864, April 3,
1858

Reproduced from the New-York
Daily Tribune
Of all governmental positions, the most trying is that of a civilian at the head of a despotic military state. In the Orient, the difficulty is more or less met by transforming the despot into a god, theocratic attributes not allowing the ruler to be reduced to a measure common to himself and to his swordsmen. In Imperial Rome, the deification of the Emperors, while not affording the same defense, grew out of the same necessity. Now, Louis Bonaparte is a civilian, although he was the editor of a history of cannon, but he cannot adopt the Roman expedient. Hence the accumulating perplexities of his position. At the same rate that France grows impatient of the yoke of the army, the army waxes bolder in its purpose of yoking Bonaparte. After the 10th of December, Bonaparte could flatter himself that he was the elect of the peasantry, that is, the mass of the French nation. Since the attempt of the 14th January, he knows that he is at the mercy of the army. Having been compelled to avow that he rules through the army, it is quite natural that the latter should seek to rule through him.

The parceling out of France into five pashalics, therefore, but preceded the installation of Espinasse as Minister of the Interior. The latter step was followed by making over the police of Paris to M. Boitelle, who was a non-commissioned officer in 1830, serving with M. de Persigny in the same regiment at La Fere and trying, when the revolution of July broke out, to make his comrades cry "Vive Napoleon II." The glorification of Boitelle is backed by the nomination of Pelissier Duc de Malakoff, as his Imperial Majesty's representative at the Court of St. James's. This appointment means flattery to the army and menace to England. It is true that the Moniteur pretends to turn it into a compliment to John

---

a Napoléon-Louis Bonaparte, Histoire du canon dans les armées modernes.—Ed.
Bull, a but Veuillot of the Univers, who is known to have his petites and grandes entrées b at the Tuileries, foreshadowed the event in a fierce article containing this significant phrase:

"The pride of England is wounded. The wound is an old one. The wound was inflicted in the Crimea at the Alma, at Inkermann, at the Malakoff, everywhere where the French were the first at the field and penetrated the deepest into the enemy's ranks. St. Arnaud, Bosquet, Canrobert, Pelissier, McMahon—these are the men who wounded the pride of England. c"

In one word, Napoleon III. has sent his Menchikoff to London, of whom, by-the-by, he is rather glad to get rid for a time, since Pelissier has taken up the attitude of a frondeur from the moment his appointment as Commander-in-Chief of the five pashalis was rescinded. The Paris Bourse, on the news becoming known, went down at once.

Pelissier has more than one grudge to avenge upon England. In 1841, before his electors at Tiverton, Palmerston publicly branded him as a monster, d and gave the signal to his general abuse by the London Press. After the Crimean campaign, General de Lacy Evans, in the House of Commons, more than hinted at Pelissier as the principal cause of the disgrace that had befallen the English army before Sevastopol. He was also roughly handled by the British Press, expatiating upon the intimations of Gen. Evans. Lastly, at a banquet given to the Crimean Generals, Pelissier simply appropriated the whole Crimean glory, such as it is, to the eagles of France, not even condescending to recollect John Bull's cooperation. Again, the London Press, by way of reprisal, dissected Pelissier. Moreover, his temper is known to unfit him altogether for the part of that mythological Greek personage who alone was able to heal the wounds it had inflicted. e Still we cannot share the opinion of those London papers which, working themselves up to a Roman state of mind, warn the Consuls to take care "ne republica detrimenti capit." f Pelissier means intimidation,

---

a "Voici en quels termes les principaux organes...", Le Moniteur universel, No. 86, March 27, 1858.—Ed.
b The right of informal and official entrance.—Ed.
c "Le journal la Patrie publie...", L'Indépendance belge, No. 86, March 27, 1858.—Ed.
d Palmerston's speech before the electors at Tiverton on June 28, 1841, The Times, No. 1773, July 3, 1841.—Ed.
e The reference is to Achilles, who, as the Greek myth has it, was the only one able to heal the wounds he had inflicted to Telephus, Heracles' son.—Ed.
f That the state suffer no harm (the decretum ultimum passed by the Roman senate in times of national peril, which gave the chief magistrates, the consuls, full powers to use any means to save the commonwealth).—Ed.
but he does not mean war. This appointment is a mere coup de théâtre.

The broad ditch that separates perfide Albion from la belle France, is her Lacus Curtius, but Bonaparte is not the romantic youth to close the yawning chasm by plunging himself into the gulf, and disappearing. Of all men in Europe, he knows best that his frail tenure of power hinges upon the alliance with England; but this is a truth fatal to the revenger of Waterloo, and which he must do his best to conceal from his armed myrmidons by pulling hard on John Bull, and clothing the very alliance in the garbs of a vassalage, imposed by France, and accepted by England.

Such is his game, a most dangerous one, likely to hasten the issue it aims to put off. If Pelissier fails in his bullying mission, as he is sure to do, the last card has been played, the theatrical performances must make room for real ones, or Bonaparte will stand before his army a confessed impostor, hiding behind his Napoleonic airs the sorry figure of the London constable of the 10th of April, 1848.

In point of fact, it was but the alliance with England which enabled the nephew for a time to mimic the uncle. The close connection of England and France, while giving the death-blow to the Holy Alliance and putting at nought the balance of European power, naturally invested Bonaparte, the Continental representative of that alliance, with the appearance of the arbiter of Europe. So long as the Russian war and the internal state of France allowed him to do so, he was but too glad to content himself with this symbolical rather than real supremacy. All this has changed since peace reigns in Europe and the army reigns in France. He is now called upon by the army to show that, like a real Napoleon, he holds the dictate of Europe, not in trust for England, but in spite of England. Hence his perplexities. On the one hand he bullies John Bull, on the other hand he insinuates to him that he means no harm. He rather implores him to look frightened, out of courtesy, at the mock-menaces of his "august ally." This is the very way of stiffening John Bull, who feels that he risks nothing in giving himself heroical airs.

Written on March 26, 1858

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5299, April 15, 1858
M. Mazzini has recently addressed a letter to the French Emperor, a which, in a literary point of view, must hold, perhaps, the first place among his productions. There are but few traces left of that false sublimity, puffy grandeur, verbosity and prophetic mysticism so characteristic of many of his writings, and almost forming the distinctive features of that school of Italian literature of which he is the founder. An enlargement of views is also perceptible. He has, till now, figured as the chief of the Republican formalists of Europe. Exclusively bent on the political forms of the State, they have had no eye for the organization of society on which the political superstructure rests. Boasting of a false idealism, they have considered it beneath their dignity to become acquainted with economical realities. Nothing is easier than to be an idealist on behalf of other people. A surfeited man may easily sneer at the materialism of hungry people asking for vulgar bread instead of sublime ideas. The Triumvirs of the Roman Republic of 1848, leaving the peasants of the Campagna in a state of slavery more exasperating than that of their ancestors of the times of imperial Rome, were quite welcome to descant on the degraded state of the rural mind.

All real progress in the writing of modern history has been effected by descending from the political surface into the depths of social life. Dureau de la Malle, in tracing the different phases of the development of landed property in ancient Rome, has afforded a key to the destinies of that world-conquering city, beside which Montesquieu’s considerations on its greatness and

\[a\] G. Mazzini. To Louis Napoléon.— Ed.
decline a appear almost like a schoolboy’s declamation. The venerable Lelewel, by his laborious research into the economical circumstances which transformed the Polish peasant from a free man into a serf, b has done more to shed light on the subjugation of his country than the whole host of writers whose stock in trade is simple denunciation of Russia. M. Mazzini, too, does not now disdain to dwell on social realities, the interests of the different classes, the exports and imports, the prices of necessaries, house-rent, and other such vulgar things, being struck, perhaps, by the great if not fatal shock given to the second Empire, not by the manifestoes of Democratic Committees, but by the commercial convulsion which started from New-York to encompass the world. It is only to be hoped that he will not stop at this point, but, unbiased by a false pride, will proceed to reform his whole political catechism by the light of economical science. His letter commences with this vigorous apostrophe to Louis Napoleon:

“The fullness of time approaches; the Imperial tide is visibly rolling back. You too feel it. All the measures you have been enacting, since the 14th of January, 520 in France—all the diplomatic notes and requests you have been, since the fatal day, scattering to the four winds abroad, are bespeaking the restlessness of terror. There is a Macbeth feeling of intense agony preying upon your soul, and betraying itself through all that you say or do. There is at work within a presentiment that summa dies et ineluctable fatum c are impending. The Thane of Glamis, Thane of Cawdor, and King—the Pretender, President and Usurper—are doomed. The spell is broken. The conscience of mankind is aroused; it gazes sternly on you; it confronts you; it sifts your acts, and calls to account your promises. From this moment, your fate is sealed. You may now live months; years you cannot.”

Having thus announced the doom of the second Empire, Mazzini contrasts the present economical state of France with Napoleon’s glowing promises of general prosperity:

“You promised, when you unlawfully conquered power, and as an atonement for its origin, that you would rule restless, perturbed, perturbing France to peace. Is imprisoning, gagging, transporting, ruling? Is the gendarme a teacher? Is the spy an apostle of morality and mutual trust? You told the French uneducated peasant that a new era was, with your empire, dawning for him, and that the burdens under which he groans would all, one by one, disappear. Has any disappeared? Can you point out a single amelioration to his fate—a single element of taxation removed? Can you explain how it is that the peasant is now enlisting in the Marianne521? Can you deny that the absorption of the funds, once naturally

a A. Dureau de la Malle, *Economie politique des Romains*; Ch. Montesquieu, *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence.*—Ed.
b J. Lelevel, *Considérations sur l’état politique de l’ancienne Pologne et sur l’histoire de son peuple.*—Ed.
c The last day and the ineluctable hour (cf. Virgil, *Aeneid, II, 325.*—Ed.
d G. Mazzini, *To Louis Napoléon*, p. 3.—Ed.
devoted to the agricultural element, into the channels of industrial speculation opened by you, has deprived the laborer of the possibility of finding advances for the purchase of working implements and the improvement of the land? You allured the misguided working man by declaring that you would be the Empereur du peuple, a sort of remodeled Henry IV., and procure to him perennial work, high wages, and la poule au pot.\(^a\) Is not la poule au pot somewhat dear just now in France? Is not house-rent, are not some of the first necessities of life, still dearer? You have opened new streets—drawn for your strategic, repressive purposes new lines of communication—destroyed and rebuilt. But do the bulk of the working classes belong to the benefited building branch? Can you overturn Paris and the main provincial towns, indefinitely, for the sake of creating for the prolétaire a source of work and earnings? Can you ever dream of making of such a factitious, temporary remedy a substitute for regular normal progress, and required production? Is the demand for production now in a satisfactory state? Are not three-fifths of the cabinet-makers, of the carpenters, of the mechanics, out of employment now in Paris? You whispered to the easily frightened, easily fascinated bourgeoisie fantastic dreams, hopes of a redoubled industrial activity, new sources of profits, El Dorados of stimulated exportation, and international intercourse. Where are they? Stagnation hovers over your French productive life; orders to commerce are diminishing; capital is beginning to retreat. You have, like the barbarian, cut the tree to pluck the fruit. You have artificially over-stimulated wild, immoral, all-promising and never-fulfilling speculation; you have, by self-puffing, gigantic, swollen schemes, attracted the savings of the small capitalists from the four corners of France to Paris, and diverted them from the only true permanent sources of national wealth, agriculture, trade and industry. These savings have been engulfed and disappeared in the hands of some dozens of leading speculators; they have been squandered in boundless unproductive luxuries; or they are quietly and prudently—I might quote members of your family—transferred to safe foreign countries. The half of these schemes have sunk into oblivious nonentity. Some of their inventors are traveling, as a precautionary measure, in foreign countries. You find yourself before a dissatisfied bourgeoisie, with all normal resources dried up, with the incubus of some five hundred millions of francs spent, throughout the principal towns of France, in unproductive public works, with a deficit of three hundred millions visible in your last budget, with an extensively indebted city of Paris, with no remedy to propose except a new loan of one hundred and sixty millions to be opened—not in your name, it would not succeed—but in the name of the City Council itself, and to meet the burden of interest, a widening of the barriers, therefore, of the hated octroi,\(^b\) to the extent of the outward fortifications. The remedy will weigh heavy on the working class, and embitter against you the hitherto devoted suburbs. Your artificial contrivances are at an end; henceforth, everything you do to meet the financial difficulty of your position, will mark a step in the fatal descent. You have hitherto lived on an indefinite series of loans and credit; but where is your guaranty for prolonged credit? Rome and Napoleon were ransacking a world; you have only France to ransack. Their armies lived on conquest; yours cannot. You may dream of conquest; you cannot, do not dare to venture on it. The Roman dictators and your uncle were leading the conquering armies; however fond of gilt parade uniforms, I doubt your being able to lead a few combined battalions.\(^c\)

\(^a\) A fowl in his pot.—Ed.
\(^b\) A tax on articles (for sale) entering a town.—Ed.
\(^c\) Here and below G. Mazzini, To Louis Napoléon, pp. 3-8 and 13.—Ed.
From the material prospect of the second Empire, Mazzini turns to the moral, and, of course, is somewhat perplexed in summing up the evidence for the proposition that liberty wears no Bonapartist livery. Liberty, not only in its bodily forms, but in its very soul, its intellectual life, has shriveled at the coarse touch of these resurrectionists of a bygone epoch. Consequently, the representatives of intellectual France, by no means distinguished by too nice a delicacy of political conscience, never failing to gather around every regime, from the Regent to Robespierre—from Louis XIV. to Louis Philippe—from the first Empire to the second Republic—have, for the first time in French history, seceded in mass from an established government.

"From Thiers to Guizot, from Cousin to Villemain, from Michelet to Jean Reynaud, intellectual France shrinks from your polluting contact. Your men are Veuillot, the upholder of the St. Bartholomew and of the Inquisition, Granier de Cassagnac, the patron of negro slavery, and such like. To find a man worth indorsing your pamphlet addressed to England, you have to look for one who is an apostate from Legitimism, and an apostate from Republicanism."

Mazzini then hits on the true meaning of the affair of the 14th of January by stating that the missiles which missed the Emperor pierced the Empire, and laid bare the hollowness of its boasts:

"You boasted to Europe, only a short while ago, that the heart of France was yours, hailing you as her savior, calm, happy, undisturbed. A few months have elapsed, a crash has been heard in the rue Lepelletier, and through your wild, alarmed, repressive measures—through your half-threatening, half-imploring appeals to Europe—through your military division of the country, with a saber in the Ministry of the Interior, you declare now, after seven years of unlimited sway—with an overwhelming concentrated army—with the national ranks cleared of all the dreaded leading men—that you cannot live and rule unless France is converted into a huge Bastille, and Europe into a mere Imperial police-office.... Yes; the Empire has proved a lie. You shaped it, Sir, to your own image. No man, during the last half century, has lied in Europe, Talleyrand excepted, so much as you have; and that is the secret of your temporary power."

The falsehoods of the savior of society are then recapitulated from 1831, when he joined the insurrectionary movement of the Roman population against the Pope as "a sacred cause;" to 1851, a few days before the coup d'état, when he said to the army, "I shall ask nothing from you beyond my right, recognized by the Constitution;" to the 2d of December itself, the final result of the usurping schemes still pending, when he proclaimed that "his duty was to protect the Republic." Finally, he tells Napoleon roundly

---

*Philip II of Orleans.—* Ed.
that but for England he would have been already conquered by the Revolution. Then, having disposed of Napoleon's claim to have inaugurated the alliance between France and England, he concludes with the words:

"You stand now, Sir, whatever self-mouthed, self-disguising diplomacy may say, alone in Europe."

Written on March 30, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5321, May 11, 1858
Karl Marx

THE FRENCH TRIALS IN LONDON

Paris, April 4, 1858

When Victor Hugo marked the nephew as Napoleon the Little, he acknowledged the uncle as Napoleon the Great. The title of his celebrated pamphlet—a meant an antithesis, and, to some degree, did homage to that very Napoleon-worship on which the son of Hortense Beauharnais contrived to raise the bloody fabric of his fortune. What is more useful to impress on the present generation is that Napoleon the Little represents in fact the littleness of Napoleon the Great. The plainest illustration of this fact is afforded by the recent “painful misconceptions” between England and France, and the criminal proceedings against refugees and printers which they have led to on the part of the English Government. A short historical review will prove that during the whole of this miserable melo-drama Napoleon the Little has only re-enacted with anxious minuteness the shabby part invented and played before by Napoleon the Great.

It was only during the short interval separating the peace of Amiens (March 25, 1802) from the new declaration of war on the part of Great Britain (May 18, 1803) that Napoleon could indulge his desire for interference with the internal state of Great Britain. He lost no time. Even while the peace negotiations were still pending, the Moniteur emitted his venom on all the London papers venturing to question “the moderation and sincerity of Bonaparte’s views,” and gave no very unintelligible hint that “such disbelief might ere long be followed with chastisement.”

—a V. Hugo, Napoléon le petit. (Originally this epithet was used by the author of the pamphlet in his speech in the Legislative Assembly in 1851.)—Ed.

b “Paris, le 22 ventôse”, “Paris, le 25 ventôse”. Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 173, 176, 23, 26 ventôse an 10 de la République française.—Ed.
the Consul confine himself to a censorship over the language and sentiments of the British press. The *Moniteur* abused Lord Grenville and Mr. Windham for the part they took in the discussions on peace. Mr. Elliot, a Member of Parliament, was called to account in the House of Commons by Perceval, the Attorney-General, for expressing his doubts as to Bonaparte's intentions. Lord Castlereagh and Pitt himself pitched the key of submission, by inculcating, what had never been done on any former occasions, forbearance of language in debate as respecting the Consul of France. About six weeks had passed from the conclusion of the peace, when Talleyrand, on June 3, 1802, informed Mr. Merry, the British Plenipotentiary at Paris, that Bonaparte, out of consideration for England, had resolved to replace Mr. Otto, the French Plenipotentiary at London, by a real Ambassador in the person of Gen. Andréossy; but that before the arrival of that exalted personage at London, it was the First Consul's sincere wish

"to see such obstacles removed which stood very much in the way of the perfect reconciliation between the two countries and their Governments."

What he demanded, was simply the removal out of the British dominions of

"all the French princes and their adherents, together with the French bishops and other French individuals whose political principles and conduct must necessarily occasion great jealousy of the French Government.... The protection and favor which all the persons in question continued to meet with, in a country so close a neighbor to France, must alone be always considered as an encouragement to the disaffected here, even without those persons themselves being guilty of any acts leading to foment fresh disturbances in this country; but that the Government here possessed proofs of the abuse which they were now making of the protection which they enjoyed in England, and of the advantage they were taking of their vicinity to France, by being really guilty of such acts, since several printed papers had lately been intercepted, which it was known they had sent, and caused to be circulated in France, and which had for their object to create an opposition to the Government." 

There existed at that time an alien law in England, which, however, was framed strictly with a view to the protection of the
British Government. In answer to Talleyrand's demand, Lord Hawkesbury, the then Foreign Minister, replied that

"His Majesty the King\(^a\) certainly expected that all foreigners who might reside within his dominions, should not only hold a conduct conformable to the laws of the country, but abstain from all acts hostile to the Government of any country with which his Majesty might be at peace. As long, however, as they conduct themselves according to these principles, his Majesty would feel it inconsistent with his dignity, with his honor, and with the common laws of hospitality, to deprive them of that protection which individuals resident in his dominions can only forfeit by their own misconduct. The greater part of the persons to whom allusion has been made in Mr. Talleyrand's conversation, are living in retirement."\(^b\)

In delivering Lord Hawkesbury's dispatch to Talleyrand, Mr. Merry was by no means sparing of assurances calculated to "soothe, tranquilize and satisfy the First Consul."\(^c\) Talleyrand, however, insisted upon his pound of flesh,\(^d\) stating that the First Consul had solicited no more than the British Government itself had demanded of Louis XIV., when the Pretender\(^e\) was in France, that he could not see any humiliation in the measure intimated, and that he must repeat

"that the adoption of it would be in the highest degree agreeable and satisfactory to the First Consul," and be considered by him as "the most convincing proof of his Majesty's disposition to see a cordial good understanding established between the two countries."\(^f\)

On July 25, 1802, Mr. Otto, from his residence at Portman Square, addressed a letter to Lord Hawkesbury, requesting, in a very categorical way, nothing less than the suppression of the liberty of the English press, as far as Bonaparte and his Government were concerned.

"I transmitted," he says, "some time ago, to Mr. Hammond, a number of Peltier, containing the most gross calumnies against the French Government, and against the whole nation; and I observed, that I should probably receive an order to demand a punishment of such an abuse of the press. That order is actually arrived, and I cannot conceal from you, my Lord, that the reiterated insults of a small number of foreigners, assembled in London to conspire against the French Government, have produced the most unfavorable effects on the good understand-

\(^a\) George III.—*Ed.*
\(^b\) R. Hawkesbury's dispatch to A. Merry, dated June 10, 1802, *Cobbett's Annual Register*, Vol. III, col. 999-1000.—*Ed.*
\(^d\) Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act I, Scene 3.—*Ed.*
\(^e\) James II.—*Ed.*
ing between the two nations.... It is not to Peltier alone, but to the editor of the Courrier Français de Londres (Reynaud), to Cobbett, and to other writers who resemble them, that I have to direct the attention of his Majesty's Government.... The want of positive laws against these sorts of offenses cannot palliate the violation of the laws of nations, according to which peace should put a stop to all species of hostilities; and doubtless those which wound the honor and reputation of a Government, and which tend to create a revolt of the people whose interests are confided to that Government, are the most apt to lessen the advantages of peace and to keep up national resentments."

Instead of meeting these first reproaches of Bonaparte's interference on the subject of the press with a firm and dignified reply, Lord Hawkesbury, in a letter to M. Otto on July 28, made a paltry apology for the existence of the liberty of the press. He says that it is

"impossible his Majesty's Government could peruse Peltier's article without the greatest displeasure, and without an anxious desire that a person who published it should suffer the punishment he so justly deserves."

Then, after lamenting the "inconveniences" of prosecutions for libel, and the "difficulty" of obtaining judgment against the offenders, he concludes by stating that he has referred the matter to the King's Attorney-General\(^1\)"for his opinion whether it is or is not a libel."\(^2\)

While the British Government was thus preparing a crusade against the liberty of the press, in order to soothe the susceptibility of its great and new ally, there appeared suddenly, on August 9, a menacing article in the Moniteur, in which England was not only accused of receiving French robbers and assassins, of harboring them at Jersey, and of sending them to make predatory excursions on the coasts of France, but in which the English King himself was represented as a rewarder and instigator of assassination:

"The Times, which is said to be under Ministerial inspection, is filled with perpetual invectives against France. Two of its four pages are every day employed in giving currency to the grossest calumnies. All that imagination can depict, that is low, vile and base, is by that miserable paper attributed to the French Government. What is its end? Who pays it? What does it effect? A French journal,\(^3\) edited by some miserable emigrants, the remnant of the most impure, a vile refuse, without country, without honor; sullied with crimes which it is not in the power of any amnesty to wash away, outdoes even The Times." Eleven Bishops, presided over

---


\(^2\) Spencer Perceval.—*Ed.*


\(^4\) L'Ambigu, variétés atroces et amusantes.—*Ed.*
by the atrocious Bishop of Arras, rebels to their country and to the Church, have assembled in London. They print libels against the Bishops and the French clergy.”

“The Isle of Jersey is full of brigands, condemned to death by the tribunals, committed subsequent to the peace for assassination, robberies, and the practices of an incendiary. Georges wears openly at London his red ribbon, as a recompense for the infernal machine which destroyed a part of Paris, and killed thirty women and children, or peaceable citizens. This special protection authorizes a belief that if he had succeeded, he would have been honored with the Order of the Garter.”

“Either the English Government authorizes and tolerates those public and private crimes, in which case it cannot be said that such conduct is consistent with British generosity, civilization and honor; or it cannot prevent them, in which case it does not deserve the name of a Government, above all, if it does not possess the means of repressing assassination and calumny and protecting social order.”

When the menacing Moniteur arrived late at night in London, it produced such an irritation that The True Briton, the Ministerial paper, was compelled to declare,

“That article could not have been inserted in the Moniteur with the knowledge or consent of the French Government.”

In the House of Commons Dr. Laurence called upon Mr. Addington (afterward Lord Sidmout) as to the French libels on his Majesty. The Minister replied that

“he wished he could show to the learned gentleman the satisfactory explanations which had taken place on that head.”

It was replied that while the British Government made a public matter of a jest on Bonaparte and his wife, and Mr. Peltier was, for his jokes upon those people, to be brought into the Court of King’s Bench and to be arraigned as a criminal; in the other case, when the British nation was libeled and its royal master, in the official gazette of France, styled the rewarder of assassins, the matter was to be settled by an “explanation”, and that explanation so secret, too, as not to admit of being communicated to Parliament. Encouraged by the apparent vacillation of the English

---

a Georges Cadoudal.— Ed.

b The reference is to the attempt on the life of Napoleon Bonaparte on December 24, 1800 in the rue Saint-Nicaise.— Ed.

c “Paris, le 19 thermidor”, Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, No. 320, 20 thermidor an 10 de la République française. (The last sentence of this passage was quoted by Marx in his letter to Engels of February 14, 1858. See present edition, Vol. 40, p. 266.).— Ed.

d The True Briton’s declaration, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. II, col. 130.— Ed.

e Fr. Laurence’s speech in the House of Commons on December 9, 1802, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. II, col. 1774-76.— Ed.

f H. Addington’s speech in the House of Commons on December 9, 1802, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. II, col. 1776-77.— Ed.
Ministry, Otto, on Aug. 17, 1802, came out with a most impudent note to Lord Hawkesbury, in which the demand is formally put to adopt effectual measures for putting down all the unbecoming and seditious publications of the English prints, to send out of Jersey certain individuals, to expel the French bishops, to transport Georges and his adherents to Canada, and to send the French princes to Warsaw. With reference to the alien law M. Otto insists that the Ministry must possess

"a legal and sufficient power to restrain foreigners, without having recourse to the courts of law;"

and he adds,

"The French Government, which offers on this point a perfect reciprocity, thinks it gives a new proof of its pacific intentions, by demanding that those persons should be sent away whose machinations uniformly tend to sow discord between the two nations."\(^a\)

Lord Hawkesbury’s answer, dated Aug. 28, sent in the form of a dispatch to the English Plenipotentiary at Paris, has during the late quarrel with Bonaparte III. been quoted by the London press as a model of statesmanlike dignity; but it must be confessed that in spite of the terms of virtuous indignation in which it is couched, promises are held out of sacrificing the French emigrants to the jealous fears of the First Consul.\(^b\)

In the beginning of the year 1803 Napoleon took upon himself to regulate the proceedings of Parliament and to restrain the liberty of speech among its members. With respect to the ex-Ministers, Mr. Windham, Lord Grenville, and Lord Minto, he intimated literally in his Moniteur,

"It would be a patriotic and wise law which should ordain that displaced Ministers should not, for the first seven years after their dismissal, be competent to sit in the English Parliament. Another law, not less wise, would be that every member who should insult a friendly people and power should be condemned to silence for two years. When the tongue offends, the tongue must suffer punishment."\(^c\)

At the same time Gen. Andréossy, who had meanwhile arrived at London, complained in a note to Lord Hawkesbury that the despicable pamphleteers and libelers of the British press

\(^a\) L. G. Otto’s note to R. Hawkesbury, dated August 17, 1802, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. III, col. 1103.—Ed.

\(^b\) R. Hawkesbury’s dispatch to A. Merry, dated August 28, 1802, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. III, col. 1007-13.—Ed.

\(^c\) “Paris, le 10 nivôse an 11”, Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, No. 101, 11 nivôse an 11 de la République française.—Ed.
"have found themselves invariably supported in their insolent observations by particular phrases, taken from the speeches of some leading Members of Parliament."

Of these speeches it is said that

"every reasonable Englishman must be humiliated by such unheard-of licentiousness."

In the name of the First Consul he expresses the wish

"that means should be adopted to prevent in future any mention being made of what is passing in France, either in the official discussions or in the polemical writings in England, as in like manner, in the French official discussions and polemical writings, no mention should be made of what is passing in England." [a]

While Bonaparte in this tone of mingled hypocrisy and arrogance privately addressed the British Government, the Moniteur teemed with insults against the British people, and also published an official report of Col. Sebastiani, containing the most injurious charges against the British army in Egypt. [b] On Feb. 5, 1803, the French Commissaire de Relation Commerciale at Jersey, though acknowledged in no public capacity, had the insolence to prefer a complaint against some printers for inserting paragraphs from the London papers offensive to Bonaparte, and to threaten that if the practice was not punished, Bonaparte would certainly revenge himself upon Jersey. This threat had the desired effect. Two of the printers were brought before the Royal Court, and the positive injunction was laid on them not to publish in future anything offensive to France, even from the London papers. [c] On Feb. 20, 1803, one day before Peltier's trial, Lord Whitworth, the English Ambassador at Paris, was summoned into the presence of the great man himself. Being received in his cabinet, Whitworth was desired to sit down after Bonaparte had sat down himself on the other side of the table. He enumerated the several provocations which he pretended to have received from England.

"He adverted to the abuse thrown out about him in the English prints, but this he said he did not so much regard as that which appeared in the French papers published in London. This he considered as much more mischievous, since it was meant to excite his country against him and his Government. He complained of the protection given to Georges and others of his description; [...] he acknowledged that the irritation he felt against England increased daily, because every wind which

[b] H. Sebastiani, "Rapport fait au Premier Consul", Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, No. 130, 10 pluviôse an 11 de la République française.—Ed.
blew from England brought nothing but enmity and hatred against him.... As a proof of his desire to maintain peace, he wished to know what he had to gain by going to war with England. A descent was the only means of offense he had, and that he was determined to attempt, by putting himself at the head of the expedition. He acknowledged that there were one hundred chances to one against him, but still he was determined to attempt it if war should be the consequence of the present discussion; and that such was the disposition of the troops that army after army would be found for the enterprise.... To preserve peace the treaty of Amiens must be fulfilled, the abuse in the public prints, if not totally suppressed, at least kept within bounds and confined to the English papers, and the protection so openly given to his bitterest enemies must be withdrawn."\(^a\)

On Feb. 21, Peltier was tried before Lord Ellenborough and a special Jury, for libeling Bonaparte and “intending to excite the people of France to assassinate their ruler.”\(^b\) Lord Ellenborough had the meanness to terminate his address to the Jury with the following words:

“Gentlemen, I trust your verdict will strengthen the relations by which the interests of this country are connected with those of France, and that it will illustrate and justify in every quarter of the world the conviction that has been long and universally entertained of the unsullied purity of British judicature.”\(^c\)

The Jury, without retiring from their box, immediately returned the verdict of Guilty. In consequence of the subsequent rupture between the two countries, Mr. Peltier was, however, not called upon to receive judgment, and the prosecution thus stopped. Having goaded the British Ministry into these persecutions of the press, and wrung from them Peltier’s condemnation, the truthful and heroic Moniteur, March 2, 1803, published the following commentary:

“A person of the name of Peltier has been found guilty, before a court of justice at London, of printing and publishing some wretched libels against the First Consul. It is not easy to imagine why the English Ministry should affect to make this a matter of so much éclat. As it has been said in the English newspapers that the trial was instituted at the demand of the French Government, and that the French Ambassador was even in the Court when the Jury gave in their verdict, we have authority to deny that any such things did ever take place. The First Consul was even ignorant of the existence of Peltier’s libels till they came to his knowledge in the public accounts of the proceedings at his trial.... Yet it is to be acknowledged that these proceedings, however useless in other respects, have afforded an occasion to the Judges who presided at the trial to evince, by their wisdom and

\(^{a}\) Napoleon I’s conversation with Lord Whitworth, dated February 20, 1803, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. III, col. 1034.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) Cited according to “Trial of Mr. Peltier”, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. III, col. 276-83.—Ed.

\(^{c}\) E. L. Ellenborough’s speech at the trial of J. G. Peltier on February 21, 1803, Cobbett’s Annual Register, Supplement to Vol. III, col. 1232.—Ed.
impartiality, that they are truly worthy to administer justice in a nation so enlightened, and estimable in so many respects."

While the *Moniteur* in the same article insisted that the duty weighed on all "civilized nations in Europe" reciprocally to put down the barbarians of the press, M. Reinhard, the French Plenipotentiary at Hamburg, summoned together the Hamburg Senate, in order to consider a requisition from the First Consul to insert in the *Hamburger Correspondent* an article most offensive to the British Government. It was the wish of the Senate at least to be allowed to omit or qualify the most offensive passages; but M. Reinhard said his orders were positive for the full and exact insertion of the whole. The article appeared consequently in its original coarseness. The French Minister desired that the same should be published in the papers at Altona; but the Danish magistrates said that they could not possibly permit it without an express order from their Government. In consequence of this refusal, M. D'Aguessseau, the French Minister at Copenhagen, received from his colleague at Hamburg a copy of the article, with the request that he would solicit permission for its publication in the Danish papers. When called upon with respect to this libel by Lord Whitworth, M. Talleyrand declared that

"the British Ministers could not be more surprised than the First Consul had been at seeing such an article inserted by authority; that an immediate explanation had been required of M. Reinhard, etc."

Such was Napoleon the Great.

Written on April 4, 1858

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5309, April 27, 1858

---

\(a\) "Paris, le 11 ventôse", *Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel*, No. 162, 12 ventôse an 11 de la République française.— *Ed.*

Karl Marx

[THE FINANCIAL STATE OF FRANCE]

Paris, April 13, 1858

By mere force of circumstances the restored Empire finds itself more and more compelled to throw up its adventitious graces and show its real features in their native hideousness. The hour of confessions has broken in upon it unexpectedly. It had already dropped every pretense of being a regular Government, or the offspring of the “suffrage universel.” It had proclaimed itself the régime of the upstart, the informer and the 12-pounder. It goes now a step further, and avows itself the régime of the swindler. The Moniteur of April 11 contains a note stating that certain journals have announced prematurely the fixation of the dividend upon the shares of certain railway companies and other industrial societies, and have attributed to this dividend a lower figure than that which has been since determined by the Councils of Administration.

“These are maneuvers against which the industry and the capital of the country must be protected. The editors of the journals referred to have been called before the Procureur Impérial, and warned that such facts will for the future be sent before the tribunals, as constituting the offense of publishing false views. The duty of the press is to enlighten the public, and not deceive it.”

In other words, it is the duty of the press writers, at the peril of being transported to Cayenne, to bolster up the Crédit Mobilier, instead of warning the public of the impending breaking up of that monster imposture, as they have done of late, although in very timid and subdued tones. The Crédit Mobilier is to hold its general annual meeting April 29 and declare its dividend for the past year. While its directors shrouded themselves

a “Paris, le 10 avril”, Le Moniteur universel, No. 101, April 11, 1858.— Ed.
in impenetrable mystery, most disastrous reports were circulated as to the way in which the expected dividend was to be "cooked," and one paper dared to hint at the fact that at the meeting of one company, connected with the Crédit Mobilier, held some time before, the manager coolly announced that though he could only declare a dividend of 8 per cent, *the company was in a far better position* than the year before, when he gave 25. The writer ventured upon expressing his suspicion whether *any* dividend of this "and other" companies were not paid out of the capital rather than the profits realized. Hence the wrath of the *Moniteur*. The shares of the Crédit Mobilier, quoted from 957 to 960 frs. on Feb. 10, from 820 to 860 frs. on March 10, had fallen to from 715 to 720 frs. on April 10, and even this latter quotation was merely nominal. There was no means of concealing the ugly fact that Austrian and Prussian holders had resolved upon selling no fewer than 6,000 shares, and that the "Maritime Générale Compagnie," one of the fantastic creations of the Péreires, was *in articulo mortis*, from having engaged in speculations anything but "maritime." It is a fine notion, quite worthy of a political economist of the force of General Espinasse, to imagine that menaces in the *Moniteur* will enforce credit as well as silence. The warning will act, but quite in the opposite direction, the more so since it emanates from a Government whose financial frauds have become a topic of general conversation. It is known that the budget drawn up by M. Magne, the Minister of Finance, represented a surplus, but, by the indiscretion of some member of the *Cour de Révision*, it oozed out that it showed in fact a deficit of some 100,000,000 francs. When summoned to the "savior of property" for an explanation, M. Magne had the grave impudence to tell his master that knowing his predilections for a "surplus," he had "cooked up" a budget, as the Ministers of Louis Philippe had done before him. There the matter rested, but the notoriety given to this incident drove the Government into a confession. Having pompously announced in the *Moniteur*, that an augmentation had taken place in the customs receipts for the month of February, it dared not stand by its own statement. The

---

*a* At the point of death.—*Ed.*

*b* The *Economist*, No. 756, February 20, 1858, "Foreign Correspondence".—*Ed.*


*d* Napoleon 111.—*Ed.*

*e* "Paris, le 11 mars", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 71, March 12, 1858.—*Ed.*
monthly customs returns, published at the end of March, show the import duties in February last to be, even in the official version, but 13,614,251 francs, while they amounted, in the corresponding month of 1857, to 14,160,013 francs; and to be for the months of January and February united only 25,842,256 francs, against 28,044,478 for the same months of 1857. Such is the official meaning of "protecting the industry and the capital of the country against maneuvers," and of "enlightening the public," instead of "deceiving it."

The re-enactment of the coup d'état on an enlarged scale, the wholesale transportations, the parceling out of France into Praetorian camps, the rumors of war, the complications without and the conspiracies within—in one word, the convulsive spasms of the lesser Empire since the attempt of Jan. 14, have somewhat distracted the general attention from the financial state of France. Otherwise the public would have become aware that during that same epoch the factitious prosperity of the Bonapartist régime has already resolved itself into its elementary principles of peculation and jobbery. In proof of this proposition, I will content myself with enumerating such facts as have from time to time found their way into the European press. There is first M. Prost, the chief of the Compagnie Générale de Caisses d'Escompte, which not only engaged in all sorts of Bourse speculations, but took upon itself to establish banks of discount all over France. The capital was $6,000,000, in 60,000 shares. It had effected an amalgamation with the Portuguese Crédit Mobilié, and was magna pars of the Crédit Mobilié of Madrid. All the capital is gone, and the liabilities amount to about $3,000,000. M. Damonieu, of the Compagnie Parisienne des Equipages de grandes Remises, was condemned by the tribunal of police correctionelle for having swindled his shareholders out of $100,000 in cash and shares, having plunged them into debt to the amount of $400,000, and squandered all the capital, amounting to $1,600,000. The manager of another company—the Lignéenne—professing to make paper from wood, has also been condemned for embezzling the capital of $800,000. Two other Bonapartist "saviors of property" were convicted for having entered into an arrangement with some

---

\(^a\) "Direction générale des douanes et des contributions indirectes", Le Moniteur universel, No. 80, March 21, 1858.—Ed.

\(^b\) An important part.—Ed.

\(^c\) The Economist, No. 756, February 20, 1858, "Foreign Correspondence".—Ed.

\(^d\) Here and below The Economist, No. 760, March 20, 1858, "Foreign Correspondence".—Ed.
bankers to palm off on the public, for $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, some forests and mines far off on the banks of the Danube, which they had purchased for $200,000. In another case, it appeared that the managers of a mining company near Aix-la-Chapelle had sold to their shareholders for $500,000 mines which they were afterward obliged to admit were worth only $200,000. In consequence of these and other similar revelations, the shares of the Messageries Générales, once quoted at 1,510 francs, fell to about 500 francs. The shares of the Compagnie des Petites Voitures, shortly after their issue maneuvered up to 210 francs, have sunk to 40 francs. The shares of the Union Company have dwindled down from 500 to 65 francs. The shares in the Franco-American Navigation Company, once at 750 francs, may now be had at 30 francs. The Amalgamated Gas Company shares have receded from 1,120 francs to 720 francs. The shareholders of the Caisse des Actionnaires have been told by M. Millaud, their director, one of the mushroom millionaires of the lesser Empire, that

"the operations of the last half-year have produced no profits at all, so that it would not be possible to declare a dividend, nor even to pay the ordinary half-year's interest, but that he would pay this interest out of his own pocket."a

Thus the social ulcers of the lesser Empire are breaking up. The ridiculous conferences of Louis Bonaparte with the principal stock-jobbers as to the remedies to be applied to French commerce and industry have, of course, resulted in nothing. The Bank of France finds itself in a bad plight, since it is unable to sell the bonds of the railway companies, on the security of which it has been obliged to provide them with the money for carrying out their works. Nobody wants to buy these bonds at a moment when all railway property is rapidly depreciating in France, and the weekly railway returns exhibit a continuous falling off in receipts.

"With respect to the state of French trade," remarks the Paris correspondent of The London Economist, "it remains what it was; that is to say manifesting a tendency to improve, but not improving."b

Meanwhile, Bonaparte clings to his old way of sinking capital in unproductive works, but which, as Mr. Haussmann, the Prefect of

---

a M. Millaud's report to the shareholders of the Caisse des Actionnaires of February 10, 1858 was published in The Economist, No. 756, February 20, 1858, and also in the Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 45, February 14, 1858, supplement. Italics by Marx.—Ed.

b The Economist, No. 763, April 10, 1858, "Foreign Correspondence".—Ed.
the Seine, has the frankness to impart to the Paris people, are important in "a strategical point of view," and calculated to guard against "unforeseen events which may always arise to put society in danger." Thus Paris is condemned to erect new boulevards and streets, the cost of which is estimated at 180,000,000 francs, in order to protect it from its own ebullitions. The opening of the continuation of the boulevard of Sevastopol was quite in keeping with this "strategical point of view." Originally intended to be a purely civil and municipal ceremony, it was all of a sudden converted into a military demonstration, it being pretended that a fresh plot for the assassination of Bonaparte had been discovered. To explain away this *quid pro quo* the *Moniteur* says:

"It was quite right that a muster of troops should mark the inauguration of such an artery of the capital, and, after the Emperor, our soldiers were the first who ought to have trodden a soil bearing the name of so glorious a victory."a

Written on April 13, 1858

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5312, April 30, 1858

---

a "Paris, le 5 avril", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 95-96, April 5-6, 1858.—*Ed.*
The second critical period of the Indian insurrection has been brought to a close. The first found its center in Delhi, and was ended by the storming of that city; the second centered in Lucknow, and that place, too, has now fallen. Unless fresh insurrections break out in places hitherto quiet, the revolt must now gradually subside into its concluding, chronic period, during which the insurgents will finally take the character of dacoits or robbers, and find the inhabitants of the country as much their enemies as the British themselves.

The details of the storming of Lucknow are not yet received, but the preliminary operations and the outlines of the final engagements are known. Our readers recollect* that after the relief of the residency of Lucknow, Gen. Campbell blew up that post, but left Gen. Outram with about 5,000 men in the Alumbagh, an intrenched position a few miles from the city. He himself, with the remainder of his troops, marched back to Cawnpore, where Gen. Windham had been defeated by a body of rebels; these he completely beat, and drove them across the Jumna at Calpee. He then awaited at Cawnpore the arrival of re-enforcements and the heavy guns, arranged his plans of attack, gave orders for the concentration of the various columns destined to advance into Oude, and especially turned Cawnpore into an intrenched camp of strength and proportions requisite for the immediate and principal base of operations against Lucknow. When all this was completed, he had another task to perform before he thought it safe to move—a task the attempting of which

* See this volume, pp. 441-42.—Ed.
at once distinguishes him from almost all preceding Indian commanders. He would have no women loitering about the camp. He had had quite enough of the “heroines” at Lucknow, and on the march to Cawnpore; they had considered it quite natural that the movements of the army, as had always been the case in India, should be subordinate to their fancies and their comfort. No sooner had Campbell reached Cawnpore than he sent the whole interesting and troublesome community to Allahabad, out of his way; and immediately sent for the second batch of ladies, then at Agra. Not before they had reached Cawnpore, and not before he had seen them safely off to Allahabad, did he follow his advancing troops toward Lucknow.

The arrangements made for this campaign of Oude were on a scale hitherto unprecedented in India. In the greatest expedition ever undertaken by the British there, the invasion of Afghanistan, the troops employed never exceeded 20,000 at a time, and of these the great majority were natives. In this campaign of Oude, the number of Europeans alone exceeded that of all the troops sent into Afghanistan. The main army, led by Sir Colin Campbell personally, consisted of three divisions of infantry, one of cavalry, and one of artillery and engineers. The first division of infantry, under Outram, held the Alumbagh. It consisted of five European and one native regiment. The second (four European and one native regiment) and third (five European and one native regiment), the cavalry division under Sir Hope Grant (three European and four or five native regiments) and the mass of the artillery (forty-eight field-guns, siege trains and engineers), formed Campbell’s active force, with which he advanced on the road from Cawnpore. A brigade concentrated under Brigadier Franks at Juanpore and Azimghur, between the Goomtee and the Ganges, was to advance along the course of the former river to Lucknow. This brigade numbered three European regiments and two batteries, beside native troops, and was to form Campbell’s right wing. Including it, Campbell’s force in all amounted to—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Infantry</th>
<th>Cavalry</th>
<th>Artillery and Engrs.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europeans</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Here and below Engels used the material from The Times, Nos. 22954, 22959 and 22963, March 30, April 5 and 9, 1858.—Ed.*
or in all 30,000 men; to whom must be added the 10,000 Nepaulese Ghoorkas advancing under Jung Bahadoor from Goruckpore on Sultanpore, making the total of the invading army 40,000 men, almost all regular troops. But this is not all. On the south of Cawnpore, Sir H. Rose was advancing with a strong column from Saugor upon Calpee and the lower Jumna, there to intercept any fugitives that might escape between the two columns of Franks and Campbell. On the north-west, Brigadier Chamberlain crossed toward the end of February the upper Ganges, entering the Rohilkund, situated north-north-west of Oude, and, as was correctly anticipated, the chief point of retreat of the insurgent army. The garrisons of the towns surrounding Oude must also be included in the force directly or indirectly employed against that kingdom, so that the whole of this force is certainly from 70,000 to 80,000 combatants, of which, according to the official statements, at least 28,000 are British. In this is not included the mass of Sir John Lawrence's force, which occupies at Delhi a sort of flank position, and which consists of 5,500 Europeans at Meerut and Delhi, and some 20,000 or 30,000 natives of the Punjaub.

The concentration of this immense force is the result partly of Gen. Campbell's combinations, but partly also of the suppression of the revolt in various parts of Hindostan, in consequence of which the troops naturally concentrated toward the scene of action. No doubt Campbell would have ventured to act with a smaller force; but while he was waiting for this, fresh resources were thrown, by circumstances, on his hands; and he was not the man to refuse to avail himself of them, even against so contemptible an enemy as he knew he would meet at Lucknow. And it must not be forgotten that, imposing as these numbers look, they still were spread over a space as large as France; and that at the decisive point at Lucknow he could only appear with about 20,000 Europeans, 10,000 Hindoos, and 10,000 Ghoorkas—the value of the last, under native command, being at least doubtful. This force, in its European components alone, was certainly more than enough to insure a speedy victory, but still its strength was not out of proportion to its task; and very likely Campbell desired to show the Oudians, for once, a more formidable army of white faces than any people in India had ever seen before, as a sequel to an insurrection which had been based on the small number and wide dispersion of the Europeans over the country.

The force in Oude consisted of the remnants of most of the mutinous Bengal regiments and of native levies from the country.
itself. Of the former, there cannot have been more than 35,000 or 40,000 at the very outside. The sword, desertion and demoralization must have reduced this force, originally 80,000 strong, at least one half; and what was left was disorganized, disheartened, badly appointed, and totally unfit to take the field. The new levies are variously stated at from 100,000 to 150,000 men; but what their numbers may have been is unimportant. Their arms were but in part firearms, of inferior construction; most of them carried arms for close encounter only—the kind of fighting they were least likely to meet with. The greater part of this force was at Lucknow, engaging Sir J. Outram’s troops; but two columns were acting in the direction of Allahabad and Juanpore.

The concentric movement upon Lucknow began about the middle of February. From the 15th to the 26th the main army and its immense train (60,000 camp followers alone) marched from Cawnpore upon the capital of Oude, meeting with no resistance. The enemy, in the mean time, attacked Outram’s position, without a chance of success, on February 21 and 24. On the 19th Franks advanced upon Sultanpore, defeated both columns of the insurgents in one day, and pursued them as well as the want of cavalry permitted. The two defeated columns having united, he beat them again on the 23d, with the loss of 20 guns and all their camp and baggage. Gen. Hope Grant, commanding the advanced guard of the main army, had also, during its forced march, detached himself from it, and making a point to the left had, on the 23d and 24th, destroyed two forts on the road from Lucknow to Rohilcund.

On March 2 the main army was concentrated before the southern side of Lucknow. This side is protected by the canal, which had to be passed by Campbell in his previous attack on the city; behind this canal strong intrenchments had been thrown up. On the 3d, the British occupied the Dilkhoosha Park, with the storming of which the first attack also had commenced. On the 4th, Brig. Franks joined the main army, and now formed its right flank, his right supported by the River Goomtee. Meantime, batteries against the enemy’s intrenchments were erected, and two floating bridges were constructed, below the town, across the Goomtee; and as soon as these were ready, Sir J. Outram, with his division of infantry, 1,400 horse, and 30 guns, moved across to take position on the left or north-eastern bank. From here he could enfilade a great part of the enemy’s line along the canal, and many of the intrenched palaces to its rear; he also cut off the enemy’s communications with the whole north-eastern part of
Oude. He met with considerable resistance on the 6th and 7th, but drove the enemy before him. On the 8th, he was again attacked, but with no better success. In the meantime, the batteries on the right bank had opened their fire; Outram's batteries, along the river-bank, took the position of the insurgents in flank and rear; and on the 9th the 2d division, under Sir E. Lugard, stormed the Martiniere, which, as our readers may recollect, is a college and park situated on the south side of the canal, at its junction with the Goomtee, and opposite the Dilkhoosh. On the 10th, the Bank-House was breached and stormed, Outram advancing further up the river, and enfilading with his guns every successive position of the insurgents. On the 11th, two Highland regiments (42d and 93d) stormed the Queen's Palace, and Outram attacked and carried the stone-bridges leading from the left bank of the river into the town. He then passed his troops across and joined in the attack against the next building in front. On March 13, another fortified building, the Imambarrash, was attacked, a sap being resorted to in order to construct the batteries under shelter; and on the following day, the breach being completed, this building was stormed. The enemy, flying to the Kaiserbagh or King's Palace, was so hotly pursued that the British entered the place at the heels of the fugitives. A violent struggle ensued, but by 3 o'clock in the afternoon the palace was in the possession of the British. This seems to have brought matters to a crisis; at least, all spirit of resistance seems to have ceased, and Campbell at once took measures for the pursuit and interception of the fugitives. Brigadier Campbell, with one brigade of cavalry and some horse artillery, was sent to pursue them, while Grant took the other brigade round to Seetapore, on the road from Lucknow to Rohilcund, in order to intercept them. While thus the portion of the garrison which took to flight was provided for, the infantry and artillery advanced further into the city, to clear it from those who still held out. From the 15th to the 19th, the fighting must have been mainly in the narrow streets of the town, the line of palaces and parks along the river having been previously carried; but on the 19th, the whole of the town was in Campbell's possession. About 50,000 insurgents are said to have fled, partly to Rohilcund, partly toward the Doab and Bundelcund. In this latter direction they had a chance of escaping, as Gen. Rose, with his column, was still sixty miles at least from the Jumna, and was said to have 30,000 insurgents in front of him. In the direction of

---

a See this volume, p. 419.—Ed.
Rohilcund there was also a chance of their being able to concentrate again; Campbell would not be in a position to follow them very fast, while of the whereabouts of Chamberlain we know nothing, and the province is large enough to afford them shelter for a short time. The next feature of the insurrection, therefore, will most likely be the formation of two insurgent armies in Bundelcund and Rohilcund, the latter of which, however, may soon be destroyed by concentric marches of the Lucknow and Delhi armies.

The operations of Sir C. Campbell in this campaign, as far as we can now judge, were characterized by his usual prudence and vigor. The dispositions for his concentric march on Lucknow were excellent, and the arrangements for the attack appear to have taken advantage of every circumstance. The conduct of the insurgents, on the other hand, was as contemptible, if not more so, than before. The sight of the redcoats struck them everywhere with panic. Franks's column defeated twenty times its numbers, with scarcely a man lost; and though the telegrams talk of "stout resistance" and "hard fighting," as usual, the losses of the British appear, where they are mentioned, so ridiculously small that we fear there was no more heroism needed and no more laurels to be gathered this time at Lucknow than when the British got there before.

Written on April 15, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5312, April 30, 1858 as a leading article; reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1350, May 4, 1858

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune

---

a "The Siege of Lucknow", The Times, No. 22966, April 13, 1858.— Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 419-24 and 435-42.— Ed.
Mr. Disraeli's speech on the Budget in the Commons, on April 19, \(^a\) fills about ten columns of *The London Times*, but, at all events, it is pleasant to read, perhaps rather more so than the *Young Duke* of the same author. As to lucidity of analysis, simplicity of composition, skillful arrangement and easy handling of details, it stands in happy contrast with the cumbersome and circumlocutory lucubrations of his Palmerstonian predecessor. \(^b\) Neither does it contain or pretend to any striking novelty. Mr. Disraeli found himself in the happy position of a Minister of Finance who has to deal with a deficit not of his own making, but bequeathed by a rival. His part was that of the doctor, not of the patient. On the one hand, then, he had to meet a deficit; on the other, all serious restriction of expenditure was put out of the question by the ventures England had embarked in under the auspices of Lord Palmerston. Mr. Disraeli roundly told the House that, if they wanted a policy of invasion and aggression, they must pay for it, and that their loud cry for economy was a mere mockery, blended, as it was, with an unscrupulous readiness for expenditure. According to his statement, the charges devolving upon the financial year 1858-59 would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge on the funded debt</td>
<td>£28,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent charge on the consolidated fund</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army estimates</td>
<td>11,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge for the navy, including packet service</td>
<td>9,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) *The Times*, No. 22972, April 20, 1858.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) G. C. Lewis.— *Ed.*
Revenue department .................. 4,700,000
Exchequer bonds to be liquidated in May, '58 .... 2,000,000
War sinking fund .................. 1,500,000

Total charge .................. £67,110,000

The revenue of the year 1858-59 was estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>£23,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duty</td>
<td>7,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; assessed taxes</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Office</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and income tax</td>
<td>6,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown lands</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total revenue .................. £63,020,000

A comparison between the estimated expenditure and the estimated income shows, despite the rather sanguine views taken by Mr. Disraeli of the eventual produce of the customs, the excise and the post-office, a clear deficit of £4,000,000. How was it to be met? The Palmerstonians had chuckled at the mere idea that Mr. Disraeli would be forced to suspend the decline in the next year of the income tax from 7d. to 5d. in the pound, a proposition which, when made by Sir Cornewall Lewis, he and Mr. Gladstone had distinguished themselves by opposing. Then the cry of factious opposition would have been raised, and the unpopularity of the tax turned to good account. In one word, the income tax was the rock which it was confidently predicted the Derby state ship must split upon. Mr. Disraeli, however, was too old a fox to be ensnared in such a trap. He told the House, on the contrary, that John Bull, during the last five years, had “behaved” like a good boy in financial matters; had borne the public burdens with great spirit, and should, therefore, under his present distressed circumstances, not be grieved by a tax he had always felt a peculiar aversion to, especially since, by the arrangement of the year 1853, resolved upon by an immense majority of the House, the good boy had been promised the progressive diminution of the tax, and its final extinction at the end of a certain number of years. Mr. Disraeli's own prescriptions for meeting the deficit, and securing even a small margin of surplus income, amount to this: Postpone the liquidation of two millions of Exchequer bonds to a later period; do not pay the £1,300,000 for the war sinking fund until there is a bona fide surplus to be sunk in it; equalize the
English and Irish duties on spirits, by raising the latter from 6s. 10d. to 8s. per gallon, which equalization would give an increase of £500,000 to the Exchequer; and, lastly, put a penny stamp on bankers' checks, which would produce to the revenue a surplus of £300,000.

Now as to the trifling new taxes imposed by Mr. Disraeli, no serious objection can be raised against them. Though the representatives of Paddy felt it, of course, their duty to protest, any check put upon the spirit consumption in Ireland must be considered a curative measure. In proposing it, the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not withstand the temptation of poking some fun at his Irish friends. "In the most cordial spirit" he asked "the high-spirited Irishmen" to concur in the proposition for taxing "Irish spirit," and mingle their "spirits" with those of Englishmen and Scotchmen, &c. The penny stamp on bankers' checks was fiercely attacked by Mr. Glyn, the representative of the London banking and stock-jobbing interest. That unfortunate penny, he felt sure, would prevent the monetary circulation of the country from performing its duties; but, whatever terror Mr. Glyn might feel or feign to feel at the audacity of imposing a trifling duty on bankers and stock-jobbers, his feelings are not likely to find an echo among the mass of the British people.

The serious feature of Mr. Disraeli's budget is the stopping of the operation of the artificial sinking fund, that great financial sham reintroduced by Sir Cornwall Lewis, on occasion of the debts contracted during the Russian war. The genuine British sinking fund is one of those monster delusions which obscure the mental faculties of a whole generation, and the gist of which the following one is hardly able to understand. It was first in the year 1771, that Dr. Richard Price, in his observations on reversionary payments, revealed to the world the mysteries of compound interest and the sinking fund.

"Money," he said, "bearing compound interest, increases at first slowly; but, the rate of increase being continually accelerated, it becomes in some time so rapid as to mock all the powers of imagination. One penny, put out at our Savior's birth at five per cent interest, would, before this time, have increased to a greater sum than would be contained in 150 millions of earths, all solid gold. But, if put out at simple interest, it would in the same time have amounted to no more than 7s. 4½d. Our Government has hitherto chosen to improve money in the last rather
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a G. G. Glyn's speech in the House of Commons on April 19, 1858, The Times, No. 22972, April 20, 1858.—Ed.

b The Crimean war of 1853-56.—Ed.
than the first of these ways. A State need never be under any difficulties; for, with the smallest savings, it may, in as little time as its interest can require, pay off the largest debts. On this plan, it is of little importance what interest the State is obliged to give for money; for the higher the interest the sooner will such a fund pay off the principal."

Consequently he proposed,

"an annual saving, to be applied invariably, together with the interest of all the sums redeemed by it, to the purpose of discharging the public debt; or, in other words, the establishment of a sinking fund."c

This fantastic scheme, rather less ingenious than the financial plan of the fool in one of Cervantes' novels, who proposed to the whole Spanish people to abstain for only two weeks from eating and drinking, in order to get the means of discharging the public debt, nevertheless caught the imagination of Pitt. It was avowedly on this basis that he built up his sinking fund in 1786, allotting a fixed sum of 5,000,000 sterling, to be paid every year "without fail," for this purpose. The system was not abandoned until 1825, when the Commons passed a resolution that only the bona fide surplus revenue of the country was to be applied in payment of the national debt. The whole system of public credit had been thrown into confusion by this curious sort of sinking fund. Between what was borrowed from necessity, and what was borrowed from amusement; between loans that were to increase the debt, and loans that were to pay it off, there arose a tumultuous medley. Interest and compound interest, debt and redemption, danced before men's eyes in such perpetual succession; there was such a phantasmas-soria of consols and bonds, of debentures and exchequer bills, of capital without interest and interest without capital, that the strongest understanding became bewildered. Dr. Price's principle was that the State should borrow money at simple interest in order to improve it at compound interest. In fact, the United Kingdom contracted a debt of 1,000 millions sterling, for which it nominally received about 600 millions, 390 millions of this sum being, however, destined not for the payment of the debt, but to keep up the sinking fund. This glorious institution, which marks the golden era of stock-jobbers and speculators, the Palmerstonian Chancellor of the Exchequer
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a R. Price, An Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the National Debt, pp. 18 and 19.—Ed.
b R. Price, Observations on Reversionary Payments..., pp. XIV and 140.—Ed.
c Ibid., p. 139.—Ed.
d M. de Cervantes Saavedra, Novelas exemplares.—Ed.
had attempted to saddle again on the shoulders of John Bull. Mr. Disraeli has given it the *coup de grâce*.

Written on April 20, 1858

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5318, May 7, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper
Karl Marx

THE ENGLISH ALLIANCE

Paris, April 22, 1858

The Anglo-French alliance has taken a new turn since Dr. Bernard’s acquittal and the public enthusiasm that cheered it. In the first instance, being shrewd enough to understand that the “heart of England” spoke not “in the starched compliments with which the municipality of Dover overwhelmed the frank nature of the Duke of Malakoff”, but rather “in the infamous huzzas raised by the people in the Court of Old Bailey,” the Univers proclaimed England not only a “den of assassins,” but a people of assassins, juries and judges included. The original proposition of the colonels is thus affirmed on a broader basis. At the heels of the Univers, in steps the Constitutionnel with an article appearing at the head of its columns, and signed by M. Renée, the son-in-law of Mr. Macquard, who in his turn is the known amanuensis, confidant, and factotum of Bonaparte. If the Univers had taken up the colonels’ definition of the English people, while enlarging its meaning, the Constitutionnel repeats their menaces, only that it tries to back the exasperation of the barracks by the alleged indignation of the “towns and rural districts.” Affecting that tone of wounded moral sensibility so peculiar to the meretricious literature of the second Empire, it exclaims:

“We will not dwell at any length on such an acquittal, which throws an unheard-of scandal on public morality; for what man of honor in France or England could entertain a doubt of Bernard’s guilt? We will only inform those of
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a “Trial and acquittal of Simon Bernard...”, The Times, No. 22971, April 19, 1858.— Ed.
b The Times, No. 22973, April 21, 1858, “France”.— Ed.
c Am. Renée, “L’acquittement de Bernard a causé...”, Le Constitutionnel, No. 111, April 21, 1858.— Ed.
our neighbors who desire the maintenance of good relations between the two countries, that if, by misfortune, the address pronounced by Bernard's counsel—that address which was allowed to teem with calumny and insult against the Emperor, against the nation which elected him, against the army, and against our institutions—was circulated in the towns, barracks, and rural districts of France" (a curious position this, of the barracks, between the towns and rural districts!) "it would be difficult for Government, with the best intention, to stay the consequences of public indignation."

So far so good. On the mere chance whether or not Mr. James’s speech, a advertised by the Constitutionnel itself, b be or be not circulated in France, it will then depend whether or not France shall rush upon England. But after this quasi-declaration of war, there follows, a day later, a curious and startling winding-up in the Patrie. The French invasion is to be averted, but only by a new turn to be given to the Anglo-French alliance. Bernard’s acquittal has revealed the rising power of anarchy in British society. Lord Derby is to save society in England in the same way as Bonaparte has saved it in France. Such is the upshot of the alliance, and such is its conditio sine qua non. c The Earl of Derby, it is added, is a "man of immense talent, and of almost royal alliances," and consequently the man to save society in England! d The English daily papers cling to the weakness, tergiversation, and infirmity of purpose, betrayed in this alternation of rage, menace and sophism. The Paris correspondent of The Daily News imagines himself to have solved the riddle of these dissolving views exhibited in the Univers, the Constitutionnel, and the Patrie, by dwelling upon the well-known fact that Bonaparte has a double set of advisers—the drunken revelers of the evening, and the sober counselors of the morning. He smells in the articles of the Univers and the Constitutionnel the fumes of Chateau Maryaux and cigars, and in the article of the Patrie the showers of the cold water bath. But the same double set acted during Bonaparte’s duel with the French Republic. The one, after January, 1849, threatened, in its little evening journals, with a coup d’état, while the other, in the heavy columns of the Moniteur, gave them the lie direct. Still it was not in the “starched” articles of the Moniteur, but in the drunken “huzzas” of the Pouvoir, that the shadow of coming events was traced. We are, however, far from believing that Bonaparte is
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a E. James' speech at the court hearing of S. Bernard’s case on April 16, 1858, The Times, No. 22970, April 17, 1858.—Ed.
b "Affaire Simon Bernard.—Complicité dans l'attentat du 14 janvier", Le Constitutionnel, No. 108, April 18, 1858.—Ed.
c Indispensable condition.—Ed.
d The Times, No. 22975, April 23, 1858, "France".—Ed.
possessed of the means of successfully crossing the "broad ditch.""

The comical lucubrations in that line, which *The N. Y. Herald* had taken upon itself to publish, are sure to raise a smile on the lips even of mere tyros in military science. But we are decidedly of opinion that Bonaparte, a civilian, it ought never to be forgotten, at the head of a military Government, has, in the *Patrie*, put the last and the only possible interpretation on the Anglo-French alliance which will satisfy his "colonels." He finds himself in a situation at once the most grotesque and the most dangerous. To impose upon foreign Governments, he must clap on the sword. To soothe the sword-bearers, and prevent them from taking his rhodomontades in real good earnest, he must recur to such impossible *fictiones juris* as that the Anglo-French alliance means the saving of society in England in the approved Bonapartist fashion. Of course, facts must clash with his doctrines, and the upshot, if his reign is not, as we are inclined to think, cut short by a revolution, will be that his fortune is engulfed, as it has been raised, in mad-brain adventures in some *expédition de Boulogne* on an enlarged scale. The Emperor will subside into the adventurer, as the adventurer has been converted into the Emperor.

In the mean time, while the *Patrie* has spoken the last word Bonaparte can utter as to the meaning of the Anglo-French alliance, it is worth the while to direct attention to the manner in which this alliance is now spoken of among the governing classes of England. In this respect an article of *The London Economist*, entitled "*The French Alliance, its character, its value and its price,*" claims peculiar notice. It is written with studied pedantry, such as fits the position of an ex-Secretary of the Treasury under Palmerston's Administration, and an expounder of the economical views of English capitalists. Mr. Wilson sets out with the thesis that "the thing gained may not be exactly the thing bargained for."

"Scarcely," he says, "any estimate of the value of a real alliance between France and England can be too high;" but then there exist different sorts of alliances, real ones and artificial ones, genuine alliances and alliances of a hot-house growth, "natural" ones and "governmental" ones, "governmental" alliances and "personal" alliances. In the first place, *The Economist* gives full swing to his "imagination;" and it may be remarked with respect to *The Economist*, what has been said with respect to lawyers, that
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*a* The Channel.—*Ed.*

*b* Here and below *The Economist*, No. 763, April 10, 1858.—*Ed.*
the more prosaic the man the more tricks imagination is able to play with him. He can scarcely trust his

"imagination to dwell on the influence which a real alliance between the two great peoples which stand at the head of modern civilization would exercise on the destinies of Europe and the fortune and felicity of all other lands."

Still he is forced to admit that, although he hopes and believes the two nations to be "ripening" for a genuine alliance, they "are not ripe for it yet." If, then, England and France are not yet ripe for a genuine, national alliance, the question will naturally arise, of what sort is the present Anglo-French alliance?

"Our alliance of late," confesses the ex-member of the Palmerston Administration and the oracle of English capitalists, "has been to a great extent, we admit, unavoidably with the Government rather than with the nation—with the Emperor rather than the Empire—with Louis Bonaparte rather than with France; and further, in the value we have set upon the alliance and the price we have paid for it, we have somewhat lost sight of this material and weighty fact."

Bonaparte, of course, is the chosen of the French nation, and all that bosh, but, unfortunately,

"he represents only the numerical and not the intellectual majority of the French people. By mischance, it so happens that the classes which stand aloof from him comprise precisely those parties whose opinions on nearly all the great questions of civilization, are analogous to our own."

Having thus in most cautious and civil language, and in circumlocutory sentences which we will not discomfort the reader with, laid down the axiom that the present so-called Anglo-French alliance is rather governmental than national, The Economist goes the length of confessing that it is more personal even than purely governmental.

"Louis Napoleon," he says, "has hinted more plainly than became the head of a great nation that he was our especial friend in France—that he, rather than his people, desired and sustained the English alliance; and it may be that we have acquiesced in this view of the matter more readily and fully than was perfectly prudent and sincere."^a

Take it all in all, the Anglo-French alliance is a spurious, adulterated article—an alliance with Louis Bonaparte, but not an alliance with France. The question, therefore, naturally arises, whether that spurious article was worth the price paid for it? Here The Economist beats his own bosom and cries, in the name of the English governing classes, Pater, peccavi!^b In the first place,
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^a Here and below The Economist, No. 764, April 17, 1858.—Ed.
^b "Father, I have sinned", Luke 15:18.—Ed.
England is a constitutional country, while Bonaparte is an autocrat.

"We owed to ourselves that our frank and loyal courtesy toward the de facto sovereign of France should be allowed to ripen and to warm into cordial and affectionate admiration only as far and as fast as his policy turned out such as we could honestly and righteously approve."

Instead of applying thus a sliding scale to their Bonapartism, the English people, a constitutional people,

"have lavished on an Emperor who had destroyed the constitutional liberties of his subjects, attentions such as were never before bestowed on a constitutional king who had granted and respected them. And when he was angry and irritated, we have stooped to soothe him by language of fulsome adulation which sounded marvelous from English lips. Our proceedings and our language have alienated all those sections of the French people in whose eyes Louis Napoleon is either a usurper or a military despot. It has especially irritated and disgusted the Parliamentary party in France, whether Republican or Orleanist."

*The Economist* discovers at last that this prostration before a lucky usurper was far from prudent.

"It is impossible," he says, "to believe that the existing régime in France can be the permanent one under which that energetic and restless nation will consent to live.... Is it wise, therefore, so to ally ourselves with a *passing phase of government* in *France* as to excite the enmity of its future and more permanent development?"

Moreover, the English alliance was more necessary to Bonaparte than his alliance to England. In 1852, he was an adventurer—a successful one, but still an adventurer.

"He was not recognized in Europe; it was questionable whether he would be recognized. But England promptly and unhesitatingly accepted him; acknowledged his title deeds at once; admitted him to the circle of royal exclusiveness, and gave him thus currency among the courts of Europe." "Nay, more, by the exchange of visits and cordial coalitions, our Court allowed acquaintanceship to ripen into intimacy.... Those enterprising moneyed and commercial classes, by whom it was especially important to him to be supported, saw at once how vast was the strength he gained by the closeness and cordiality of the alliance with England."

That alliance was necessary for him, and he "would have bought it at almost *any price*." Did the English Government prove their commercial acumen and wonted sharpness in fixing that price? They asked no price at all; they insisted upon no condition whatever; but, like Oriental satraps, crawled in the dust while handing to him the gift of the alliance. No infamy on his part was colossal enough to make them halt for one moment in their race "of thriftless generosity," as *The Economist* calls it—of reckless flunkeyism, as we should call it.
"It would be hard to prove," confesses the English sinner, "that of all his various measures for discountenancing Protestantism, for repressing thought, for destroying municipal action, for reducing Senates and Chambers to a mockery, we have manifested our dissatisfaction with a single one by even so much as a passing coolness or a casual frown." "Whatever he has done, whomsoever he has proscribed, how many journals he has seized or repressed, whatever the flimsy prettexts on which he has dismissed honorable and eminent professors from their posts—our language has still been the same; he has still been this great man, this wise and sagacious statesman, this eminent and firm ruler."

Not only have the English thus fostered, supported and promoted his abominable domestic policy, but, as The Economist avows, allowed him to hamper, modify, emasculate and degrade their foreign policy.

"To continue longer in such a false position," concludes The Economist, "may redound neither to our honor nor to our profit, nor to the benefit of the commonwealth of nations."

Compare this declaration with that of the Patrie, and there can remain no doubt that the Anglo-French alliance is gone, and with it the only international prop of the second Empire.

Written on April 22, 1858
Reproduced from the newspaper First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5319, May 8, 1858
London, April 30, 1858

There have been recently issued on the part of the British Government several statistical papers—the Board of Trade returns for the first quarter of 1858,¹ a comparative statement of Pauperism for January, 1857 and 1858,² and lastly, the half-yearly reports of the Inspectors of Factories. The Board of Trade returns, as was to be expected, show a considerable falling off in exports as well as imports during the first three months of 1858, if compared with the same quarter of the previous year. The total declared value of all articles exported, which during the latter period amounted to £28,827,493, had fallen for the first three months of this year to £23,510,290, so that the aggregate decrease in British exports may be rated at about 19 per cent. The table of the values of the principal articles of import, given only up to the end of February, shows a decline, as compared with the first two months of 1857, from £14,694,806 to £10,117,920, the downward movement in imports being thus more marked still than that in exports. The comparative state of the export trade from the United Kingdom to the United States during the first three months of 1857 and 1858 may be ascertained from the following extract:

¹ "Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation for the Three Months Ended March 31", "The Board of Trade Returns", The Economist, No. 765, April 24, 1858.—Ed.
² Presumably a reference to Monthly Comparative Return of Paupers relieved in each month in each year [1857, 1858].—Ed.
Exports from the United Kingdom to the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1857 Quantities</th>
<th>1858 Quantities</th>
<th>Declared Val. 1857</th>
<th>Declared Val. 1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer and Ale (bbls.)</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>£40,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal and Culm (tuns)</td>
<td>19,972</td>
<td>44,299</td>
<td>11,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottons (yards)</td>
<td>61,198,140</td>
<td>35,371,558</td>
<td>1,128,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardw's &amp; Cutlery (cwt.)</td>
<td>44,096</td>
<td>14,623</td>
<td>301,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linens (yards)</td>
<td>18,373,022</td>
<td>8,757,750</td>
<td>527,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Pig (tuns)</td>
<td>10,172</td>
<td>6,569</td>
<td>39,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Bar (tuns)</td>
<td>70,877</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>610,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Cast (tuns)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>4,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought of all sorts</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>151,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel, unwrought</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>128,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (cwt.)</td>
<td>11,075</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>69,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (tuns)</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Seed (gals.)</td>
<td>400,200</td>
<td>42,790</td>
<td>62,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt (tuns)</td>
<td>66,022</td>
<td>35,205</td>
<td>33,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk manufactures (lb)</td>
<td>66,973</td>
<td>22,920</td>
<td>82,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens, Cloth (pieces)</td>
<td>106,519</td>
<td>30,624</td>
<td>351,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens, mixed stuffs (ps)</td>
<td>9,030,643</td>
<td>6,368,551</td>
<td>401,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsted stuffs (pieces)</td>
<td>212,763</td>
<td>80,601</td>
<td>249,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware &amp; Porcel'n</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>155,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashery &amp; Millin'y</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>614,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Plates</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>273,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With some trifling exceptions, this list exhibits a general and heavy falling off; but what strikes us is that in most instances the decline in the value of exports hardly keeps pace with the diminution in their quantity. The United States proves in this respect a far better market than other countries whence the Britishers for an increased quantity fetched in return a smaller value. Thus, for instance, of wool there were exported to Holland, in 1858, 277,342 lbs. against 254,593 lbs. in 1857; but the former realized but a value of £24,949, while the latter had brought £25,563; and for 1,505,621 lbs. exported to France in 1858, as against 1,445,322 lbs. exported in 1857, the value returned amounts but to £103,235, while for the smaller export of 1857 it reached the sum of £108,412. Moreover, if we compare the
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a Here and below "Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation...", III.—Exports of the Principal and Other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures...—Ed.
returns for the whole of the first quarter of 1858 with those for the month of March, a tendency to recovery in the British export trade to the United States will be discovered. Thus, in worsted stuffs the falling off between March, 1857, and March, 1858, is only from £66,617 to £54,376, while on the whole quarter it is from £249,013 to £106,913. The only country, however, which forms an exception to the general rule, and shows a considerably increased instead of diminished absorption of British manufactures, is India, as will appear from the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>Declared Val.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer and ale, bbls</td>
<td>24,817</td>
<td>51,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, yards</td>
<td>120,092,475</td>
<td>151,463,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardw's &amp; Cut'ry, cwt</td>
<td>10,642</td>
<td>16,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton yarn, yards</td>
<td>5,145,044</td>
<td>10,609,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron bar, tuns</td>
<td>20,674</td>
<td>26,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop'r sh'ts &amp; rails, cwt</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>29,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens, cloth</td>
<td>12,123</td>
<td>19,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthware &amp; porcel'n</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberd'y &amp; millinery</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam engines</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in the British exports to India may, for some items, woolens for instance, be accounted for by the war demand. Generally, however, the rationale of that ascending movement is not to be sought in that direction. The case is simply this, that the insurrection for some months had shut up the Indian market altogether, thus causing the commodities floating in the market to be absorbed and creating a vacuum now again filled up. With respect to Australia, the returns show also considerable increase in some articles of British export, but the letters received from Sidney and Melbourne leave no doubt as to the merely speculative character of those shipments which, instead of selling at their declared value, will have to be disposed of at a heavy discount.

The comparative statement of Paupers in England and Wales, who received official relief in the fifth week of January, 1857 and 1858, shows their number, from 920,608, to which it amounted in the former period, to have increased to 976,773 in the latter one, thus exhibiting an aggregate increase of 6.10 per cent. For the North Midland, North-Western and York divisions, however, that is, for the industrial districts, the increase in the percentage of paupers rose respectively by 20.52, 44.87, and 23.13 per cent. Besides, it must be kept in view that a very considerable portion of
the working classes stubbornly prefer starvation to enrollment in the workhouses. The following extract from the official returns is curious, because it proves how small a percentage even in England the strictly manufacturing population bears to the aggregate people:

**Industrial Statistics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>No. of persons aged 20 years and upward</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts, Trade and Domestic Service</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Manufacturing and Mineral Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Metropolis</td>
<td>1,394,963</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South-Eastern</td>
<td>887,134</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South Midland</td>
<td>660,775</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eastern</td>
<td>603,720</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. South-Western</td>
<td>978,025</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. West Midland</td>
<td>1,160,387</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. North Midland</td>
<td>654,679</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North-Western</td>
<td>1,351,830</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. York</td>
<td>961,945</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Northern</td>
<td>521,460</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Welsh</td>
<td>641,680</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>9,816,597</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reports of the Inspectors of Factories, extending only to the end of October, 1857, are deprived of their usual interest, because, as the Inspectors unanimously state, the closing of mills, the working of short time, the numerous bankruptcies among mill-owners, and the general depression of trade, which set in at the very time when they drew up their returns, prevented them from collecting that reliable information, which on former occasions allowed them to prepare a statement of the number of new factories, of factories that had added to their motive power, and of those which had ceased to work. The industrial statistics, therefore, illustrating the effects of the crisis, must be looked for in their next reports. The only new feature exhibited in the present publication is limited to some revelations as to the treatment of children and young persons in printing works. It was not until 1845 that the British Legislature extended their interference from textile fabrics to print-works. The Print-Works
act follows the provisions of the Factory acts in all those details relating to powers of inspectors, the mode of their dealing with offenders, and the various difficulties which might arise in the administration of the law, which are to be found in the Factory acts. It provides, in the same manner as in factories, for the registration of the persons employed: for the examination by certifying surgeons of the younger hands prior to their permanent employment; and for insuring regularity in the observance of the times of beginning and ending daily labor by a public clock. It adopts also the nomenclature of the Factory acts in the division of the hands into classes, but differs widely from those acts in the definition of what persons shall constitute each class, and, consequently, in the amount of protection afforded by the restrictions upon labor.

The three classes under the Factory acts are: 1. Males over 18 years of age, whose labor is unrestricted; 2. Males between 13 and 18 years of age, and females above 13 years of age, whose labor is restricted; 3. Children between 8 and 13 years of age, whose labor is restricted, and who are required to attend school daily.

The corresponding classes in print-works are: 1. Males above 13 years of age, whose labor is unrestricted; 2. Females above 13 years of age, whose hours of labor are restricted; 3. Children of both sexes, between the ages of 8 and 13, whose labor is restricted, and who are required to attend school periodically. The Print-Works act differs essentially from the Factory acts, in containing no provisions of any kind for either of the following purposes: For setting apart times for meals; for the Saturday holiday; for the cessation from work on Christmas day and Good Friday; for periodical half-holidays; for the secure fencing of dangerous machinery; for the reporting of accidents, and compensation of injured persons; for the periodical lime-washing of the premises.

The hours of labor in factories are now assimilated to the ordinary hours of work of mechanics and general laborers, i.e., from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., with intervals of one hour and a half for meals. The hours of labor in print-works may practically be considered to be unrestricted, notwithstanding the existence of statutory limitation. The only restriction upon labor is contained in §22 of the Print-Works act (8 and 9 Vict., 29), which enacts that no child between the ages of 8 and 13 years, and no female, shall be

---

employed during the night, which is defined to be between 10 p. m. and 6 a. m. of the following morning. Children, therefore, of the age of 8 years, may be and are lawfully employed in a labor analogous in many respects to factory labor, mostly in rooms in which the temperature is oppressive, continuously and without any cessation from work for rest or refreshment, from 6 a. m. till 10 p. m.; and a boy, having attained the age of 13, may, and is often, lawfully employed day and night for any number of hours, without any restriction whatever. The school attendance of children employed in print-works is thus provided for: Every child, before being employed in a print-work, must have attended school for at least thirty days and not less than one hundred any fifty hours during the six months immediately preceding such first day of employment, and during the continuance of its employment in the print-work must attend for a like period of thirty days and one hundred and fifty hours during every successive period of six months. The attendance at school must be between 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. No attendance of less than two hours and a half nor more than five hours, on any one day, shall be reckoned as part of the one hundred and fifty hours. The philanthropy of the master-printers shines peculiarly in the method of executing these regulations. Sometimes a child would attend school for the number of hours required by law at one period of the day, sometimes at another period, but never regularly; for instance, the attendance on one day might be from 8 a. m. to 11 a. m., on another day from 1 p. m. to 4 p. m., and the child might not appear at school again for several days, when it would attend perhaps from 3 p. m. to 6 p. m.; then it might attend for three or four days consecutively or for a week; then it would not appear in school for three weeks or a month after that, upon some odd days at some odd hours when the employer chose to spare it. Thus the child is as it were buffeted from school to work, and from work to school, until the tale of one hundred and fifty hours is told.

Written on April 30, 1858
First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5329, May 20, 1858
Reproduced from the newspaper
At last we are in possession of detailed accounts of the attack and fall of Lucknow. The principal sources of information, in a military point of view, the dispatches of Sir Colin Campbell, have not yet, indeed, been published; but the correspondence of the British press, and especially the letters of Mr. Russell in The London Times, the chief portions of which have been laid before our readers, are quite sufficient to give a general insight into the proceedings of the attacking party.

The conclusions we drew from the telegraphic news, as to the ignorance and cowardice displayed in the defense, are more than confirmed by the detailed accounts. The works erected by the Hindoos, formidable in appearance, were in reality of no greater consequence than the fiery dragons and grimacing faces painted by Chinese "braves" on their shields or on the walls of their cities. Every single work exhibited an apparently impregnable front, nothing but loopholed and embrasured walls and parapets, difficulties of access of every possible description, cannon and small-arms bristling everywhere. But the flanks and rear of every position were completely neglected, a mutual support of the various works was never thought of, and even the ground between the works, as well as in front of them, had never been cleared, so that both front and flank attacks could be prepared without the knowledge of the defense, and could approach under perfect shelter to within a few yards from the parapet. It was just such a
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a Here and below [W. H. Russell,] "The Fall of Lucknow", The Times, No. 22986, May 6, 1858.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 435-37, 506-09.—Ed.
conglomerate of intrenchments as might be expected from a body of private sappers deprived of their officers, and serving in an army where ignorance and indiscipline reigned supreme. The intrenchments of Lucknow are but a translation of the whole method of Sepoy warfare into baked clay walls and earthen parapets. The mechanical portion of European tactics had been partially impressed upon their minds; they knew the manual and platoon drill well enough; they could also build a battery and loophole a wall; but how to combine the movements of companies and battalions in the defense of a position, or how to combine batteries and loopholed houses and walls, so as to form an intrenched camp capable of resistance—of this they were utterly ignorant. Thus, they weakened the solid masonry walls of their palaces by over-loopholing them, heaped tier upon tier of loopholes and embrasures, placed parapeted batteries on their roofs, and all this to no purpose whatever, because it could all be turned in the easiest possible manner. In the same way, knowing their tactical inferiority, they tried to make up for it by cramming every post as full of men as possible, to no other purpose than to give terrible effect to the British artillery and to render impossible all orderly and systematic defense as soon as the attacking columns fell upon this motley host from an unexpected direction. And when the British, by some accidental circumstance, were compelled to attack even the formidable front of the works, their construction was so faulty that they could be approached, breached and stormed almost without any risk. At the Imambarrah this was the case. Within a few yards from the building stood a pucka (sun-baked clay) wall. Up to this the British made a short sap (proof enough that the embrasures and loopholes on the higher part of the building had no plunging fire upon the ground immediately in front), and used this very wall as a breaching battery, prepared for them by the Hindoos themselves! They brought up two 68-pounders (naval guns) behind this wall. The lightest 68-pounder in the British service weighs 87 cwt., without the carriage; but supposing even that an 8-inch gun for hollow shot only is alluded to, the lightest gun of that class weighs 50 cwt., and with the carriage at least three tuns. That such guns could be brought up at all in such proximity to a palace several stories high, with a battery on the roof, shows a contempt of commanding positions and an ignorance of military engineering which no private sapper in any civilized army could be capable of.

Thus much for the science against which the British had to contend. As to courage and obstinacy, they were equally absent
Details of the Attack on Lucknow

from the defense. From the Martinière to the Mousabagh, on the part of the natives, there was but one grand and unanimous act of bolting, as soon as a column advanced to the attack. There is nothing in the whole series of engagements that can compare even with the massacre (for fight it can scarcely be called) in the Secunderbagh during Campbell's relief of the Residency. No sooner do the attacking parties advance, than there is a general helter-skelter to the rear, and where there are but a few narrow exits so as to bring the crowded rabble to a stop, they fall pell-mell, and without any resistance, under the volleys and bayonets of the advancing British. The "British bayonet" has done more execution in any one of these onslallows on panic-stricken natives than in all the wars of the English in Europe and America put together. In the East, such bayonet-battles, where one party is active and the other abjectly passive, are a regular occurrence in warfare; the Burmese stockades in every case furnished an example. According to Mr. Russell's account, the chief loss suffered by the British was caused by Hindoos cut off from retreat, and barricaded in the rooms of the palaces, whence they fired from the windows upon the officers in the court-yards and gardens.

In storming the Imambarra and the Kaiserbagh, the bolting of the Hindoos was so rapid, that the place was not taken, but simply marched into. The interesting scene, however, was now only commencing; for, as Mr. Russell blandly observes, the conquest of the Kaiserbagh on that day was so unexpected that there was no time to guard against indiscriminate plunder. A merry scene it must have been for a true, liberty-loving John Bull to see his British grenadiers helping themselves freely to the jewels, costly arms, clothes, and all the toggery of his Majesty of Oude. The Sikhs, Ghoorkas and camp-followers were quite ready to imitate the example, and a scene of plunder and destruction followed which evidently surpassed even the descriptive talent of Mr. Russell. Every fresh step in advance was accompanied with plunder and devastation. The Kaiserbagh had fallen on the 14th; and half an hour after, discipline was at an end, and the officers had lost all command over their men. On the 17th, Gen. Campbell was obliged to establish patrols to check plundering, and to remain in inactivity "until the present license ceases." The troops were evidently completely out of hand. On the 18th, we hear that there is a cessation of the grosser sort of plunder, but devastation is still going on freely. In the city, however, while the vanguard were fighting against the natives' fire from the houses, the rearguard
plundered and destroyed to their hearts' content. In the evening, there is another proclamation against plundering; strong parties of every regiment to go out and fetch in their own men, and to keep their camp-followers at home; nobody to leave the camp except on duty. On the 20th, a recapitulation of the same orders. On the same day, two British “officers and gentlemen”, Lieuts. Cape and Thackwell, “went into the city looting, and were murdered in a house;” and on the 26th, matters were still so bad that the most stringent orders were issued for the suppression of plunder and outrage; hourly roll-calls were instituted; all soldiers strictly forbidden to enter the city; camp-followers, if found armed in the city, to be hanged; soldiers not to wear arms except on duty, and all non-combatants to be disarmed. To give due weight to these orders, a number of triangles for flogging were erected “at proper places.”

This is indeed a pretty state of things in a civilized army in the nineteenth century; and if any other troops in the world had committed one-tenth of these excesses, how would the indignant British press brand them with infamy! But these are the deeds of the British army, and therefore we are told that such things are but the normal consequences of war. British officers and gentlemen are perfectly welcome to appropriate to themselves any silver spoons, jeweled bracelets, and other little memorials they may find about the scene of their glory; and if Campbell is compelled to disarm his own army in the midst of war, in order to stop wholesale robbery and violence, there may have been military reasons for the step; but surely nobody will begrudge these poor fellows a week's holiday and a little frolic after so many fatigues and privations.

The fact is, there is no army in Europe or America with so much brutality as the British. Plundering, violence, massacre—things that everywhere else are strictly and completely banished—are a time-honored privilege, a vested right of the British soldier. The infamies committed for days together, after the storming of Badajos and San Sebastian, in the Peninsular war, are without a parallel in the annals of any other nation since the beginning of the French Revolution; and the medieval usage, proscribed everywhere else, of giving up to plunder a town taken by assault, is still the rule with the British. At Delhi imperious military considerations enforced an exception; but the army, though bought off by extra pay, grumbled, and now at Lucknow they have made up for what they missed at Delhi. For twelve days and nights there was no British army at Lucknow—nothing but a
lawless, drunken, brutal rabble, dissolved into bands of robbers, far more lawless, violent and greedy than the Sepoys who had just been driven out of the place. The sack of Lucknow in 1858 will remain an everlasting disgrace to the British military service.

If the reckless soldiery, in their civilizing and humanizing progress through India, could rob the natives of their personal property only, the British Government steps in immediately afterward and strips them of their real estate as well. Talk of the first French Revolution confiscating the lands of the nobles and the church! Talk of Louis Napoleon confiscating the property of the Orleans family! Here comes Lord Canning, a British nobleman, mild in language, manners and feelings, and confiscates, by order of his superior, Viscount Palmerston, the lands of a whole people, every rood, perch and acre, over an extent of ten thousand square miles. A very nice bit of loot indeed for John Bull! And no sooner had Lord Ellenborough, in the name of the new Government, disapproved of this hitherto unexampled measure,a than up rise The Times and a host of minor British papers to defend this wholesale robbery, and break a lance for the right of John Bull to confiscate everything he likes. But then, John is an exceptional being, and what is virtue in him, according to The Times, would be infamy in others.b

Meanwhile—thanks to the complete dissolution of the British army for the purpose of plunder—the insurgents escaped, unpursued, into the open country. They concentrate in Rohilcund, while a portion carry on petty warfare in Oude, and other fugitives have taken the direction of Bundelcund. At the same time, the hot weather and the rains are fast approaching; and it is not to be expected that the season will be so uncommonly favorable to European constitutions as last year. Then, the mass of the European troops were more or less acclimated; this year, most of them are newly arrived. There is no doubt that a campaign in June, July and August will cost the British an immense number of lives, and what with the garrisons that have to be left in every conquered city, the active army will melt down very rapidly. Already are we informed that re-enforcements of 1,000 men per month will scarcely keep up the army at its effective strength; and as to garrisons, Lucknow alone requires at least 8,000 men, over one-third of Campbell's army. The force organizing for the

a E. L. Ellenborough's speech in the House of Lords on May 7, 1858, The Times, No. 22988, May 8, 1858.—Ed.
b “On Monday it will be exactly a twelvemonth since...”, The Times, same issue.—Ed.
campaign of Rohilcund will scarcely be stronger than this garrison of Lucknow. We are also informed that among the British officers the opinion is gaining ground that the guerrilla warfare which is sure to succeed the dispersion of the larger bodies of insurgents, will be far more harassing and destructive of life to the British than the present war with its battles and sieges. And, lastly, the Sikhs are beginning to talk in a way which bodes no good to the English. They feel that without their assistance the British would scarcely have been able to hold India, and that, had they joined the insurrection, Hindostan would certainly have been lost to England, at least for a time. They say this loudly, and exaggerate it in their Eastern way. To them the English no longer appear as that superior race which beat them at Moodka, Ferozepore and Aliwal. From such a conviction to open hostility there is but a step with Eastern nations; a spark may kindle the blaze.

Altogether, the taking of Lucknow has no more put down the Indian insurrection than the taking of Delhi. This Summer's campaign may produce such events that the British will have, next Winter, to go substantially over the same ground again, and perhaps even to reconquer the Punjaub. But in the best of cases, a long and harassing guerrilla warfare is before them—not an enviable thing for Europeans under an Indian sun.

Written on May 8, 1858


Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*
About eighteen months ago, at Canton, the British Government propounded the novel doctrine in the law of nations that a State may commit hostilities on a large scale against a Province of another State, without either declaring war or establishing a state of war against that other State. Now the same British Government, in the person of the Governor-General of India, Lord Canning, has made another forward move in its task of upsetting the existing law of nations. It has proclaimed that

"the proprietary right in the soil of the Province of Oude is confiscated to the British Government, which will dispose of that right in such manner as it may seem fitting."  

When, after the fall of Warsaw in 1831, the Russian Emperor confiscated "the proprietary right in the soil" hitherto held by numerous Polish nobles, there was one unanimous outburst of indignation in the British press and Parliament. When, after the battle of Novara, the Austrian Government did not confiscate, but merely sequestered, the estates of such Lombard noblemen as had taken an active part in the war of independence, that unanimous outburst of British indignation was repeated. And when, after the 2d December, 1851, Louis Napoleon confiscated the estates of the Orleans family, which, by the common law of France, ought to have been united to the public domain on the accession of Louis Philippe, but which had escaped that fate by a
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a Here and below Ch. J. Canning, "Proclamation", *The Times*, No. 22986, May 6, 1858.—*Ed.*
b Nicholas I.—*Ed.*
legal quibble, then British indignation knew no bounds, and _The London Times_ declared that by this act the very foundations of social order were upset, and that civil society could no longer exist. All this honest indignation has now been practically illustrated. England, by one stroke of the pen, has confiscated not only the estates of a few noblemen, or of a royal family, but the whole length and breadth of a kingdom nearly as large as Ireland, "the inheritance of a whole people," as Lord Ellenborough himself terms it.

But let us hear what pretexts—grounds we cannot call them—Lord Canning, in the name of the British Government, sets forth for this unheard-of proceeding: First, "The army is in possession of Lucknow." Second, "The resistance, begun by a mutinous soldiery, has found support from the inhabitants of the city and of the province at large." Third, "They have been guilty of a great crime, and have subjected themselves to a just retribution." In plain English: Because the British army have got hold of Lucknow, the Government has the right to confiscate all the land in Oude which they have not yet got hold of. Because the native soldiers in British pay have mutinied, the natives of Oude, who were subjected to British rule by force, have not the right to rise for their national independence. In short, the people of Oude have rebelled against the legitimate authority of the British Government, and the British Government now distinctly declares that rebellion is a sufficient ground for confiscation. Leaving, therefore, out of the question all the circumlocution of Lord Canning, the whole question turns upon the point that he assumes the British rule in Oude to have been legitimately established.

Now, British rule in Oude was established in the following manner: When, in 1856, Lord Dalhousie thought the moment for action had arrived, he concentrated an army at Cawnpore which, the King of Oude was told, was to serve as a corps of observation against Nepaul. This army suddenly invaded the country, took possession of Lucknow, and took the King prisoner. He was urged to cede the country to the British, but in vain. He was then carried off to Calcutta, and the country was annexed to the territories of the East India Company. This treacherous invasion was based
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a "If Louis Napoleon had proceeded to exercise with judgment...", _The Times_, No. 21021, January 26, 1852.— _Ed._

b E. L. Ellenborough's speech in the House of Lords on May 7, 1858, _The Times_, No. 22988, May 8, 1858.— _Ed._

c Wajid Ali Shah.— _Ed._
upon article 6 of the treaty of 1801, concluded by Lord Wellesley. This treaty was the natural consequence of that concluded in 1798 by Sir John Shore. According to the usual policy followed by the Anglo-Indian Government in their intercourse with native princes, this first treaty of 1798 was a treaty of offensive and defensive alliance on both sides. It secured to the East India Company a yearly subsidy of 76 lacs of rupees ($3,800,000); but by articles 12 and 13 the King was obliged to reduce the taxation of the country. As a matter of course, these two conditions, in open contradiction to each other, could not be fulfilled by the King at the same time. This result, looked for by the East India Company, gave rise to fresh complications, resulting in the treaty of 1801, by which a cession of territory had to make up for the alleged infractions of the former treaty; a cession of territory which, by the way, was at the time denounced in Parliament as a downright robbery, and would have brought Lord Wellesley before a Committee of Inquiry, but for the political influence then held by his family.

In consideration of this cession of territory, the East India Company, by article 3, undertook to defend the King's remaining territories against all foreign and domestic enemies; and by article 6 guaranteed the possession of these territories to him and his heirs and successors forever. But this same article 6 contained also a pit-fall for the King, viz: The King engaged that he would establish such a system of administration, to be carried into effect by his own officers, as should be conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and be calculated to secure the lives and property of the inhabitants. Now, supposing the King of Oude had broken this treaty; had not, by his government, secured the lives and property of the inhabitants (say by blowing them from the cannon's mouth, and confiscating the whole of their lands), what remedy remained to the East India Company? The King was, by the treaty, acknowledged as an independent sovereign, a free agent, one of the contracting parties. The East India Company, on declaring the treaty broken and thereby annulled, could have but two modes of action: either by negotiation, backed by pressure, they might have come to a new arrangement, or else they might have declared war against the King. But to invade his territory without declaration of
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[a] "Treaty between the Honorable East India Company and His Excellency the Nabob Vizier-ul-Momalik..., 10th November 1801".— Ed.
[b] "Treaty with the Nabob Vizier Saadet Ali Khan Behauder, 21st February 1798".— Ed.
[c] Lac = 100,000.— Ed.
war, to take him prisoner unawares, dethrone him and annex his territory, was an infraction not only of the treaty, but of every principle of the law of nations.

That the annexation of Oude was not a sudden resolution of the British Government is proved by a curious fact. No sooner was Lord Palmerston, in 1831, Foreign Secretary, than he sent an order to the then Governor-General\(^a\) to annex Oude. The subordinate at that time declined to carry out the suggestion. The affair, however, came to the knowledge of the King of Oude,\(^b\) who availed himself of some pretext to send an embassy to London. In spite of all obstacles, the embassy succeeded in acquainting William IV., who was ignorant of the whole proceeding, with the danger which had menaced their country. The result was a violent scene between William IV. and Palmerston, ending in a strict injunction to the latter never to repeat such \emph{coup d'etat} on pain of instant dismissal. It is important to recollect that the actual annexation of Oude and the confiscation of all the landed property of the country took place when Palmerston was again in power. The papers relating to this first attempt at annexing Oude, in 1831, were moved for, a few weeks ago, in the House of Commons, when Mr. Baillie, Secretary of the Board of Control, declared that these papers had disappeared.\(^c\)

Again, in 1837, when Palmerston, for the second time, was Foreign Secretary, and Lord Auckland Governor-General of India, the King of Oude\(^d\) was compelled to make a fresh treaty with the East India Company.\(^e\) This treaty takes up article 6 of the one of 1801, because “it provides no remedy for the obligation contained in it” (to govern the country well); and it expressly provides, therefore, by article 7,

\begin{quote}
"that the King of Oude shall immediately take into consideration, in concert with the British Resident, the best means of remedying the defects in the police, and in the judicial and revenue administrations of his dominions; and that if his Majesty should neglect to attend to the advice and counsel of the British Government, and if gross and systematic oppression,archy and misrule should prevail within the Oude dominions, such as seriously to endanger the public tranquillity, the British Government reserves to itself the right of appointing its
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[a] W. C. Bentinck.—\textit{Ed.}
\item[b] Nazir-ed-Din.—\textit{Ed.}
\item[c] H. J. Baillie's speech in the House of Commons on March 16, 1858, \textit{The Times}, No. 22943, March 17, 1858.—\textit{Ed.}
\item[d] Mohammud Ali Shah.—\textit{Ed.}
\item[e] “Treaty between the Honorable East India Company and His Majesty ... Mohammud Ali Shah..., 11th September 1837”.—\textit{Ed.}
\end{footnotes}
own officers to the management of whatsoever portions of the Oude territory, either to a small or great extent, in which such misrule shall have occurred, for so long a period as it may deem necessary; the surplus receipts in such case, after defraying all charges, to be paid into the King’s Treasury, and a true and faithful account rendered to his Majesty of the receipts and expenditure.”

By article 8, the treaty further provides:

“That in case the Governor-General of India in Council should be compelled to resort to the exercise of the authority vested in him by article 7, he will endeavor so far as possible to maintain, with such improvements as they may admit of, the native institutions and forms of administration within the assumed territories, so as to facilitate the restoration of these territories to the Sovereign of Oude, when the proper period for such restoration shall arrive.”

This treaty professes to be concluded between the Governor-General of British India in Council, on one hand, and the King of Oude on the other. It was, as such, duly ratified, by both parties, and the ratifications were duly exchanged. But when it was submitted to the Board of Directors of the East India Company, it was annulled (April 10, 1838) as an infraction of the friendly relations between the Company and the King of Oude, and an encroachment, on the part of the Governor-General, on the rights of that potentate. Palmerston had not asked the Company’s leave to conclude the treaty, and he took no notice of their annulling resolution. Nor was the King of Oude informed that the treaty had ever been canceled. This is proved by Lord Dalhousie himself (minute Jan. 5, 1856):

“It is very probable that the King, in the course of the discussions which will take place with the Resident, may refer to the treaty negotiated with his predecessor in 1837; the Resident is aware that the treaty was not continued in force, having been annulled by the Court of Directors as soon as it was received in England. The Resident is further aware that, although the King of Oude was informed at the time that certain aggravating provisions of the treaty of 1837, respecting an increased military force, would not be carried into effect, the entire abrogation of it was never communicated to his Majesty. The effect of this reserve and want of full communication is felt to be embarrassing to-day. It is the more embarrassing that the canceled instrument was still included in a volume of treaties which was published in 1845, by the authority of Government.”

In the same minute, sec. 17, it is said:

“If the King should allude to the treaty of 1837, and should ask why, if further measures are necessary in relation to the administration of Oude, the large powers which are given to the British Government by the said treaty should not now be put in force, his Majesty must be informed that the treaty has had no existence since it was communicated to the Court of Directors, by whom it was wholly annulled. His Majesty will be reminded that the Court of Lucknow was informed at
the time that certain articles of the treaty of 1837, by which the payment of an additional military force was imposed upon the King, were to be set aside. It must be presumed that it was not thought necessary at that time to make any communication to his Majesty regarding those articles of the treaty which were not of immediate operation, and that the subsequent communication was inadvertently neglected."

But not only was this treaty inserted in the official collection of 1845, it was also officially adverted to as a subsisting treaty in Lord Auckland’s notification to the King of Oude, dated July 8, 1839; in Lord Hardinge’s (then Governor-General) remonstrance to the same King, of November 23, 1847, and in Col. Sleeman’s (Resident at Lucknow) communication to Lord Dalhousie himself, of the 10th December, 1851. Now, why was Lord Dalhousie so eager to deny the validity of a treaty which all his predecessors, and even his own agents, had acknowledged to be in force in their communications with the King of Oude? Solely because, by this treaty, whatever pretext the King might give for interference, that interference was limited to an assumption of government by British officers in the name of the King of Oude, who was to receive the surplus revenue. That was the very opposite of what was wanted. Nothing short of annexation would do. This denying the validity of treaties which had formed the acknowledged base of intercourse for twenty years; this seizing violently upon independent territories in open infraction even of the acknowledged treaties; this final confiscation of every acre of land in the whole country; all these treacherous and brutal modes of proceeding of the British toward the natives of India are now beginning to avenge themselves, not only in India, but in England.

Written on May 14, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5336, May 28, 1858 as a leading article; reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1358, June 1, 1858, under the title “Confiscation in Oude”
Karl Marx

A CURIOUS PIECE OF HISTORY

Manchester (Eng.), May 18, 1858

A very short time after the close of the last Russian war the public was informed that a certain Mohammed Bey, Colonel in the Turkish army, alias M. Bangya, ex-Colonel of the Hungarian army, had left Constantinople for Circassia along with a number of Polish volunteers. On his arrival, he at once became a sort of chief of the staff to Sefer Pasha, the Circassian chief. Those who knew the antecedents of this Hungarian liberator of Circassia could have no doubt that he had gone to that country for one purpose only: to sell it to Russia. The man had been, openly and unmistakably, proved to have been, in London and Paris, a spy in the pay both of the French and the Prussian police. Accordingly, about a month ago, the European papers contained the news that Bangya-Mohammed Bey had actually been detected in treasonable correspondence with the Russian General, Philipson, and that a Court-martial, held upon him, had sentenced him to death. Bangya, however, a short time after, appeared all at once in Constantinople, and, with his usual impudence, declared all these stories about treachery, courts-martial, &c., to be pure inventions of his enemies, and tried to pass himself off as the victim of an intrigue.

We happen to be in possession of the most important documents relating to this curious incident of the Circassian war, and shall now give some extracts from them. These papers were brought to Constantinople by Sub-Lieutenant Franz Stock of the Polish battalion in Circassia, and one of the members of the

---

a The Crimean war of 1853-56.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 236-37.—Ed.
Court-martial which convicted Bangya. The public may then judge for themselves.\textsuperscript{a}

\textit{Extracts from the Minutes of the Council of War held at Aderbi, Circassia, on Mohammed Bey, alias J. Bangya of Illosfalva.}

[No. 1]—Sitting of January 9, 1858.—Deposition of Mustapha, native of the Province of Natkouatz.

"... When the Colonel, Mohammed Bey, came to Shepsohour, he asked me to forward a letter to the Commander of the Cossack of the Black Sea, General Philipson. On my observing that I could not do so without informing Sefer Pasha, or without his permission, Mohammed Bey informed me that as Envoy and Lieutenant of the Padishah and Military Commandant in Circassia he had the right to exchange letters with the Russians, that Sefer Pasha was acquainted with the subject, and that his object was to mislead the Russians.\textsuperscript{b} When Sefer Pasha and the National Assembly forwarded to me the manifesto of Circassia, addressed to the Czar,\textsuperscript{b} Mohammed Bey gave me also a letter for Gen. Philipson. I did not find Gen. Philipson at Anapa, and I delivered the letter to the Major commanding at Anapa. The Major promised to forward the manifesto, but would not accept the letter, which was without address or signature. I brought back the letter, but feeling suspicious of the frequent correspondence of Mohammed Bey, and fearing myself to get compromised, I communicated the whole affair to the authorities...."

[No. 2.]—Deposition of Achmet Effendi, formerly Turkish Secretary to Mohammed Bey.

"... Mohammed Bey was very irate against Tefik Bey (Col. Lapinski) and spoke very ill of him, adding that he would block his path very long. The second night after our arrival at Aderbi ... it was early dawn when I was roused by Mohammed Bey's groom. Mohammed Bey himself told me that a great noise of guns was heard in the direction of Ghelendjeek. He was up and seemed uneasy.... The report that Col. Lapinski had been captured with all his party arrived at Aderbi, I know not how, even before the roar of the guns had ceased. I heard Mohammed Bey talk of it. When later news came that neither the Colonel nor his men had been made prisoners, Mohammed Bey said, very angrily, "That probably he had sold his guns to the Russians.'"

[No. 3.]—Deposition of the Officers and Soldiers of the Polish Detachment stationed at Aderbi.

"One day before Ghelendjeek was surprised, Mohammed Bey came to the camp and said he had received letters from Constantinople, informing him that it was entirely Col. Lapinski's fault if they got no assistance anywhere.... He caused spirits to be distributed to the soldiers, and made them all sorts of promises if they would

\textsuperscript{a} Here and below Marx used the material from \textit{The Free Press}, No. 16, May 12, 1858, pp. 121-25.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} Alexander II.—Ed.
abandon their Colonel and follow him.... When afterward the news (of the supposed capture of Lapinski) turned out false, Mohammed Bey came in person to the camp and harangued the detachment to induce them to refuse obedience to the Colonel. But when the Colonel came back, he pretended to know nothing about the matter, and abandoned several individuals who had attached themselves to him, and allowed them to be punished without interfering in their favor. Later, during the absence of the Colonel, Mohammed Bey endeavored to lead the troops into rebellion by the means of several Hungarians. The Hungarians drew up an act of accusation against the Colonel and endeavored to get the men to sign. With the exception of three men, who admit that they were seduced to sign, all the others declared on their oath that their signatures had been forged. This forgery was the easier since in the detachment only a few soldiers knew how to write."

[No. 4.]—Confession of Bangya before the Court-Martial. a

"Tired of so long interrogatory, I present to the Commission this confession, written by my hand and signed by me. I hope that my judges, to whom I spare by so doing a long and difficult task, will be the more disposed to remember that with my fate is tied up also the fate of my innocent family.* Formerly my name was John Bangya of Illosfalva; my name now is Mohammed Bey; my age is forty; my religion was the Roman Catholic, but in 1853 I embraced Islamism.... My political action ... was dictated by the ancient chief of my country, Louis Kossuth.... Provided with letters of introduction from my political chief, I came to Constantinople on the 22d of December, 1853.... I entered the Turkish army with the rank of Colonel. At this time I was frequently receiving from Kossuth letters and instructions concerning the interest of my country. At the same epoch Kossuth addressed to the Ottoman Government a missive, in which he warmly recommends the Turks to beware of the French, English or Austrian alliance, and advised them to link themselves rather with the revolutionary Italians and Hungarians.... My instructions recommended me to get attached in some way or other to the troops destined to act on the Circassian shores.... Arrived in Circassia, I contented myself for a time with studying the state of affairs in the country, and communicating my observations to my political friends.... I tried to attach myself to Sefer Pasha.... My instructions recommended me to prevent any offensive steps on the part of the Circassians, and to oppose all foreign influence in the country. A very short time previous to my departure from Constantinople Col. Türr, who receives his instructions from the same quarters as myself, and with whom I have been for years in political relation, received orders to join the Greek insurrection. Gen. Stein (Ferhad Pasha), who also belongs to our party, was directed to proceed to Anatolia. As for the plan of getting attached to Sefer Pasha, it succeeded, and very soon I gained his entire confidence. His confidence once acquired, it was easy for me to follow and execute my instructions.... I persuaded Sefer Pasha that after the war

* By this he alludes to the Bangya family No. 3. He has one wife living in Hungary and another in Paris, beside the Islamic family he has in Constantinople. [This footnote is missing in The Free Press. It is not established whether it belongs to Marx or the NYDT editors.—Ed.]

a Marx also used "Extract from the Minutes of the Council of War, held at Aderbi" and especially "Confession of Bangya" in his Herr Vogt (see present edition, Vol. 17).—Ed.
Circassia would be restored to the Sultan's rule.... To the Turkish commanders I represented that all offensive measures with their troops would be dangerous, since the Circassians ... would desert them in the hour of danger. The circumstances were favorable for me, and although the Russians had sent their troops to the theater of war, and left unprotected their frontiers, they had not to suffer from any serious incursions of the Circassians. I forwarded regular reports of my secret action to my political chiefs.... At the same time I found on my way men and circumstances just contrary to my plans. I allude to the arrival at Anapa of Mr. Longworth, British Consul. Mr. Longworth's instructions ordered him to induce Sefer Pasha to organize 6,000 Circassians at the expense of Great Britain and to dispatch them to the Crimea.... I received similar orders from the Turkish authorities, but at the same time my secret chiefs sent me the most positive order to do all in my power to annihilate the mission of the Consul.... In a conversation which I had with Mr. Longworth ... I asked for a post in the British army with the rank of Colonel, or for the capital sum of £10,000.... Mr. Longworth thought to gain me by an offer of 50,000 piasters.... My intrigue succeeded. Prince Sefer, so often deceived by vain promises, became suspicious and roundly refused to the Consul what he wanted of his people.... At this time I made an enemy in the person of Prince Ibrahim Karabatir, the son of Sefer Pasha, who had been named to command the 6,000 Circassians....

"The 21st of March, 1856, Sefer Pasha informed me that it had been decided in the General Assembly to send a deputation to the Turkish, French and British Governments to ask these Powers to reincorporate Circassia with Turkey. I induced Sefer Pasha to send me with this deputation.... On my arrival in Constantinople ... I addressed to my political friends and to Kossuth a detailed account of the state of Circassia.... I received in reply instructions ordering me to communicate with Col. Türr and Gen. Stein, and to conduct the affairs in common with them, and to engage in it as many Hungarians as possible. At the same time I entered into communication with Ismail Pasha, Postmaster of the Ottoman Empire, a Circassian by birth, who appeared to me patriotic and able to make sacrifices for his country. I consulted with him on the manner in which it might be possible for us to send into Circassia arms, ammunition, tools for artificers, good officers and artisans. But the real plan of the expedition was arranged between Gen. Stein, Col. Türr and myself. Capt. Franchini, military secretary to the Russian Minister, was present at several of our conferences. The object was to gain over Circassia to Russian interests in a peaceable, slow, but certain manner...." When once Circassia should have submitted to the direction of Gen. Stein and myself, our plan would be:

"I. To persuade the Circassians that they are not to expect any assistance either from the Sultan or from any other Power;

"II. To de-moralize the mountaineers by dint of defeats on the field of battle—defeats studied and prepared beforehand;

"IV. To bring them to recognize the Czar as their nominal sovereign without paying any tribute, but admitting garrisons into the country.... The Hungarians imported into Circassia would be placed about the Prince; the more capable would be intrusted with the important posts.... Capt. Franchini assured me that Russia required nothing more than apparent submission; ... the marks of Imperial favor, money and Russian orders would do the rest...."

"The 22d of September, 1856, Ismail Pasha recommended me to engage for Circassia several hundred Poles who were barracked in Scutari, and who had

a Italics by Marx.—Ed.
formed part of the legion under Zamoyski.... This proposal did not agree with our plans, but it was difficult to reject it.... I had formerly known M. Lapinski, who had served with distinction in Hungary.... He was living at Scutari.... We agreed with Gen. Stein that the best plan would be to engage Col. Lapinski, who had absolute confidence in me.... On Sept. 24 I notified in writing to Col. Lapinski that he was called upon by the Circassian patriots to form a Polish corps in Circassia. The Colonel, in reply, demanded arms and equipments for 700 Poles.... We afterward consulted together—Gen. Stein, Türr, Franchini and myself—a—and it was decided that Türr should proceed to England to purchase tools and machines for making cartridges, but that he would delay sending any arms. We wanted to be sure of the Poles before we gave them any arms.... The serious remonstrances of Col. Lapinski ... obliged me to hurry the departure, although I had not the means of taking with me the Hungarian officers I had engaged.... In the month of January, 1857, I received letters and instructions from Kossuth and from my other political friends. My plan was approved.... A short time before my departure an apparent coolness was simulated between me and Gen. Stein. I still wanted to delay my departure to render possible that of a few Hungarians with me, but Capt. Franchini declared that there was not a day to be lost, because the expedition had become the talk of all Constantinople, and if the Russian Embassy did not interfere it might be accused of complicity. On the 15th of February Col. Lapinski embarked on board the English steamer Kangaroo. I embarked also.... On my arrival at Dob (Kabardinsky of the Russians) I addressed letters to Sefer Pasha, to the Naib, and to the other chiefs of the tribes; and in those letters I announced myself as sent by his Imperial Majesty the Sultan to command the military forces of Circassia.... The conduct of Col. Lapinski was not very reassuring for me.... A few weeks after the arrival of the Polish detachment at Shepshoour (Fort Tenginsk of the Russians), the residence of Sefer Pasha, Mr. Römer arrived at Dob with the brig laden with arms and ammunition which we had left in the Bosphorus.... The irruption of the Russians by Attakum, in the month of May, brought together thousands of Circassian warriors from all parts of the country. For the first time the Circassians saw artillery of their own attacking with advantage the Russian artillery. This engagement, of little consequence in itself, gave importance to the Polish detachment and to me.... I took advantage of this disposition of the people to act my part; I presented myself in public as the Envoy of the Sultan; I exacted obedience.... I afterward learned that Col. Lapinski was working with all his might to upset my plans.... I endeavored to gain partisans among the officers and men of his detachment, and the situation of the corps being precarious, I attributed this to the fault of their commander.... The capture by a Russian vessel of a few sandals, in the ports of Sudjak and Gheledjek, gave me an occasion to remove the Colonel to a distance from the seat of war, near Attakum, and to isolate him completely.... A few days later I received from Col. Lapinski a letter, by which he announced that there were no troops at Gheledjek, and that his position was not tenable.... I went myself to Gheledjek, and on the spot Col. Lapinski represented to me the danger of his position and the imminence of an attack from the Russians. Nine days afterward his prediction was realized....

"The agitation which I kept up among the officers and soldiers at Aderbi, during and after the catastrophe at Gheledjek, was simply the consequence of the resolution which I had taken to sow discord between the detachment and Col.  

\[\text{\footnotesize a Italics by Marx.—Ed.}\]  
\[\text{\footnotesize b Mohammed-Amin.—Ed.}\]  
\[\text{\footnotesize c Abdul Mejid.—Ed.}\]
Lapinski.... Through emissaries I was circulating among the Circassians reports that he had sold the guns to the Russians.... I allowed myself to be taken in by the simulated sincerity of the Colonel, who was observing me with greater vigilance than ever....

"In conformity with my instructions I was to form relations with the Russian General." ... My anonymous letter, which is actually in the hands of the Commission, was to be the introduction to a regular correspondence, but by the stupidity of the Russian commander it has fallen into your hands....

"All of a sudden Col. Lapinski threw off the mask, and abruptly declared to me at Sefer Pasha's that he did not recognize me either as his superior or as military commandant in Circassia, broke off all intercourse with me, ... addressed also a general order in this sense to the Polish detachment. I tried to depose him by another order of the day addressed to the soldiers, but my efforts were vain....

"(Signed.)
Mohammed Bey."

[No. 5.]—Letter of John Bangya to General Philipson.

"Would it not be in the interest of Russia to pacify Circassia? It might be possible to conquer the plains of Circassia momentarily by dint of enormous sacrifices, but the mountains and natural fastnesses will never be conquered. The Russian guns have lost their influence. The Circassian artillery will reply to the Russian with satisfactory results. The Circassians are not what they were five years ago; supported by a small regular force, they fight as well as the Russian troops, and for their religion and their country they will fight to the last man. Would it not be better to allow the Circassians a sort of mock liberty? to place Circassia under a national prince, and take this prince under the protection of the Russian Czar? In a word, to make of Circassia another Georgia, or something of the kind? Once Circassia intimately allied to Russia, the roads of Anatolia and of India are open to the Russians. Sapienti sat." It might be possible to open negotiations on this basis. Reflect and answer."

[No. 6.]—Sentence, January 20, 1858.

"After the reading of the confession of Col. Mohammed Bey, read at the sittings of the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 11th of January; after having heard the depositions of the witnesses at the sitting of the 9th of January, the Court-Martial declares, at the sitting of this day, Mohammed Bey, by his confession and by the depositions of the witnesses, convicted of treachery to the country, and secret correspondence with the enemy; declares him infamous, deprived of his rank in this country, and condemns him to death—unanimously.

"Signed: Jacob Beckert, soldier; Philipp Terteltaub, bombardier; Mathias Bedneizek, sergeant; Otto Linowski, gunner; Franz Stock, sub-lieutenant; Anton Krystewitz, sub-lieutenant; Michael Marecki, lieutenant; Leon Zgowski, gunner; Stanislas Tanckowski, lance-corporal; John Hamaniski, sergeant;"
To the above documents we have merely to add that Sefer Pasha was loth to have the sentence of death executed upon a man who held the rank of Colonel in the Sultan's army, and that he consequently had him escorted to Trebizond. The Hungarians in Constantinople declared Mohammed Bey's treachery to be a pure calumny, but the Polish officers at once protested against this assertion and threatened an eventual publication of the documents relating to this affair. We now publish them, in extract, as they form by far the most interesting contribution to the history of the Circassian war.

With regard to the conduct of the Russian Embassy during this affair, we may add the following facts: It was generally known in Constantinople that the Kangaroo was chartered to take troops and stores to Circassia. The Russian Embassy, however, did not drop one word with respect to that expedition to the Porte; but the very day the Kangaroo got clear of the Bosphorus, the Russian Ambassador addressed a protest to the Porte, and caused an inquiry to be made to discover the promoters of the expedition. They strained every nerve to implicate Count Zamoyski, who was at Constantinople at the time; but they signally failed in this. Then, on the ostensible demand of Russia, Gen. Stein and Ismail Pasha were sent into exile for having been mixed up with the affair. After a banishment of some months, on the occasion of a festal day in the Russian Imperial family, at the request again of the Russian Embassy, Gen. Stein and Ismail Pasha were allowed to return to Constantinople.

Critical remarks on the documents were written on May 18, 1858

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5352, June 16, 1858; reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1363, June 18, 1858

A. P. Butenev.— Ed.
Lord Canning's proclamation in relation to Oude, a some
important documents in reference to which we published on
Saturday, b has revived the discussion as to the land tenures of
India—a subject upon which there have been great disputes and
differences of opinion in times past, and misapprehensions in
reference to which have led, so it is alleged, to very serious
practical mistakes in the administration of those parts of India
directly under British rule.552 The great point in this controversy
is, what is the exact position which the zemindars, talookdars or
sirdars, so called,553 hold in the economical system of India? Are
they properly to be considered as landed proprietors or as mere
tax-gatherers?

It is agreed that in India, as in most Asiatic countries, the
ultimate property in the soil rests [with] the Government; but
while one party to this controversy insists that the Government is
to be looked upon as a soil proprietor, letting out the land on
shares to the cultivators, the other side maintain that in substance
the land in India is just as much private property as in any other
country whatever—this alleged property in the Government being
nothing more than the derivation of title from the sovereign
theoretically acknowledged in all countries, the codes of which are
based on the feudal law and substantially acknowledged in all
countries whatever in the power of the Government to levy taxes

a The Times, No. 22986, May 6, 1858.—Ed.
b The words “some important documents ... on Saturday” belong to the NYDT editors who refer to “The Oude Proclamation. The Correspondence between the Governor-General and the Commissioner of Oude” published in the newspaper, No. 5343, June 5, 1858.—Ed.
on the land to the extent of the needs of the Government, quite independent of all considerations, except as mere matter of policy, of the convenience of the owners.

Admitting, however, that the lands of India are private property, held by as good and strong a private title as land elsewhere, who shall be regarded as the real owners? There are two parties for whom this claim has been set up. One of these parties is the class known as zemindars and talookdars, who have been considered to occupy a position similar to that of the landed nobility and gentry of Europe; to be, indeed, the real owners of the land, subject to a certain assessment due to the Government, and, as owners, to have the right of displacing at pleasure the actual cultivators, who, in this view of the case, are regarded as standing in the position of mere tenants at will, liable to any payment in the way of rent which the zemindars may see fit to impose. The view of the case which naturally fell in with English ideas, as to the importance and necessity of a landed gentry as the main pillar of the social fabric, was made the foundation of the famous landed settlement of Bengal seventy years ago, under the Governor-Generalship of Lord Cornwallis—a settlement which still remains in force, but which, as it is maintained by many, wrought great injustice alike to the Government and to the actual cultivators. A more thorough study of the institutions of Hindostan, together with the inconveniences, both social and political, resulting from the Bengal settlement, has given currency to the opinion that by the original Hindoo institutions, the property of the land was in the village corporations, in which resided the power of allotting it out to individuals for cultivation, while the zemindars and talookdars were in their origin nothing but officers of the Government, appointed to look after, to collect, and to pay over to the prince the assessment due from the village.

This view has influenced to a considerable degree the settlement of the landed tenures and revenue made of late years in the Indian provinces, of which the direct administration has been assumed by the English. The exclusive proprietary rights claimed by the talookdars and zemindars have been regarded as originating in usurpations at once against the Government and the cultivators, and every effort has been made to get rid of them as an incubus on the real cultivators of the soil and the general improvement of the country. As, however, these middlemen, whatever the origin of their rights might be, could claim prescription in their favor, it was impossible not to recognize their claims as to a certain extent legal, however inconvenient, arbitrary
and oppressive to the people. In Oude, under the feeble reign of
the native princes, these feudal landholders had gone very far in
curtailing alike the claims of the Government and the rights of the
cultivators; and when, upon the recent annexation of that
kingdom, this matter came under revision, the Commissioners
charged with making the settlement soon got into a very
acrimonious controversy with them as to the real extent of their
rights. Hence resulted a state of discontent on their part which led
them to make common cause with the revolted Sepoys.

By those who incline to the policy above indicated—that of a
system of village settlement—looking at the actual cultivators as
invested with a proprietary right in the land, superior to that of
the middlemen, through whom the Government receives its share
of the landed produce—the proclamation of Lord Canning is
defended as an advantage taken of the position in which the great
body of the zemindars and talookdars of Oude had placed
themselves, to open a door for the introduction of much more
extensive reforms than otherwise would have been practicable—
the proprietary right confiscated by that proclamation being
merely the zemindarree or talookdarree right, and affecting only a
very small part of the population, and that by no means the actual
cultivators.

Independently of any question of justice and humanity, the view
taken on the other hand by the Derby Ministry of Lord Canning's
proclamation, corresponds sufficiently well with the general
principles which the Tory or Conservative party maintain on the
sacredness of vested rights and the importance of upholding an
aristocratic landed interest. In speaking of the landed interest at
home, they always refer rather to the landlords and rent-receivers
than to the rent-payers and to the actual cultivators; and it is,
therefore, not surprising that they should regard the interests of
the zemindars and talookdars, however few their actual number,
as equivalent to the interests of the great body of the people.

Here indeed is one of the greatest inconveniences and
difficulties in the Government of India from England, that views
of Indian questions are liable to be influenced by purely English
prejudices or sentiments, applied to a state of society and a
condition of things to which they have in fact very little real
pertinency. The defense which Lord Canning makes in his
dispatch, published to-day, of the policy of his proclamation

---

a "The Correspondence between the Governor-General and the Commissioner
of Oude", *The Times*, No. 23000, May 22, 1858.— *Ed.*
against the objections of Sir James Outram, the Commissioner of Oude, is very plausible, though it appears that he so far yielded to the representations of the Commissioner as to insert into the proclamation the mollifying sentence, not contained in the original draft sent to England, and on which Lord Ellenborough’s dispatch\textsuperscript{a} was based.\textsuperscript{556}

Lord Canning’s opinion as to the light in which the conduct of landholders of Oude in joining in the rebellion ought to be viewed does not appear to differ much from that of Sir James Outram and Lord Ellenborough. He argues that they stand in a very different position not only from the mutinous Sepoys, but from that of the inhabitants of rebellious districts in which the British rule had been longer established. He admits that they are entitled to be treated as persons having provocation for the course they took; but at the same time insists that they must be made to understand that rebellion cannot be resorted to without involving serious consequences to themselves. We shall soon learn what the effect of the issue of the proclamation has been, and whether Lord Canning or Sir James Outram was nearer right in his anticipation of its results.

Written on May 25, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5344, June 7, 1858 as a leading article

\textsuperscript{a} [E. L. Ellenborough,] “The Secret Committee of the Court of Directors of the East India Company to the Governor-General of India in Council. April 19, 1858”, *The Times*, No. 22989, May 10, 1858.—*Ed.*
The dilapidated state of the Bonapartist Exchequer cannot longer be said to form a matter of dispute. It has been openly proclaimed by the "savior of property" himself. In no other way is it possible to account for General Espinasse's circular to the French Prefects, calling upon them to use their influence, and, "if need be, their authority," in order to induce the trustees of hospitals and other charitable institutions to convert the real property from which they derive their revenues into three per cent consols. That property amounts to $100,000,000, but, as Bonaparte, in the name of the poor, bewails, does not report an income of more than 2 1/2 per cent. If invested in the Funds the revenue would improve by at least one half. In his paternal solicitude Bonaparte had recently bid the Council of State to initiate a law for this conversion of the landed property of the charitable establishments into funded property, but, strange to say, his own Council of State doggedly declined to take the hint. What he thus failed in effecting in the legislative way he now tries to get at in the "executive way," by a military ordre du jour. There are some people silly enough to fancy that he only intends increasing the funds by the maneuver. Nothing can be further off the mark. If the above-named landed property was sold at its nominal value of $100,000,000, a great part of that purchase money would of course be forthcoming from capital till now invested in consols and other public securities, so that the artificially created demand for the funds would be met by heaps of them thrown into the

---

a [Ch. M. E. Espinasse,] "La circulaire au sujet des biens immeubles...", Le Moniteur universel, No. 142, May 22, 1858.—Ed.
open market. The operation might even result in a further depression of the security market. However, Bonaparte's scheme is of a much sounder and more intelligible character. For the 100,000,000 of landed property he intends creating 100,000,000 of new Rentes. With the one hand he wants to seize the property of the charitable establishments, and with the other to indemnify them by drawing a cheque upon the "grand livre" of the nation. On a former occasion, when examining the French Bank act of 1857, we dwelt upon the enormous privileges Bonaparte had bestowed upon the Bank, at the cost of the State, with a view to secure himself a miserable loan of $20,000,000. We considered that Bank act as a financial cry of distress on the part of the savior of society, but since that time the disasters overwhelming French commerce, industry and agriculture have rebounded upon the Exchequer, while its expenses were increasing at an awful ratio. The different ministries for 1858 actually require 79,804,004 francs more than they did in 1855; the expense for the army alone amounting to 51 per cent of the total receipts of the country. The Crédit Mobilier, unable to pay a dividend to its own shareholders, and whose last report, if closely scrutinized, shows a considerable surplus of liabilities over assets, cannot, as it did in 1854 and 1855, come to the rescue, and help raise loans on "democratic" principles. There remains, then, nothing for Bonaparte but to return, in financial matters, as he has been forced to do in political ones, to the original principles of the coup d'état. The financial policy initiated by the theft from the Bank cellars of 25,000,000 francs, continued in the confiscation of the Orleans estates, is now to receive a further development in the confiscation of the property of the charitable establishments.

The latter operation, however, would cost Bonaparte one of his armies, his army of priests, who administer by far the greatest portion of the charitable establishments. Already, for the first time since the coup d'état, the Univers dares openly dissent from the savior of society, and even implores the Siècle to make common cause against this intended encroachment upon "private property."

---

a "Debt register".— Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 289-92.— Ed.
c Napoléon III, "Loi portant prorogation du privilège de la Banque de France", Le Moniteur universel, No. 162, June 11, 1857.— Ed.
d I. Péreire, "Rapport présenté au nom du Conseil d'administration [29 avril 1858]", Le Moniteur universel, No. 120, April 30, 1858.— Ed.
While the "eldest son of the Church"\(^a\) is placed in this rather equivocal position toward his holy army, his most profane army simultaneously threatens to become unmanageable. If he should interfere, in real good earnest, with the amusements of such heroes as Messrs. De Mercy, Léaudais and Hyenne, he will lose his hold on the only portion of the army on which he can rely. If, on the contrary, he allows that pretorian corruption\(^560\) which he has so systematically fostered since the days of the Camp of Satory\(^561\) boldly to show its front, all discipline will be at an end, and the army prove unable to withstand any shock from without. Another such event as the assassination of the rédacteur, of the *Figaro*,\(^b\) and that shock will take place. The general exasperation prevailing may be inferred from the one fact, that when the account of the duel got to Paris about 5,000 young men flocked to the *bureaux* of the *Figaro*, requesting to be inscribed upon a list, as ready to fight with any sub-lieutenant who might be forthcoming. The *Figaro*, of course, is itself a Bonapartist creation, heading that literature of scandal and *chantage* and private slander which suddenly shot up after the violent extinction of the political press, and found in the soil and atmosphere of the lesser Empire all the conditions for a luxuriant growth. It is a fine trait of historical irony that the signal for the impending conflict should be given by the murderous quarrel between the literary and the military representatives of the Bonapartist swell mob.

Written on May 27, 1858

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5348, June 11, 1858

---

\(^a\) Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) For details on the duel of Henri de Pène and the Sub-Lieutenant Hyenne in which the former was wounded see *The Times*, No. 23000, May 22, 1858.—*Ed.*
In spite of the great military operations of the English in the capture first of Delhi and then of Lucknow, the successive headquarters of the Sepoy rebellion, the pacification of India is yet very far from being accomplished. Indeed, it may be almost said that the real difficulty of the case is but just beginning to show itself. So long as the rebellious Sepoys kept together in large masses, so long as it was a question of sieges and pitched battles on a great scale, the vast superiority of the English troops for such operations gave them every advantage. But with the new character which the war is now taking on, this advantage is likely to be in a great measure lost. The capture of Lucknow does not carry with it the submission of Oude; nor would even the submission of Oude carry with it the pacification of India. The whole Kingdom of Oude bristles with fortresses of greater or less pretensions; and though perhaps none would long resist a regular attack, yet the capture of these forts one by one will not only be a very tedious process, but it will be attended with much greater proportional loss than operations against such great cities as Delhi and Lucknow.

But it is not alone the Kingdom of Oude that requires to be conquered and pacified. The discomfited Sepoys dislodged from Lucknow have scattered and fled in all directions. A great body of them have taken refuge in the hill districts of Rohilcund to the north, which still remains entirely in possession of the rebels. Others fled into Goruckpore on the east—which district, though it had been traversed by the British troops on their march to Lucknow, it has now become necessary to recover a second time. Many others have succeeded in penetrating southward into Bundelcund.
Indeed, a controversy seems to have arisen as to the best method of proceeding, and whether it would not have been better to have first subdued all the outlying districts which might have afforded the rebels a shelter, before directing operations against their main body collected at Lucknow. Such is said to have been the scheme of operations preferred by the military; but it is difficult to see how, with the limited number of troops at the disposal of the English, those surrounding districts could have been so occupied as to exclude the fugitive Sepoys, when finally dislodged from Lucknow, from entering into them, and, as in the case of Goruckpore, making their reconquest necessary.

Since the capture of Lucknow, the main body of the rebels appear to have retired upon Bareilley. It is stated that Nena Sahib was there. Against this city and district, upward of a hundred miles north-west from Lucknow, it has been judged necessary to undertake a Summer campaign, and at the latest accounts Sir Colin Campbell was himself marching thither.\(^3\)

Meanwhile, however, a guerrilla warfare seems to be spreading in various directions. While the troops are drawn off to the North, scattered parties of rebel soldiery are crossing the Ganges into the Doab, interrupting the communication with Calcutta, and by their ravages disabling the cultivators to pay their land tax, or at least affording them an excuse for not doing so.

Even the capture of Bareilley, so far from operating to remedy those evils, will be likely, perhaps, to increase them. It is in this desultory warfare that the advantage of the Sepoys lies. They can beat the English troops at marching to much the same extent that the English can beat them at fighting. An English column cannot move twenty miles a day; a Sepoy force can move forty, and, if hard pushed, even sixty. It is this rapidity of movement which gives to the Sepoy troops their chief value, and this, with their power of standing the climate and the comparative facility of feeding them, makes them indispensable in Indian warfare. The consumption of English troops in service, and especially in a Summer campaign, is enormous. Already, the lack of men is severely felt. It may become necessary to chase the flying rebels from one end of India to the other. For that purpose, European troops would hardly answer, while the contact of the wandering rebels with the native regiments of Bombay and Madras, which have hitherto remained faithful, might lead to new revolts.

Even without any accession of new mutineers, there are still in
the field not less than a hundred and fifty thousand armed men, while the unarmed population fail to afford the English either assistance or information.

Meanwhile, the deficiency of rain in Bengal threatens a famine—calamity unknown within this century, though in former times, and even since the English occupation, the source of terrible sufferings.

Written at the end of May 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5351, June 15, 1858 as a leading article
Our indiscreet friend, Mr. William Russell of *The London Times*, has recently been induced, by his love of the picturesque, to illustrate, for the second time, the sack of Lucknow, to a degree which other people will not think very flattering to the British character.\(^a\) It now appears that Delhi, too, was “looted” to a very considerable extent, and that besides the Kaiserbagh, the city of Lucknow generally contributed to reward the British soldier for his previous privations and heroic efforts. We quote from Mr. Russell:

“There are companies which can boast of privates with thousands of pounds worth in their ranks. One man I heard of who complacently offered to lend an officer ‘whatever sum he wanted if he wished to buy over the Captain.’ Others have remitted large sums to their friends. [...] Ere this letter reaches England, many a diamond, emerald and delicate pearl will have told its tale in a very quiet, pleasant way, of the storm and sack of the Kaiserbagh. *It is as well that the fair wearers... saw not how the glittering baubles were won, or the scenes in which the treasure was trove....* Some of these officers have made, literally, *their fortunes*... There are certain small caskets in battered uniform cases which contain *estates in Scotland and Ireland, and snug fishing and shooting boxes in every game-haunted or salmon-frequented angle of the world.*”\(^b\)

This, then, accounts for the inactivity of the British army after the conquest of Lucknow. The fortnight devoted to plunder was well spent. Officers and soldiers went into the town poor and debt-ridden, and came out suddenly enriched. They were no longer the same men; yet they were expected to return to their

---

\(^a\) Here and below see W. H. Russell, “Lucknow, April 5”, *The Times*, No. 23007, May 31, 1858.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) *Italics by Engels.— Ed.*
former military duty, to submission, silent obedience, fatigue, privation and battle. But this is out of the question. The army, disbanded for the purpose of plunder, is changed for ever; no word of command, no prestige of the General, can make it again what it once was. Listen again to Mr. Russell:

"It is curious to observe how riches develop disease; how one's liver is affected by loot, and what tremendous ravages in one's family, among the nearest and dearest, can be caused by a few crystals of carbon.... The weight of the belt round the private's waist, full of rupees and gold mohurs, assures him the vision" (of a comfortable independency at home) "can be realized, and it is no wonder he resents the 'fall in, there, fall in!' ... Two battas, two shares of prize-money, the plunder of two cities, and many 'pickings by the way', have made some of our men too rich for easy soldiering."

Accordingly, we hear that above 150 officers have sent in their resignations to Sir Colin Campbell—a very singular proceeding indeed in an army before the enemy, which in any other service would be followed up in twenty-four hours by cashiering and severest punishment otherwise, but which, we suppose, is considered in the British army as a very proper act for "an officer and a gentleman" who has suddenly made his fortune. As to the private soldiers, with them the proceeding is different. Loot engenders the desire for more; and if no more Indian treasures are at hand for the purpose, why not loot those of the British Government? Accordingly, says Mr. Russell:

"There has been a suspicious upsetting of two treasure tumbrils under a European guard, in which some few rupees were missing, and paymasters exhibit a preference for natives in the discharge of the delicate duty of convoy!"a

Very good, indeed. The Hindoo or Sikh is better disciplined, less thieving, less rapacious than that incomparable model of a warrior, the British soldier! But so far we have seen the individual British only employed. Let us now cast a glance at the British army, "looting" in its collective capacity:

"Every day adds to the prize property, and it is estimated that the sales will produce £600,000. [...] The town of Cawnpore is said to be full of the plunder of Lucknow, and if the damage done to public buildings, the destruction of private property, the deterioration in value of houses and land, and the results of depopulation could be estimated, it would be found that the capital of Oude has sustained a loss of five or six millions sterling."a

The Calmuck hordes of Jenghiz Khan and Timur, falling upon a city like a swarm of locusts, and devouring everything that came

---

a Italics by Engels.—Ed.
in their way, must have been a blessing to a country, compared with the irruption of these Christian, civilized, chivalrous and gentle British soldiers. The former, at least, soon passed away on their erratic course; but these methodic Englishmen bring along with them their prize-agents, who convert loot into a system, who register the plunder, sell it by auction, and keep a sharp look-out that British heroism is not defrauded of a tithe of its reward. We shall watch with curiosity the capabilities of this army, relaxed as its discipline is by the effects of wholesale plunder, at a time when the fatigues of a hot weather campaign require the greatest stringency of discipline.

The Hindoos must, however, by this time be still less fit for regular battle than they were at Lucknow, but that is not now the main question. It is far more important to know what shall be done if the insurgents, after a show of resistance, again shift the seat of war, say to Rajpootana, which is far from being subdued. Sir Colin Campbell must leave garrisons everywhere; his field army has melted down to less than one-half of the force he had before Lucknow. If he is to occupy Rohilcund what disposable strength will remain for the field? The hot weather is now upon him, in June the rains must have put a stop to active campaigning, and allowed the insurgents breathing time. The loss of European soldiers through sickness will have increased every day after the middle of April, when the weather became oppressive; and the young men imported into India last Winter must succumb to the climate in far greater numbers than the seasoned Indian campaigners who last Summer fought under Havelock and Wilson. Rohilcund is no more the decisive point than Lucknow was, or Delhi. The insurrection, it is true, has lost most of its capacity for pitched battles; but it is far more formidable in its present scattered form, which compels the English to ruin their army by marching and exposure. Look at the many new centers of resistance. There is Rohilcund, where the mass of the old Sepoys are collected; there is Northeastern Oude beyond the Gogra, where the Oudians have taken up position; there is Calpee, which for the present serves as a point of concentration for the insurgents of Bundelcund. We shall most likely hear in a few weeks, if not sooner, that both Bareilly and Calpee have fallen. The former will be of little importance, inasmuch as it will serve to absorb nearly all, if not the whole of Campbell’s disposable forces. Calpee, menaced now by General Whitlock, who has led his column from Nagpoor to Banda, in Bundelcund, and by General Rose, who approaches from Jhansi, and has defeated the advanced
guard of the Calpee forces, will be a more important conquest; it will free Campbell's base of operations, Cawnpore, from the only danger menacing it, and thus perhaps enable him to recruit his field forces to some extent by troops set at liberty thereby. But it is very doubtful whether there will be enough to do more than to clear Oude.

Thus, the strongest army England ever concentrated on one point in India is again scattered in all directions, and had more work cut out than it can conveniently do. The ravages of the climate, during the Summer's heats and rains, must be terrible; and whatever the moral superiority of the European over the Hindoos, it is very doubtful whether the physical superiority of the Hindoos in braving the heat and rains of an Indian Summer will not again be the means of destroying the English forces. There are at present but few British troops on the road to India, and it is not intended to send out large re-enforcements before July and August. Up to October and November, therefore, Campbell has but that one army, melting down rapidly as it is, to hold his own with. What if in the mean time the insurgent Hindoos succeed in raising Rajpootana and Mahratta country in rebellion? What if the Sikhs, of whom there are 80,000 in the British service, and who claim all the honor of the victories for themselves, and whose temper is not altogether favorable to the British, were to rise?

Altogether, one more Winter's campaign, at least, appears to be in store for the British in India, and that cannot be carried on without another army from England.

Written on about June 4, 1858
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5361, June 26, 1858 as a leading article
Karl Marx  

THE STATE OF BRITISH COMMERCE  

London, June 8, 1858

The trade and navigation tables just published by the British Board of Trade\(^a\) comprise an account of the declared value of the exports of the United Kingdom in the three months ending 31st March, 1858, compared with the corresponding period of the year 1857; an account of the number and tonnage of vessels entered inward and cleared outward, with cargoes, in the four months ending 30th April, 1858, compared with the corresponding period of the years 1856 and 1857; and, lastly, an account of the principal exports and imports for the four months ending 30th April, 1858. The amount of the exports for the month of April, 1858, is £9,451,000, against £9,965,000 in 1857, and £9,424,000 in 1856\(^b\), while for the four months there is a reduction of nearly £6,000,000 in the year 1858. Accordingly the British exports of the month of April, 1858, would appear not only to have risen above the level of 1856, but closely to approach that reached in 1857, some months prior to the commercial explosion in the United States. Hence it might be inferred that the last traces of the crisis are rapidly disappearing, and that British commerce, at least, is again entering a new epoch of expansion. Such a conclusion, however, would be altogether erroneous. In the first place, it must be considered that the official statistics, as far as they relate to declared value, do not show the actual returns, but the returns as anticipated by the exporters. Moreover, a closer

---

\(^a\) "Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation for the Four Months ended April 30", *The Economist*, No. 770, May 29, 1858, supplement.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) "The Board of Trade Tables", *The Economist*, No. 770, May 29, 1858, p. 592.—*Ed.*
examination of the tables of exports proves that the apparent recovery of British commerce is mainly due to an over-importation of East India, which must lead to a violent contraction of that market. Already we read in the last commercial circular of Messrs. George Frazer & Company:

"The later advices from the East show symptoms of reaction from the extraordinary high range of prices which have been current in Bombay and in Calcutta during the period when supplies there were so short. A not inconsiderable decline has already been submitted to upon the arrival out of cargoes which were shipped not later than December. The supplies since then have been to both markets most liberal, if not excessive; and it seems very probable, therefore, that for some time to come we must look for less support to prices from the great activity of the Eastern demand than has been so far experienced since the beginning of January."

Beside India, those European and other countries which till now had not been reached by the effects of the commercial crisis, have been blocked up by British merchandise, not in consequence of increased demand, but by way of experiment. The countries thus blessed were Belgium, Spain and its dependencies, some Italian States—principally the Two Sicilies—Egypt, Mexico, Central America, Peru, China, and some minor markets. At the very time when the most disastrous news was arriving from Brazil and put a check upon the aggregate export to that country, some branches of British industry, compelled to find an outlet for their exuberant produce, did not only not curtail, but actually augment their shipments for that market. Thus, during the month of April, linens, earthenware and porcelain, destined for Brazil, were increasing in quantity as well as declared value. Nobody can consider this bona fide exports. The same remark holds true with respect to Australia, which had acted as so elastic a center of absorption during the first months of the crisis. Australia was then and is still overstocked; a sudden reaction took place; the aggregate exports thither were diminished, but again some branches of British industry, instead of contracting, have actually expanded—speculatively, of course—their supplies in spite of the warnings of all the Australian local papers. The export tables of the month of April, therefore, must be considered not as the bona fide standard of the recovery of British industry, but as mere feelers thrown out in order to ascertain what pressure the markets of the world are again able to bear. The following table contains an account of the declared value of the British and Irish exports in the three months ending 31st of March, 1858, compared with the corresponding period of the year 1857:
### Foreign Countries to which Exported.\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia, Northern Ports</td>
<td>£3,015</td>
<td>£8,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia, Southern Ports</td>
<td>72,777</td>
<td>42,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>48,007</td>
<td>3,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>30,217</td>
<td>5,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>92,046</td>
<td>40,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>78,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>9,502</td>
<td>3,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>288,648</td>
<td>236,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenburg</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>1,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanse Towns</td>
<td>2,318,260</td>
<td>1,645,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1,305,606</td>
<td>975,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>515,175</td>
<td>546,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,631,672</td>
<td>1,035,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal proper</td>
<td>380,160</td>
<td>356,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azores</td>
<td>10,793</td>
<td>12,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira</td>
<td>9,955</td>
<td>16,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>496,788</td>
<td>584,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>18,817</td>
<td>8,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>290,131</td>
<td>293,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>189,534</td>
<td>257,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal States</td>
<td>69,953</td>
<td>123,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sicilies</td>
<td>284,045</td>
<td>375,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Territories</td>
<td>253,042</td>
<td>323,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>40,860</td>
<td>69,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>969,288</td>
<td>821,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallachia and Moldavia</td>
<td>111,052</td>
<td>98,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria and Palestine</td>
<td>199,070</td>
<td>81,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (ports on the Mediter-</td>
<td>449,497</td>
<td>483,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>2,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>4,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>55,826</td>
<td>37,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Coast of Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(foreign)</td>
<td>235,527</td>
<td>196,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Coast of Africa</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Ports on the Red Sea</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde Islands</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>3,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>234,071</td>
<td>149,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) Here and below "An Account of the Declared Value of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures. . . .," *The Economist*, No. 770, May 29, 1858.—*Ed.*
The State of British Commerce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Islands</td>
<td>144,992</td>
<td>212,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (exclusive of Hong Kong)</td>
<td>290,441</td>
<td>389,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sea Islands</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign West Indies</td>
<td>620,022</td>
<td>521,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (Ports on the Atlantic)</td>
<td>6,231,501</td>
<td>2,565,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>50,219</td>
<td>94,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>112,277</td>
<td>151,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>22,453</td>
<td>46,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Granada</td>
<td>88,502</td>
<td>117,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>105,417</td>
<td>62,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1,292,325</td>
<td>826,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>145,481</td>
<td>177,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Ayres</td>
<td>285,187</td>
<td>279,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chili</td>
<td>336,309</td>
<td>270,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>209,889</td>
<td>299,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total to foreign countries £20,636,473 £14,940,756

British Possessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>£136,071</td>
<td>£120,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>152,926</td>
<td>210,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>116,821</td>
<td>131,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>66,148</td>
<td>52,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast of Africa (British)</td>
<td>135,452</td>
<td>62,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape of Good Hope</td>
<td>442,796</td>
<td>403,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>26,605</td>
<td>23,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>3,837</td>
<td>8,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>142,303</td>
<td>164,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>11,263</td>
<td>11,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Territories in the East Indies (exclusive of Singapore and Ceylon)</td>
<td>2,822,009</td>
<td>3,502,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>101,535</td>
<td>308,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>98,817</td>
<td>153,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>133,743</td>
<td>242,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td>15,515</td>
<td>13,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>180,123</td>
<td>249,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>706,337</td>
<td>682,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Economist thinks that, from an accurate analysis of these figures,

"the curious fact is disclosed that the entire decrease has taken place in the British trade to foreign countries as contrasted with the colonial possessions."

In fact, the above tables may be condensed as follows:

\[\text{Exports for three months.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To foreign countries</td>
<td>£20,636,473</td>
<td>£14,940,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To British possessions</td>
<td>8,191,020</td>
<td>8,569,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£28,827,493</td>
<td>£23,510,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet the conclusion arrived at by The Economist seems a fallacy. According to the condensed statement there would appear to have taken place a reduction in the trade to foreign countries to the amount of £5,695,717, simultaneously with an increase of £378,514 in the colonial trade. However, if we deduct the increase in the trade of British smuggling places such as Gibraltar, Malta, Hong Kong, and of mere depots for foreign countries, such as Singapore, a decrease in the aggregate colonial trade becomes evident; and if we deduct India, the decrease appears very considerable. Of the decrease in the trade to foreign countries, the main percentage falls upon the following countries:

\[\text{a Here and below "The Board of Trade Tables", The Economist, No. 770, May 29, 1858 (italics by Marx).—Ed.}\]
The accounts relating to navigation show a slight increase in the number as well as tunnage of the British vessels entered inward, but a decrease in the number and tunnage of the vessels cleared outward. Of foreign countries, the navigation of the United States continues to maintain the first rank. The following figures show the movement of their vessels to and from the British ports:

**Entered Inward.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Tunnage</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Tunnage</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Tunnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States...</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>383,255</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>366,407</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>366,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cleared Outward.**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States...</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>395,102</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>427,221</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>321,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the same accounts, Norway, Denmark and Russia seem the countries upon whose navigation the commercial crisis told with the most disastrous effect.

Written on June 8, 1858

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5356, June 21, 1858
England offers at this moment the curious spectacle of dissolution appearing at the summit of the State, while at the base of society all seems immovable. There is no audible agitation among the masses, but there is a visible change among their rulers. Shall we believe that the upper strata are liquefying, while the lower remain in the same dull solidity? We are, of course, not alluding to the cynical attempts of Palmerston and his compeers to "loot" the Treasury. The battles between the exiles and their proscribers form no more a standing feature in the medieval annals of Italian towns than the conflicts between the Ins and Outs in the Parliamentary history of England. But now we have the Tory leader in the House of Commons winding up a speech with the ominous declaration that

"There is one bond of union between us [the Radicals and the Tories] in this House and in this country; and that is, that we shall not any longer be the tools or the victims of an obsolete oligarchy!"

There is the House of Lords passing one point of the People's Charter—the abolition of the property qualification for the members of the Commons; there is Lord Grey, the descendant of the Whig Reformer, warning his noble compeers that they are drifting to "a total revolution in the whole system of their Government and in the character of their Constitution;" there is

---

a B. Disraeli's speech in the House of Commons on May 31, 1858, The Times, No. 23008, June 1, 1858.—Ed.
b Charles Grey.—Ed.
c H. G. Grey's speech in the House of Lords on June 10, 1858, The Times, No. 23017, June 11, 1858.—Ed.
the Duke of Rutland frightened out of his senses by the vista of having to swallow "the whole hog of the five points of the Charter, and something more." And then The London Times in sinister accents one day cautions the middle classes that Disraeli and Bulwer wish them no good, and, in order to master them, may ally themselves with the vile multitude; and then, the very next day, it warns the landed aristocracy that they are to be swamped by the shopocracy, to be enthroned through Locke King's bill, which has just passed through its second reading in the Lower House, for the extension of the elective franchise to the £10 occupiers in the counties.

The fact is that the two ruling oligarchic parties of England were long ago transformed into mere factions, without any distinctive principles. Having in vain tried first a coalition and then a dictatorship, they are now arrived at the point where each of them can only think of obtaining a respite of life by betraying their common interest into the hands of their common foe, the radical middle-class party, who are powerfully represented in the Commons by John Bright. Till now, the Tories have been aristocrats ruling in the name of the aristocracy, and the Whigs aristocrats ruling in the name of the middle class; but the middle class having assumed to rule in their own name, the business of the Whigs is gone. In order to keep the Whigs out of office, the Tories will yield to the encroachments of the middle-class party until they have worried out Whig patience and convinced these oligarchs that, in order to save the interests of their order, they must merge in the conservative ranks and forsake their tradition-ary pretensions to represent the liberal interest or form a power of their own. Absorption of the Whig faction into the Tory faction, and their common metamorphosis into the party of the aristocracy, as opposed to the new middle-class party, acting under its own chiefs, under its own banners, with its own watchwords—such is the consummation we are now witnessing in England.

If we consider this state of internal affairs in England, and couple with it the fact that the Indian war will continue to drain her of men and money, we may feel sure that she will be disabled

---

a Ch. C. J. Rutland's speech in the House of Lords on June 10, 1858, The Times, No. 23017, June 11, 1858.—Ed.
b "In those sad days of Ireland's history..., " The Times, No. 23016, June 10, 1858.—Ed.
c "There was a time within the memory...", The Times, No. 23017, June 11, 1858.—Ed.
from clogging, as she did in 1848, the European Revolution that
draws visibly nearer. There is another great power which, ten
years ago, most powerfully checked the revolutionary current. We
mean Russia. This time, combustible matter has accumulated
under her own feet, which a strong blast from the West may
suddenly set on fire. The symptoms of a servile war are so visible
in the interior of Russia, that the Provincial Governors feel
themselves unable otherwise to account for the unwonted ferme-
tation than by charging Austria with propagating through secret
emissaries Socialist and revolutionary doctrines all over the land.
Think only of Austria being not only suspected but publicly
accused of acting as the emissary of revolution! The Galician
massacres have, indeed, fully proved to the world that the
Cabinet of Vienna knows, in case of need, how to teach serfs a
socialism of its own. Austria, however, angrily retorts the charge,
by the statement that her eastern provinces are overrun and
poisoned through Russian Panslavist agents, while her Italian
subjects are wrought upon by the combined intrigues of
Bonaparte and the Czar. Prussia, finally, is keenly awake to the
dangers of the situation; but she is bound hand and foot, and
interdicted from moving in any direction. The royal power is, in
fact, broken by the insanity of the King, and the want of full
powers on the part of the Regent. The strife between the
camarilla of the King, who refuses to resign, and the camarilla of
the Prince, who dares not to reign, has opened a floodgate for the
popular torrent.

Everything, then, depends upon France, and there the commer-
cial and agricultural distress, financial coup d'etat, and the
substitution of the rule of the army for rule by the army, are
hastening the explosion. Even the French press at length admits
that all hopes of a return of prosperity must be abandoned for the
present. "We believe that it would be foolish to tantalize the public
with the chimerical hope of an immediate reaction," says the
Constitutionnel. "The stagnation continues, and in spite of the
existing favorable elements, we must not expect any immediate
modification," says the Patrie.

The Union and the Univers re-echo these complaints. "It is

a Alexander II.—Ed.
b Frederick William IV.—Ed.
c William, Prince of Prussia.—Ed.
d "Bulletin hebdomadaire de la Bourse de Paris", Le Constitutionnel, No. 158,
June 7, 1858.—Ed.
e "Paris, Monday, June 7, 6 p.m.", The Times, No. 23015, June 9, 1858.—Ed.
generally admitted that there has not been more commercial distress experienced in Paris since the Revolution of 1848 than at the present moment,” says the Paris correspondent of The London Times; and the shares of the Crédit Mobilier have sunk down to something like 550 frs., that is, below the nominal price at which they were sold to the general public. On the other hand, the emptiness of the Imperial exchequer forces Napoleon to insist on his plan of confiscation. “The only thing to be asked is,” says a clerical paper appearing at Anjou, “whether or not property is to be respected.” Property indeed! The only thing to be asked at this moment, answers Bonaparte, is how to make sure of the army? and he solves this question in his habitual way. The whole army is to be bought anew. He has ordered a general increase of its wages. Meanwhile England is alarmed and Austria in terror. On all hands, war is believed to be imminent. Louis Napoleon has no other means of escaping speedy destruction. The beginning of the end is at hand.

Written on June 11, 1858

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5359, June 24, 1858 as a leading article; reprinted unsigned in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1365, June 25, 1858 under the title “The European Revolution”
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a The Times, No. 23014, June 8, 1858.— Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 550-52.— Ed.
c Napoléon III, “Loi relative à la création d’une dotation de l’armée, au renouvellement, au remplacement et aux pensions militaires”— Ed.
Karl Marx

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND
THE SLAVE-TRADE

London, June 18, 1858

In the sitting of the House of Lords on June 17, the question of the slave-trade was introduced by the Bishop of Oxford, who presented a petition against that trade from the Parish of St. Mary in Jamaica. The impression these debates are sure to produce upon every mind not strongly prejudiced is that of great moderation on the part of the present British Government, and its firm purpose of avoiding any pretext of quarrel with the United States. Lord Malmesbury dropped altogether the "right of visit," as far as ships under the American flag are concerned, by the following declaration:

"The United States say that on no account, for no purpose, and upon no suspicion shall a ship carrying the American flag be boarded except by an American ship, unless at the risk of the officer boarding or detaining her. I have not admitted the international law as laid down by the American Minister for Foreign Affairs, until that statement had been approved and fortified by the law officers of the Crown. But having admitted that, I have put it as strong as possible to the American Government that if it is known that the American flag covers every iniquity, every pirate and slaver on earth will carry it and no other; that this must bring disgrace on that honored banner, and that instead of vindicating the honor of the country by an obstinate adherence to their present declaration the contrary result will follow; that the American flag will be prostituted to the worst of purposes. I shall continue to urge that it is necessary in these civilized times, with countless vessels navigating the ocean, that there should be a police on the ocean; that there should be, if not a right by international law, an agreement among nations how far they would go to verify the nationality of vessels, and ascertain their right to bear a particular flag. From the language I have used, from the conversations which I had with the American Minister resident in this country, 

---

a The Times, No. 23023, June 18, 1858. Speeches by the members of the House of Lords quoted below are to be found in the same issue.—Ed.

b L. Cass.—Ed.

c J. M. Dallas.—Ed.
and from the observations contained in a very able paper drawn up by Gen. Cass on this subject, I am not without strong hope that some arrangement of this kind may be made with the United States, which, with the orders given to the officers of both countries, may enable us to verify the flags of all countries, without running the risk of offense to the country to which a ship belongs."

On the Opposition benches there was also no attempt made at vindicating the right of visit on the part of Great Britain against the United States, but, as Earl Grey remarked,

"The English had treaties with Spain and other powers for the prevention of the slave-trade, and if they had reasonable grounds for suspecting that a vessel was engaged in this abominable traffic, and that she had for the time made use of the United States flag, that she was not really an American ship at all, they had a right to overhaul her and to search her. If, however, she produced the American papers, even though she be full of slaves, it was their duty to discharge her, and to leave to the United States the disgrace of that iniquitous traffic. He hoped and trusted that the orders to their cruisers were strict in this respect, and that any excess of that discretion which was allowed their officers under the circumstances would meet with proper punishment."

The question then turns exclusively upon the point, and even this point seems abandoned by Lord Malmesbury, whether or not vessels suspected of usurping the American flag may not be called upon to produce their papers. Lord Aberdeen directly denied that any controversy could arise out of such a practice, since the instructions under which the British officers were to proceed on such an occurrence—instructions drawn up by Dr. Lushington and Sir G. Cockburn—had been communicated at the time to the American Government and acquiesced in by Mr. Webster, on the part of that Government." If, therefore, there had been no change in these instructions, and if the officers had acted within their limits, "the American Government could have no ground of complaint." There seemed, indeed, a strong suspicion hovering in the minds of the hereditary wisdom, that Palmerston had played one of his usual tricks by effecting some arbitrary change in the orders issued to the British cruisers. It is known that Palmerston, while boasting of his zeal in the suppression of the slave-trade, had, during the eleven years of his administration of foreign affairs, ending in 1841, broken up all the existing slave-trade treaties, had ordered acts which the British law authorities pronounced criminal, and which actually subjected one of his instruments to legal procedure and placed a slave-dealer under the protection of the law of England against its own Government.

---

"Annex (B) to the treaty between Great Britain, Austria...; signed at London, the Twentieth Day of December in the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-One. Instructions to Cruisers."—Ed. .
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He chose the slave-trade as his field of battle, and converted it into a mere instrument of provoking quarrels between England and other States. Before leaving office in 1841 he had given instructions\textsuperscript{a} which, according to the words of Sir Robert Peel, "must have led, had they not been countermanded, to a collision with the United States." In his own words, he had enjoined the naval officers "to have no very nice regard to the law of nations." Lord Malmesbury, although in very reserved language, intimated that "by sending the British squadrons to the Cuban waters, instead of leaving them on the coast of Africa," Palmerston removed them from a station where, before the outbreak of the Russian war, they had almost succeeded in extinguishing the slave-trade, to a place where they could be good for little else than picking up a quarrel with the United States. Lord Woodhouse, Palmerston's own late Ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg, concurring in this view of the case, remarked that,

"No matter what instructions had been given, if the Government gave authority to the British vessels to go in such numbers into the American waters, a difference would sooner or later arise between us and the United States."

Yet, whatever may have been Palmerston's secret intentions, it is evident that they are baffled by the Tory Government in 1858, as they had been in 1842, and that the war cry so lustily raised in the Congress and in the press is doomed to result in "much ado about nothing."

As to the question of the slave-trade itself, Spain was denounced by the Bishop of Oxford, as well as Lord Brougham, as the main stay of that nefarious traffic. Both of them called upon the British Government to force, by every means in its power, that country into a course of policy consonant to existing treaties. As early as 1814 a general treaty was entered into between Great Britain and Spain, by which the latter passed an unequivocal condemnation of the slave-trade. In 1817 a specific treaty was concluded, by which Spain fixed the abolition of the slave-trade, on the part of her own subjects, for the year 1820, and, by way of compensation for the losses her subjects might suffer by carrying out the contract, received an indemnity of £400,000. The money was pocketed, but no equivalent was tendered for it. In 1835 a new treaty\textsuperscript{b} was entered into, by which Spain bound herself formally to bring in a

\textsuperscript{a} "Lettre adressée le 18 mai 1841, par le département des affaires étrangères aux lords de l'amirauté, au sujet de la poursuite des bâtiments américains..."— Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} "Treaty between His Majesty and the Queen Regent of Spain ... signed in Madrid, June 28, 1835."— Ed.
sufficiently stringent penal law to make it impossible for her subjects to continue the traffic. The procrastinating Spanish proverb, "A la mañana," was again strictly adhered to. It was only ten years later that the penal law was carried; but, by a singular mischance, the principal clause contended for by England was left out, namely, that of making the slave-trade piracy. In one word, nothing was done, save that the Captain-General of Cuba, the Minister at home, the Camarilla, and, if rumor speaks truth, royal personages themselves, raised a private tax upon the slavers, selling the license of dealing in human flesh and blood at so many doubloons per head.

"Spain," said the Bishop of Oxford, "had not the excuse that this traffic was a system which her Government was not strong enough to put down, because Gen. Valdez had shown that such a plea could not be urged with any show of truth. On his arrival in the island he called together the principal contractors, and, giving them six months' time to close all their transactions in the slave-trade, told them that he was determined to put it down at the end of that period. What was the result? In 1840, the year previous to the administration of Gen. Valdez, the number of ships which came to Cuba from the coast of Africa with slaves was 56. In 1842, while Gen. Valdez was Captain-General, the number was only 3. In 1840 no less than 14,470 slaves were landed at the island; in 1842 the number was 3,100."

Now what shall England do with Spain? Repeat her protests, multiply her dispatches, renew her negotiations? Lord Malmesbury himself states that they could cover all the waters from the Spanish coast to Cuba with the documents vainly exchanged between the two Governments. Or shall England enforce her claims, sanctioned by so many treaties? Here it is that the shoe pinches. In steps the sinister figure of the "august ally," now the acknowledged guardian angel of the slave-trade. The third Bonaparte, the patron of Slavery in all its forms, forbids England to act up to her convictions and her treaties. Lord Malmesbury, it is known, is strongly suspected of an undue intimacy with the hero of Satory. Nevertheless, he denounced him in plain terms as the general slave-dealer of Europe—as the man who had revived the infamous traffic in its worst features under the pretext of "free emigration" of the blacks to the French colonies. Earl Grey completed this denunciation by stating that "wars had been undertaken in Africa for the purpose of making captives, who were to be sold to the agents of the French Government." The

---

a "Leave it till tomorrow." — Ed.
b Leopoldo O'Donnel y Jorris.— Ed.
c P. J. Pidal.— Ed.
Earl of Clarendon added that “both Spain and France were rivals in the African market, offering a certain sum per man; and there was not the least difference in the treatment of these negroes, whether they were conveyed to Cuba or to a French colony.”

Such, then, is the glorious position England finds herself in by having lent her help to that man in overthrowing the Republic. The second Republic, like the first one, had abolished Slavery. Bonaparte, who acquired his power solely by truckling to the meanest passions of men, is unable to prolong it save by buying day by day new accomplices. Thus he has not only restored Slavery, but has bought the planters by the renewal of the slave-trade. Everything degrading the conscience of the nation, is a new lease of power granted to him. To convert France into a slave-trading nation would be the surest means of enslaving France, who, when herself, had the boldness of proclaiming in the face of the world: Let the colonies perish, but let principles live! One thing at least has been accomplished by Bonaparte. The slave-trade has become a battle-cry between the Imperialist and the Republican camps. If the French Republic be restored to-day, to-morrow Spain will be forced to abandon the infamous traffic.

Written on June 18, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5366, July 2, 1858; reprinted unsigned in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 1367, July 2, 1858

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
According to the London journals, Indian stock and railway securities have of late been distinguished by a downward movement in that market, which is far from testifying to the genuineness of the sanguine convictions which John Bull likes to exhibit in regard to the state of the Indian guerrilla war; and which, at all events, indicates a stubborn distrust in the elasticity of Indian financial resources. As to the latter, two opposite views are propounded. On the one hand, it is affirmed that taxes in India are onerous and oppressive beyond those of any country in the world; that as a rule throughout most of the presidencies, and through those presidencies most where they have been longest under British rule, the cultivators, that is, the great body of the people of India, are in a condition of unmitigated impoverishment and dejection; that, consequently, Indian revenues have been stretched to their utmost possible limit, and Indian finances are therefore past recovery. A rather discomfortable opinion this at a period when, according to Mr. Gladstone, for some years to come, the extraordinary Indian expenditure alone will annually amount to about £20,000,000 sterling. On the other hand, it is asserted—the asseveration being made good by an array of statistical illustrations—that India is the least taxed country in the world; that, if expenditure is going on increasing, revenue may be increased too; and that it is an utter fallacy to imagine that the Indian people will not bear any new taxes. Mr. Bright, who may be considered the most arduous and influential representative of

---

a W. E. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on June 7, 1858, The Times, No. 23014, June 8, 1858.—Ed.
the "discomfortable" doctrine, made, on the occasion of the second reading of the new Government of India bill, the following statement:

"The Indian Government had cost more to govern India than it was possible to extort from the population of India, although the Government had been by no means scrupulous either as to the taxes imposed, or as to the mode in which they had been levied. [...] It cost more than £30,000,000 to govern India, for that was the gross revenue, and there was always a deficit, which had to be made up by loans borrowed at a high rate of interest. [...] The Indian debt now amounted to £60,000,000, and was increasing; while the credit of the Government was falling, partly because they had not treated their creditors very honorably on one or two occasions, and now on account of the calamities which had recently happened in India. [...] He had alluded to the gross revenue; but as that included the opium revenue, which was hardly a tax upon the people of India, he would take the taxation which really pressed upon them at £25,000,000. Now, let not this £25,000,000 be compared with the £60,000,000 that was raised in this country. Let the House recollect that in India it was possible to purchase twelve days' labor for the same amount of gold or silver that would be obtained in payment for one in England. This £25,000,000 expended in the purchase of labor in India would buy as much as an outlay of £300,000,000 would procure in England. [...] He might be asked how much was the labor of an Indian worth? Well, if the labor of an Indian was only worth 2d. a day, it was clear that we could not expect him to pay as much taxation as if it was worth 2s. [...] We had 30,000,000 of population in Great Britain and Ireland; in India there were 150,000,000 inhabitants. [...] We raised here £60,000,000 sterling of taxes; in India, reckoning by the days' labor of the people of India, we raised £300,000,000 of revenue, or five times a greater revenue than was collected at home. Looking at the fact that the population of India was five times greater than that of the British Empire, a man might say that the taxation per head in India and England was about the same, and that therefore there was no great hardship inflicted. But in England there was an incalculable power of machinery and steam, of means of transit, and of everything that capital and human invention could bring to aid the industry of a people. In India there was nothing of the kind. They had scarcely a decent road throughout India."

Now, it must be admitted that there is something wrong in this method of comparing Indian taxes with British taxes. There is on the one side the Indian population, five times as great as the British one, and there is on the other side the Indian taxation amounting to half the British. But, then, Mr. Bright says, Indian labor is an equivalent for about one-twelfth only of British labor. Consequently £30,000,000 of taxes in India would represent £300,000,000 of taxes in Great Britain, instead of the £60,000,000 actually there raised. What then is the conclusion he ought to have arrived at? That the people of India in regard to their numerical strength pay the same taxation as the people in Great Britain, if allowance is made for the comparative poverty of the people in
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a J. Bright's speech in the House of Commons on June 24, 1858, The Times, No. 23029, June 25, 1858.—Ed.
India, and £30,000,000 is supposed to weigh as heavily upon 150,000,000 Indians as £60,000,000 upon 30,000,000 Britons. Such being his supposition, it is certainly fallacious to turn round and say that a poor people cannot pay so much as a rich one, because the comparative poverty of the Indian people has already been taken into account in making out the statement that the Indian pays as much as the Briton. There might, in fact, another question be raised. It might be asked, whether a man who earns say 12 cents a day can be fairly expected to pay 1 cent with the same ease with which another, earning $12 a day, pays $1? Both would relatively contribute the same aliquot part of their income, but still the tax might bear in quite different proportions upon their respective necessities. Yet, Mr. Bright has not yet put the question in these terms, and, if he had, the comparison between the burden of taxation, borne by the British wages' laborer on the one hand, and the British capitalist on the other, would perhaps have struck nearer home than the comparison between Indian and British taxation. Moreover, he admits himself that from the £30,000,000 of Indian taxes, the £5,000,000 constituting the opium revenue must be subtracted, since this is, properly speaking, no tax pressing upon the Indian people, but rather an export duty charged upon Chinese consumption. Then we are reminded by the apologists of the Anglo-Indian Administration that £16,000,000 of income is derived from the land revenue, or rent, which from times immemorial has belonged to the State in its capacity as supreme landlord, never constituted part of the private fortune of the cultivator, and does, in fact, no more enter into taxation, properly so called, than the rent paid by the British farmers to the British aristocracy can be said to enter British taxation. Indian taxation, according to this point of view, would stand thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate sum raised</td>
<td>£30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct for opium revenue</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct for rent of land</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxation proper</strong></td>
<td><strong>£9,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of this £9,000,000, again, it must be admitted that some important items, such as the post-office, the stamp duties, and the customs duties, bear in a very minute proportion on the mass of the people. Accordingly, Mr. Hendriks, in a paper recently laid before the British Statistical Society on the Finances of India,\(^a\) tries

\(^a\) *The Economist*, No. 772, June 12, 1858.—*Ed.*
to prove, from Parliamentary and other official documents, that of
the total revenue paid by the people of India, not more than
one-fifth is at present raised by taxation, i.e., from the real
income of the people; that in Bengal 27 per cent only, in the
Punjab 23 per cent only, in Madras 21 per cent only, in the
North-West Provinces 17 per cent only, and in Bombay 16 per
cent only of the total revenue is derived from taxation proper.

The following comparative view of the average amount of
taxation derived from each inhabitant of India and the United
Kingdom, during the years 1855-56, is abstracted from
Mr. Hendriks's statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Taxation proper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
<td>£0 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Provinces</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>4 7 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>8 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>3 3 0 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>- 1 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a different year the following estimate of the average paid
by each individual to the national revenue is made by Gen.
Briggs:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In England, 1852</td>
<td>£ 1 19 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In France</td>
<td>1 12 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Prussia</td>
<td>0 19 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In India, 1854</td>
<td>0 3 8 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these statements it is inferred by the apologists of the
British Administration that there is not a single country in Europe,
where, even if the comparative poverty of India is taken into
account, the people are so lightly taxed. Thus it seems that not
only opinions with respect to Indian taxation are conflicting, but
that the facts from which they purport to be drawn are themselves
contradictory. On the one hand, we must admit the nominal
amount of Indian taxation to be relatively small; but on the other,
we might heap evidence upon evidence from Parliamentary
documents, as well as from the writings of the greatest authorities
on Indian affairs, all proving beyond doubt that this apparently
light taxation crushes the mass of the Indian people to the dust,
and that its exaction necessitates a resort to such infamies as
torture, for instance. But is any other proof wanted beyond the
constant and rapid increase of the Indian debt and the accumula-
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a The Economist, No. 772, June 12, 1858.—Ed.
tion of Indian deficits? It will certainly not be contended that the Indian Government prefers increasing debts and deficits because it shrinks from touching too roughly upon the resources of the people. It embarks in debt, because it sees no other way to make both ends meet. In 1805 the Indian debt amounted to £25,626,631; in 1829 it reached about £34,000,000; in 1850 £47,151,018; and at present it amounts to about £60,000,000. By the by, we leave out of the count the East Indian debt contracted in England, which is also chargeable upon the East Indian revenue.

The annual deficit, which in 1805 amounted to about two and a half millions, had, under Lord Dalhousie's administration, reached the average of five millions. Mr. George Campbell of the Bengal Civil Service, and of a mind strongly biased in favor of the Anglo-Indian administration, was obliged to avow, in 1852, that:

"Although no Oriental conquerors have ever obtained so complete an ascendency, so quiet, universal and undisputed possession of India as we have, yet all have enriched themselves from the revenues of the country, and many have out of their abundance laid out considerable sums on works of public improvements. ...From doing this we are debarred. ...The quantity of the whole burden is by no means diminished" (under the English rule), "yet we have no surplus."  

In estimating the burden of taxation, its nominal amount must not fall heavier into the balance than the method of raising it and the manner of employing it. The former is detestable in India, and in the branch of the land-tax, for instance, wastes perhaps more produce than it gets. As to the application of the taxes, it will suffice to say that no part of them is returned to the people in works of public utility, more indispensable in Asiatic countries than anywhere else, and that, as Mr. Bright justly remarked, nowhere so extravagant is a provision made for the governing class itself.

Written on June 29, 1858

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5383, July 23, 1858 as a leading article

---

b Ibid., p. 414.—Ed.
c Ibid., p. 417.—Ed.
d Ibid., p. 406. Italics by Marx.—Ed.
e J. Bright's speech in the House of Commons on June 24, 1858, The Times, No. 23029, June 25, 1858.—Ed.
The war in India is gradually passing into that stage of desultory guerrilla warfare, to which, more than once, we have pointed as its next impending and most dangerous phase of development. The insurgent armies, after their successive defeats in pitched battles, and in the defense of towns and entrenched camps, gradually dissolve into smaller bodies of from two to six or eight thousand men, acting, to a certain degree, independently of each other, but always ready to unite for a short expedition against any British detachment which may be surprised singly. The abandonment of Bareilly without a blow, after having drawn the active field force of Sir C. Campbell some eighty miles away from Lucknow, was the turning point, in this respect, for the main army of the insurgents; the abandonment of Calpee had the same significance for the second great body of natives. In either case, the last defensible central base of operations was given up, and the warfare of an army thereby becoming impossible, the insurgents made eccentric retreats by separating into smaller bodies. These movable columns require no large town for a central base of operations. They can find means of existence, of re-equipment, and of recruitment in the various districts in which they move; and a small town or a large village as a center of reorganization may be as valuable to each of them as Delhi, Lucknow, or Calpee to the larger armies. By this change, the war loses much of its interest; the movements of the various columns of insurgents cannot be followed up in detail and appear confused in the accounts; the operations of the British commanders, to a great
extent, escape criticism, from the unavoidable obscurity enveloping the premises on which they are based; success or failure remain the only criterion, and they are certainly of all the most deceitful.

This uncertainty respecting the movements of the natives is already very great. After the taking of Lucknow, they retreated eccentrically—some south-east, some north-east, some north-west. The latter were the stronger body, and were followed by Campbell into Rohilcund. They had concentrated and re-formed at Bareilly; but when the British came up, they abandoned the place without resistance, and again retreated in different directions. Particulars of these different lines of retreat are not known. We only know that a portion went toward the hills on the frontiers of Nepaul, while one or more columns appear to have marched in the opposite direction, toward the Ganges and the Doab (the country between the Ganges and the Jumna). No sooner, however, had Campbell occupied Bareilly, than the insurgents, who had retreated in an easterly direction, effected a junction with some bodies on the Oude frontier and fell upon Shahjehanpore, where a small British garrison had been left; while further insurgent columns were hastening in that direction. Fortunately for the garrison, Brigadier Jones arrived with re-enforcements as early as the 11th of May, and defeated the natives; but they, too, were re-enforced by the columns concentrating on Shahjehanpore, and again invested the town on the 15th. On this day, Campbell, leaving a garrison in Bareilly, marched to its relief; but it was not before the 24th of May that he attacked them and drove them back, the various columns of insurgents which had cooperated in this maneuver again dispersing in different directions.

While Campbell was thus engaged on the frontiers of Rohilcund, Gen. Hope Grant marched his troops backward and forward in the South of Oude, without any result, except losses to his own force by fatigue under an Indian Summer's sun. The insurgents were too quick for him. They were everywhere but where he happened to look for them, and when he expected to find them in front, they had long since again gained his rear. Lower down the Ganges, Gen. Lugard was occupied with a chasse after a similar shadow in the district between Dinapore, Jugdespore and Buxar. The natives kept him constantly on the move, and, after drawing him away from Jugdespore, all at once fell upon the garrison of that place. Lugard returned, and a telegram reports his having gained a victory on the 26th.\textsuperscript{a} The identity of

\textsuperscript{a} "Alexandria, June 23", "From the India-House", \textit{The Times}, No. 23032, June 29, 1858.—\textit{Ed.}
the tactics of these insurgents with those of the Oude and Rohilcund columns is evident. The victory gained by Lugard will, however, scarcely be of much importance. Such bands can afford to be beaten a good many times before they become demoralized and weak.

Thus, by the middle of May, the whole insurgent force of Northern India had given up warfare on a large scale, with the exception of the army of Calpee. This force, in a comparatively short time, had organized in that town a complete center of operations; they had provisions, powder and other stores in profusion, plenty of guns, and even foundries and musket manufactories. Though within 25 miles of Cawnpore, Campbell had left them unmolested; he merely observed them by a force on the Doab or western side of the Jumna. Generals Rose and Whitlock had been on the march to Calpee for a long while; at last Rose arrived, and defeated the insurgents in a series of engagements in front of Calpee. The observing force on the other side of the Jumna, in the mean time, had shelled the town and fort, and suddenly the insurgents evacuated both, breaking up this their last large army into independent columns. The roads taken by them are not at all clear, from the accounts received; we only know that some have gone into the Doab, and others toward Gwalior.\footnote{Here and below “Bombay, June 4”, \textit{The Times}, No. 23037, July 5, 1858.— Ed.}

Thus the whole district from the Himalaya to the Bihar and Vindhy mountains, and from Gwalior and Delhi to Joruckpore and Dinapore, is swarming with active insurgent bands, organized to a certain degree by the experience of a twelve months war, and encouraged, amid a number of defeats, by the indecisive character of each, and by the small advantages gained by the British. It is true, all their strongholds and centers of operations have been taken from them; the greater portion of their stores and artillery are lost; the important towns are all in the hands of their enemies. But on the other hand, the British, in all this vast district, hold nothing but the towns, and of the open country, nothing but the spot where their movable columns happen to stand; they are compelled to chase their nimble enemies without any hope of attaining them; and they are under the necessity of entering upon this harassing mode of warfare at the very deadliest season of the year. The native Indian can stand the mid-day heat of his Summer with comparative comfort, while mere exposure to the rays of the sun is almost certain death to the European; he can march forty
miles in such a season, where ten break down his northern opponent; to him even the hot rains and swampy jungles are comparatively innocuous, while dysentery, cholera, and ague follow every exertion made by Europeans in the rainy season or in swampy neighborhoods. We are without detailed accounts of the sanitary condition of the British army; but from the comparative numbers of those struck by the sun and those hit by the enemy in Gen. Rose's army, from the report that the garrison of Lucknow is sickly, that the 38th regiment arrived last Autumn above 1,000 strong, now scarcely numbers 550, and from other indications we may draw the conclusion that the Summer's heat, during April and May, has done its work among the newly-imported men and lads who have replaced the bronzed old Indian soldiers of last year's campaign. With the men Campbell has, he cannot undertake the forced marches of Havelock nor a siege during the rainy season like that of Delhi. And although the British Government are again sending off strong re-enforcements, it is doubtful whether they will be sufficient to replace the wear and tear of this Summer's campaign against an enemy who declines to fight the British except on terms most favorable to himself.

The insurgent warfare now begins to take the character of that of the Bedouins of Algeria against the French; with the difference that the Hindoos are far from being so fanatical, and that they are not a nation of horsemen. This latter is important in a flat country of immense extent. There are plenty of Mohammedians among them who would make good irregular cavalry; still the principal cavalry nations of India have not joined the insurrection so far. The strength of their army is in the infantry, and that arm being unfit to meet the English in the field, becomes a drag in guerrilla warfare in the plain; for in such a country the sinew of desultory warfare is irregular cavalry. How far this want may be remedied during the compulsory holiday the English will have to take during the rains, we shall see. This holiday will, altogether, give the natives an opportunity of reorganizing and recruiting their forces. Beside the organization of cavalry, there are two more points of importance. As soon as the cold weather sets in, guerrilla warfare alone will not do. Centers of operation, stores, artillery, intrenched camps or towns, are required to keep the British busy until the cold season is over; otherwise the guerrilla warfare might be extinguished before the next Summer gives it fresh life. Gwalior appears to be, among others, a favorable point, if the insurgents have really got hold of it. Secondly, the fate of the insurrection is dependent upon its being
able to expand. If the dispersed columns cannot manage to cross from Rohilcund into Rajpootana and the Mahratta country; if the movement remains confined to the northern central district, then, no doubt, the next Winter will suffice to disperse the bands, and to turn them into dacoits, which will soon be more hateful to the inhabitants than even the palefaced invaders.

Written on July 6, 1858

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5381, July 21, 1858 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
The latest India bill has passed through its third reading in the House of Commons, and since the Lords swayed by Derby's influence, are not likely to show fight, the doom of the East India Company appears to be sealed. They do not die like heroes, it must be confessed; but they have bartered away their power, as they crept into it, bit by bit, in a business-like way. In fact, their whole history is one of buying and selling. They commenced by buying sovereignty, and they have ended by selling it. They have fallen, not in a pitched battle, but under the hammer of the auctioneer, into the hands of the highest bidder. In 1693 they procured from the Crown a charter for twenty-one years by paying large sums to the Duke of Leeds and other public officers. In 1767 they prolonged their tenure of power for two years by the promise of annually paying £400,000 into the Imperial exchequer. In 1769 they struck a similar bargain for five years; but soon after, in return for the Exchequer's foregoing the stipulated annual payment and lending them £1,400,000 at 4 per cent, they alienated some parcels of sovereignty, leaving to Parliament in the first instance the nomination of the Governor-General and four Councilors, altogether surrendering to the Crown the appointment of the Lord Chief Justice and his three Judges, and agreeing to the conversion of the Court of Proprietors from a democratic into an oligarchic body. In 1858, after having solemnly pledged themselves to the Court of Proprietors to resist by all constitutional "means" the transfer to the Crown of the governing powers of the

---

a See The Times, No. 23036, July 3, 1858.—Ed.
East India Company,\(^a\) they have accepted that principle, and agreed to a bill penal as regards the Company, but securing emolument and place to its principal Directors. If the death of a hero, as Schiller says, resembles the setting of the sun,\(^b\) the exit of the East India Company bears more likeness to the compromise effected by a bankrupt with his creditors.

By this bill the principal functions of administration are intrusted to a Secretary of State in Council,\(^572\) just as at Calcutta the Governor-General in Council manages affairs. But both these functionaries—the Secretary of State in England and the Governor-General in India—are alike authorized to disregard the advice of their assessors and to act upon their own judgment. The new bill also invests the Secretary of State with all the powers at present exercised by the President of the Board of Control, through the agency of the Secret Committee—the power, that is, in urgent cases, of dispatching orders to India without stopping to ask the advice of his Council. In constituting that Council it has been found necessary, after all, to resort to the East India Company as the only practicable source of appointments to it other than nominations by the Crown. The elective members of the Council are to be elected by the Directors of the East India Company from among their own number.

Thus, after all, the name of the East India Company is to outlive its substance. At the last hour it was confessed by the Derby Cabinet that their bill contains no clause abolishing the East India Company, as represented by a Court of Directors, but that it becomes reduced to its ancient character of a company of stockholders, distributing the dividends guaranteed by different acts of legislation.\(^c\) Pitt's bill of 1784 virtually subjected their government to the sway of the Cabinet under the name of the Board of Control. The act of 1813 stripped them of their monopoly of commerce, save the trade with China. The act of 1834 destroyed their commercial character altogether, and the act of 1854 annihilated their last remnant of power, still leaving them in possession of the Indian administration. By the rotation of history the East India Company, converted in 1612 into a joint-stock company, is again clothed in its primitive garb, only that it represents now a trading partnership without trade, and a

---

\(a\) *The Times*, No. 22896, January 21, 1858.---*Ed.*

\(b\) Schiller, *Die Räuber*, Act III, Scene II.---*Ed.*

\(c\) H. Cairns' speech in the House of Commons on July 8, 1858, *The Times*, No. 23041, July 9, 1858.---*Ed.*
joint-stock company which has no funds to administer, but only fixed dividends to draw.

The history of the Indian bill is marked by greater dramatic changes than any other act of modern Parliamentary legislation. When the Sepoy insurrection broke out, the cry of Indian reform rang through all classes of British society. Popular imagination was heated by the torture reports; the Government interference with the native religion was loudly denounced by Indian general officers and civilians of high standing; the rapacious annexation policy of Lord Dalhousie, the mere tool of Downing street; the fermentation recklessly created in the Asiatic mind by the piratical wars in Persia and China—wars commenced and pursued on Palmerston's private dictation—the weak measures with which he met the outbreak, sailing ships being chosen for transport in preference to steam vessels, and the circuitous navigation around the cape of Good Hope instead of trasportation over the Isthmus of Suez—all these accumulated grievances burst into the cry for Indian Reform—reform of the Company's Indian administration, reform of the Government's Indian policy. Palmerston caught at the popular cry, but resolved upon turning it to his exclusive profit. Because both the Government and the Company had miserably broken down, the Company was to be killed in sacrifice, and the Government to be rendered omnipotent. The power of the Company was to be simply transferred to the dictator of the day, pretending to represent the Crown as against the Parliament, and to represent Parliament as against the Crown, thus absorbing the privileges of the one and the other in his single person. With the Indian army at his back, the Indian treasury at his command, and the Indian patronage in his pocket, Palmerston's position would have become impregnable.

His bill passed triumphanty through the first reading, but his career was cut short by the famous Conspiracy bill, followed by the advent of the Tories to power.

On the very first day of their official reappearance on the Treasury benches, they declared that, out of deference for the decisive will of the Commons, they would forsake their opposition to the transfer from the Company to the Crown of the Indian Government. Lord Ellenborough's legislative abortion seemed to hasten Palmerston's restoration, when Lord John Russell, in order to force the dictator into a compromise, stepped in, and saved the

---

*E. G. Derby's speech in the House of Lords on March 1, 1858, *The Times*, No. 22930, March 2, 1858.—*Ed.*
Government by proposing to proceed with the Indian bill by way of Parliamentary resolution, instead of by a governmental bill. Then Lord Ellenborough's Oude dispatch, his sudden resignation, and the consequent disorganization in the Ministerial camp, were eagerly seized upon by Palmerston. The Tories were again to be planted in the cold shade of opposition, after they had employed their short lease of power in breaking down the opposition of their own party against the confiscation of the East India Company. Yet it is sufficiently known how these fine calculations were baffled. Instead of rising on the ruins of the East India Company, Palmerston has been buried beneath them. During the whole of the Indian debates, the House seemed to indulge the peculiar satisfaction of humiliating the Civis Romanus. All his amendments, great and small, were ignominiously lost; allusions of the most unsavory kind, relating to the Afghan war, the Persian war, and the Chinese war, were continually flung at his head; and Mr. Gladstone's clause, withdrawing from the Indian Minister the power of originating wars beyond the boundaries of India, intended as a general vote of censure on Palmerston's past foreign policy, was passed by a crushing majority, despite his furious resistance. But although the man has been thrown overboard, his principle, upon the whole, has been accepted. Although somewhat checked by the obstructive attributes of the Board of Council, which, in fact, is but the well-paid specter of the old Court of Directors, the power of the executive has, by the formal annexation of India, been raised to such a degree that, to counterpoise it, democratic weight must be thrown into the Parliamentary scale.

Written on July 9, 1858
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a J. Russell's speech in the House of Commons on April 12, 1858, The Times, No. 22966, April 13, 1858.— Ed.

b W. E. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on July 6, 1858, The Times, No. 23039, July 7, 1858.— Ed.
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEUE ZEIT

[London, not later than July 12, 1858]

How a German "man of the people" and "poet" succeeds in combining the Pleasant with the Useful.

Four weeks ago Dr Kinkel inserted the following advertisement in The Manchester Guardian:

"Tour through the English Lakes. Reading German Literature. A Professor of German at one of the most distinguished educational establishments in this country will read to a Party composed of Ladies and Gentlemen: Schiller's Gedichte, 'Don Carlos', Auerbach's 'Dorfgeschichten' and Hauff's 'Bettlerin vom Pont des Arts'. This Party being a select one, care will be taken to keep it so, and to connect by these means sociable and pleasant intercourse with instructive and entertaining reading. The Party to start from Kendall, Monday, July 5th. Early applications will oblige, as none will be received after June 19th. Address to the Publisher of this paper for Dr. K."\n
For the edification of such of our German readers who have not completely mastered the English tongue, I append a translation of this concoction which is a curiosity if only by reason of its style.\n
..."This Party being a select one" (how republican and how grammatical!)... "by these means" (how?)...

If desired, I can provide a cutting of the original advertisement.

Anti-Humbug

First published in Die Neue Zeit, London, No. 4, July 17, 1858

Published according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

---

\a Quoted by Marx in English.—Ed.

\b In the original there follows a German rendering with comments in brackets by Marx. Only these have been retained, preceded by the particular words to which they refer.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

TRANSPORT OF TROOPS TO INDIA

London, July 27, 1858

At the beginning of the Anglo-Indian war, two curious questions were mooted—the one relating to the respective superiority of steamers or sailing vessels, the other as to the use of the overland route for the transport of troops. The British Government having decided in favor of sailing vessels against steamers, and for the voyage round the Cape of Good Hope against the overland route, the House of Commons, on the motion of Sir De Lacy Evans, ordered, on the 4th of February, 1858, a Committee to be appointed, under the chairmanship of the veteran General, which was to inquire "concerning the measures resorted to." The formation of this Committee was completely altered by the intervening change of Ministry, consequent upon which three Palmerstonians were substituted for Lord Stanley and Sir John Pakington. The report of the Committee proving, on the whole, favorable to the late Administration, Gen. Sir De Lacy Evans had a protest printed and circulated, in which he asserts the conclusion arrived at to be at utter variance with the premises from which it pretended to be drawn, and quite inconsistent with the facts and evidence laid before them. An examination of the evidence itself must oblige all impartial persons to fully concur in this view of the case.

The decisive importance of a short line of communication between an army in the field and its base of communication needs no demonstration. During the American War of Independence the principal obstacle England had to grapple with was a sea line
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"G. de Lacy Evans' speech in the House of Commons on February 4, 1858, The Times, No. 22909, February 5, 1858.—Ed."
of 3,000 miles over which she had to convey her troops, stores and re-enforcements. From Great Britain to the mouths of the Indus and Ganges, to Calcutta, Madras, Kurrachee and Bombay, the distance, according to past arrangements, may be reckoned at about 14,000 miles; but the use of steam offered the means of shortening it considerably. Hitherto on all occasions it had been the practice to effect the relief of regiments in India, by this long sea voyage in sailing vessels. This was considered a sufficient reason on the part of the late British Administration, for declaring at the beginning of the Indian troubles, that sailing vessels would still be preferred to steamers for the conveyance of troops. Up to the 10th of July, 1857, of 31 vessels taken up, nearly the whole were sailing ships. Meanwhile, public censure in England and unfavorable news from India effected so much that in the interval from the 10th of July to the 1st of December, among the 59 ships taken up for troops, 29 screw steamers were admitted. Thus a rough test was afforded of the relative qualities of steamers and sailing vessels in accomplishing the transit. According to the return furnished by the Marine Department of the East India Company, giving names of transports and length of passages to the four principal ports of India, the following may be considered the average results as between steamers and sailing vessels.

**From England to Calcutta.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From August 6 to October 21, 1857, average of steamers, omitting fractions</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 22 sailing vessels, from June 10 to August 27, 1857</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in favor of steamers 34

**To Madras.**

Average of 2 steamers 90
Average of 2 sailing ships 131

Difference in favor of steamers 41

**To Bombay.**

Average of 5 steamers 76
Average of 9 sailing ships 118

Difference in favor of steamers 42
To Kurrachee.

Average of 3 steamers ........................................... 91
Average of 10 ships .............................................. 128

Difference in favor of steamers ....................... 37

Average of the whole of the 19 passages by steamers to
the four ports of India ................................. 83
Average passage of 43 sailing ships ................ 120

Difference between averages of steam
and sailing vessels ........................................ 37

The same official return, dated Feb. 27, 1858, gives the
following details:

Men.

To Calcutta were conveyed by steamers .............. 6,798
By sailing ships ........................................... 9,489

Total to Calcutta ........................................... 16,287

To Madras, by steamers .................................. 2,089
By sailing ships ........................................... 985

Total to Madras ........................................... 3,074

To Bombay, by steamers .................................. 3,906
By sailing ships ........................................... 3,439

Total to Bombay ........................................... 7,345

To Kurrachee, by steamers ............................... 1,351
By sailing ships ........................................... 2,321

Total to Kurrachee ........................................ 3,672

It appears, then, from the above that 27 steamers carried to the
four ports of disembarkation in India 14,144 men, averaging,
therefore, 548 men in each ship; that in 55 sailing ships were
conveyed 16,234 men, averaging 289 men in each. Now, by the
same official statement of averages, it appears that the 14,144 men
conveyed in steamers arrived at their respective places of
destination on an average of 37 days sooner than the 16,234 men
embarked on sailing ships. On the part of the British Admiralty
and the other ministerial departments no arguments were
adduced in favor of the traditionary transport but precedent and
routine, both dating from an epoch when steam navigation was
utterly unknown. Lord Palmerston’s principal plea, however, for the delay was expense, the cost of steamers in most of the above cases amounting to perhaps treble that of sailing ships. Apart from the fact that this great enhancement of charge for steamers must have gradually diminished after the first unusual demand, and that in so vital an emergency expense ought not to be admitted as an element of calculation, it is evident that the increased cost of transport would have been more than compensated for by the lessened chances of the insurrection.

Still more important than the question of superiority as between steamers and sailing vessels, seems the controversy respecting the voyage round the Cape on the one hand and the overland route on the other; Lord Palmerston affirming the general impracticability of the latter route. A controversy in regard to it between his Board of Control and the East India Directors, appears to have commenced cotemporaneously with the first information of the Indian revolt reaching England. The question had, in fact, been solved as long ago as the beginning of this century. In the year 1801, when there were no steam navigation company’s agents to aid the military arrangements, and when no railway existed, a large force under Sir David Baird proceeded from India and landed at Kosseir in May and June; crossed in nine days the desert of Kherie, on the Nile; proceeded down that river, garrisoned Alexandria, and in the following year, 1802, several regiments returned to India by Suez and the Red Sea, in the month of June. That force, amounting to 5,000 men, consisted of a troop of horse-artillery, six guns and small arms, ammunition, camp equipage, baggage, and 126 chests of treasure. The troops generally were very healthy. The march across the Suez Desert, from the lake of St. Pilgrims, near Grand Cairo to Suez, was performed in four days with the greatest ease, marching by night and encamping during the day. In June the ships proceeded to India, the wind at that season blowing down the Red Sea. They made a very quick passage. Again, during the late Russian war, in the summer of 1854, the 10th and 11th regiments of Dragoons (1,400 horses, 1,600 men) arrived in Egypt from India, and were forwarded thence to the Crimea. These corps, though their transfer took place during the hot months, or monsoon, and though they had to remain some time in Egypt, are known to have
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been remarkably healthy and efficient, and to have continued so throughout their Crimean service. In the last instance there is the experience of the actual Indian war. After the waste of nearly four months, some thousand troops were dispatched by Egypt with extraordinary advantage as to economy of time, and with perfect preservation of health. The first regiment that was conveyed by this line passed from Plymouth to Bombay in thirty-seven days. Of the first regiment sent from Malta, the first wing arrived at Bombay in sixteen and the second wing in eighteen days. An overwhelming mass of evidence, from numerous trustworthy witnesses, attest the peculiar facilities, especially in periods of emergency, afforded by the overland route transport. Col. Poeklington, Deputy Quartermaster-General, appointed in October, 1857, to direct and superintend the transit of the troops, and who, expressly prepared by order of the War Department a report for the Committee of Inquiry, states:

"The advantages of the overland route are very considerable, and the trajet is most simple. A thousand men per week can be conveyed across the isthmus by the Transit administration of Egypt without interference with the ordinary passenger traffic. Between 300 and 400 men can move at a time, and perform the distance from ship to ship in 26 hours. The transit by rail is completed to within almost twenty miles of Suez. This last portion of the journey is performed by the soldiers on donkeys in about six hours. There can be no doubt as to the experiment having succeeded."

The time occupied by troops from England to India is, by the overland route, from 33 to 46 days. From Malta to India, from 16 to 18 or 20 days. Compare these periods with the 83 by steamers, or the 120 by sailing ships, on the long sea route, and the difference will appear striking. Again, during the longer route, Great Britain will have from 15,000 to 20,000 troops, in effect hors de combat,\(^a\) and beyond counter orders for a period annually, of from 3 to 4 months, while, with the shorter line, it will be but for the brief period of some 14 days, during the transit from Suez to India, that the troops will be beyond reach of recall, for any unexpected European contingency.

In resorting to the overland route only 4 months after the outbreak of the Indian war, and then only for a mere handful of troops, Palmerston set at naught the general anticipation of India and Europe. The Governor-General in India\(^b\) assumed that the Home Government would dispatch troops by the way of Egypt. The following is a passage from the Governor-General in Council's

\(^a\) Out of action.— Ed.
\(^b\) Charles John Canning.— Ed.
Transport of Troops to India

letter to the Home Government, dated Aug. 7, 1857:

“We are also in communication with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the conveyance from Suez of the troops that may possibly have been dispatched to India by that route.”

On the very day of the arrival at Constantinople of the news of the revolt, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe telegraphed to London to know whether he should apply to the Turkish Government to allow the British troops to pass through Egypt, on their way to India. The Sultan\(^a\) having meanwhile offered and transmitted a firman to that effect on the 2d of July, Palmerston replied by telegraph, that it was not his intention to send troops by that route. It being in France likewise assumed, as a matter of course, that the acceleration of the military re-enforcements must at that moment form the paramount object of British policy, Bonaparte spontaneously tendered permission for the passage over France of British troops, to enable their being embarked, if deemed desirable, at Marseilles, for Egypt. The Pasha of Egypt\(^b\) lastly, when, at length, Mr. Holton, the Superintendent of the Peninsular and Oriental Company in Egypt, was authorized to reply on the subject, answered immediately,

“It would be a satisfaction to him to give facility to the passage of not only 200 men, as in the present instance, but to that of 20,000, if necessary, and not en bourgeois\(^c\) but in uniform, and with their arms, if required.”

Such were the facilities recklessly thrown away, the proper use of which might have prevented the Indian war from assuming its formidable dimensions. The motives by which Lord Palmerston was prompted in preferring sailing vessels to steamers, and a line of communication extending over 14,000 miles to one limited to 4,000 miles, belong to the mysteries of cotemporaneous history.

Written between July 16 and 20, 1858 Reproduced from the newspaper

First published unsigned in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5401, August 13, 1858

\(^a\) Abdul Mejid.— Ed.
\(^b\) Said Pasha.— Ed.
\(^c\) In civilian clothes.— Ed.
London, July 23, 1858

The great Bulwer scandal, which The London Times thought to be "fortunately" hushed up by an amicable family arrangement, is far from having subsided into a state of quiescence. It is true that, despite the great party interest involved, the metropolitan press, with some trifling exceptions, did everything in its power to hush the case by a conspiracy of silence—Sir Edward Bulwer being one of the chiefs of the literary coterie which lords it more despotically over the heads of the London journalists than even party connection, and to openly affront whose wrath literary gentlemen generally lack the necessary courage. The Morning Post first informed the public that Lady Bulwer's friends intended insisting upon legal investigation; The London Times reprinted the short paragraph of The Morning Post, and even The Advertiser, although it certainly has no literary position to hazard, did not venture beyond some meager extracts from The Somerset Gazette. Even Palmerston's influence proved for the moment unavailing to extort anything from his literary retainers, and on the appearance of the flippantly apologetical letter of Bulwer's son, all these public guardians of the liberty of the subject, while declaring themselves highly satisfied, deprecated any further indeicate intrusion upon the "painful matter." The Tory press, of course, has long since spent all its virtuous indignation on Lord Clanricarde's behalf, and the Radical press, which more or less receives its inspirations from
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the Manchester school, anxious to avoid creating any embarrassment to the present Administration. Yet, along with the respectable or would-be respectable press of the metropolis, there exists an irrespectable press, absolutely swayed by its political patrons with no literary standing to check them, always ready to coin money out of its privilege of free speech, and anxious to improve an opportunity of appearing in the eyes of the public as the last representatives of manliness. On the other hand, the moral instincts of the bulk of the people once awakened, there will be no need of further maneuvering. The public mind once worked into a state of moral excitement, even The London Times may throw off its mask of reserve, and, with a bleeding heart of course, stab the Derby Administration by passing the sentence of “public opinion” on such a literary chieftain even as Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton.

This is exactly the turn things are now taking. That Lord Palmerston, as we hinted at first, is the secret manager of the spectacle is now un secret qui court les rues, as the French say.

"On dit," says a London weekly, "that Lady Bulwer-Lytton’s best friend in this affair has been Lady Palmerston. We all remember how the Tories took up the cudgels for Mr. Norton when Lord Melbourne was in trouble about that gentleman’s wife. Tit for tat is fair play. But on reflection it is rather sad at this time of day to find a Secretary of State using the influence of his position to commit acts of oppression, and the wife of a Minister playing off the wife of another Minister against an Administration."

It is often by the crooked ways of political intrigue only that truth becomes smuggled into some corner of the British press. The apparently generous horror at a real outrage is after all but a calculated grimace; and public justice is only appealed to in order to cherish private malice. For aught the chivalrous knights of the inkhorn would care about it, Lady Bulwer might have remained forever in a lunatic asylum, at London; she might have been disposed of more quietly than at St. Petersburgh or Vienna; the conventionalities of literary decorum would have debarred her from any means of redress but for the happy circumstance of Palmerston’s keen eye singling her out as the thin end of the wedge wherewith possibly to split a Tory Administration.

A short analysis of the letter, addressed by Bulwer’s son to the London journals, will go far to elucidate the true state of the case. Mr. Robert B. Lytton sets out by asserting that his “simple assertion” must be “at once believed in,” because he is “the son of
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a A secret known to everybody.—Ed.
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Lady Bulwer-Lytton, with the best right to speak on her behalf, and obviously with the best means of information.” Now, this very tender son had neither cared for his mother, nor corresponded with her, nor seen her, for nearly seventeen years, until he met her at the hustings at Hertford on the occasion of his father’s re-election. When Lady Bulwer left the hustings and visited the Mayor of Hertford in order to apply for the use of the Town Hall as a lecturing room, Mr. Robert B. Lytton sent a physician into the Mayor’s house with the mission of taking cognizance of the state of the maternal mind. When, afterward, his mother was kidnapped in London, at the house of Mr. Hale Thompson, Clarges street, and her cousin Miss Ryves ran out into the street, and seeing Mr. Lytton waiting outside, entreated him to interfere and procure assistance to prevent his mother being carried off to Brentford, Mr. Lytton coolly refused to have anything to do with the matter. Having acted first as one of the principal agents in the plot laid by his father, he now shifts sides and presents himself as the natural spokesman of his mother. The second point pleaded by Mr. Lytton is, that his mother “was never for a moment taken to a lunatic asylum,” but, on the contrary, into the “private house” of Mr. Robert Gardiner Hill, surgeon. This is a mere quibble. As the “Wyke House,” conducted by Mr. Hill, does legally not belong to the category of “asylums,” but to that of “Metropolitan Licensed Houses,” it is literally true that Lady Bulwer was thrown, not into a “lunatic asylum,” but into a lunatic house.

Surgeon Hill, who trades upon his own account in “lunacy,” has also come out with an apology, wherein he states that Lady Bulwer had never been locked in, but, on the contrary, had enjoyed the use of a brougham and driven almost every evening during her detention to Richmond, Acton, Hanwell or Isleworth. Mr. Hill forgets to tell the public that this “improved treatment of the insane,” adopted by him, exactly corresponds to the official recommendation of the Commissioners in Lunacy. The friendly grimaces, the smiling forbearance, the childish coaxing, the oily twaddle, the knowing winks and the affected serenity of a band of trained attendants may drive a sensitive woman mad as well as douches, straight waistcoats, brutal keepers and dark wards. However that may be, the protests on the part of Mr. Surgeon Hill and Mr. Lytton amount simply to this, that Lady Bulwer was treated as a lunatic indeed, but after the rules of the new instead of the old system.

“I,” says Mr. Lytton, in his letter, “put myself in constant communication with my mother, ... and I carried out the injunctions of my father, who confided to me
implicitly every arrangement ... and enjoined me to avail myself of the advice of Lord Shaftesbury in whatever was judged best and kindest to Lady Lytton."

Lord Shaftesbury, it is known, is the commander-in-chief of the host who have their head-quarters at Exeter Hall. To deodorise a dirty affair by his odor of sanctity might be considered a *coup de théâtre* worthy of the inventive genius of a novel writer. More than once, in the Chinese business, for instance, and in the Cambridge House conspiracy, Lord Shaftesbury has been employed in that line. Yet Mr. Lytton admits the public only to a half confidence, otherwise he would have plainly declared that on the kidnapping of his mother an imperious note from Lady Palmerston upset Sir Edward's plans, and induced him to "avail himself of the advice of Lord Shaftesbury," who, by a particular mischance, happens to be at once Palmerston's son-in-law and the Chairman of the Commissioners in Lunacy. In his attempt at mystification, Mr. Lytton proceeds to state:

"From the moment my father felt compelled to authorize those steps which have been made the subject of so much misrepresentation, his anxiety was to obtain the opinion of the most experienced and able physicians, in order that my mother should not be subject to restraint for one moment longer than was strictly justifiable. Such was his charge to me."

From the evasive wording of this studiously awkward passage it appears, then, that Sir Edward Bulwer felt the necessity of authoritative medical advice, not for sequestrating his wife as insane, but for setting her free as *mentis compos*. In fact, the medical men upon whose consent Lady Bulwer was kidnapped were anything but "most experienced and able physicians." The fellows employed by Sir Edward were one Mr. Ross, a city apothecary, whom, it seems, his license for trading in drugs has all at once converted into a psychological luminary, and one Mr. Hale Thompson, formerly connected with the Westminster Hospital, but a thorough stranger to the scientific world. It was only after gentle pressure from without had set in, when Sir Edward felt anxious to retrace his steps, that he addressed himself to men of medical standing. Their certificates are published by his son—but what do they prove? Dr. Forbes Winslow, the editor of "The Journal of Psychological Medicine," who had previously been consulted by Lady Bulwer's legal advisers, certifies that, "having examined Lady B. Lytton as to her state of mind," he found it such as "to justify her liberation from restraint."  
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proved to the public was, not that Lady Bulwer's liberation, but on the contrary, that her restraint was justified. Mr. Lytton dares not touch upon this delicate and decisive point. Would not a constable, accused of illegal imprisonment of a free-born Briton, be laughed at for pleading that he had committed no wrong in setting his prisoner at large? But is Lady Bulwer really set at large?

"My mother," continues Mr. Lytton, "is now with me, free from all restraint, and about, at her own wish, to travel for a short time, in company with myself and a female friend and relation, of her own selection."

Mr. Lytton's letter is dated "No. 1 Park lane," that is, from the town residence of his father. Has, then, Lady Bulwer been removed from her place of confinement at Brentford to a place of confinement at London, and been bodily delivered up to an exasperated foe? Who warrants her being "free from all restraint?" At all events, when signing the proposed compromise, she was not free from restraint, but smarting under Surgeon Hill's improved system. The most important circumstance is this: While Sir Edward has spoken, Lady Bulwer has kept silence. No declaration on her part, given as she is to literary exercise, has met the public eye. An account written by herself, of her own treatment, has been cleverly withdrawn from the hands of the individual to whom it was addressed.

Whatever may be the agreement entered upon by the husband and the wife, the question for the British public is whether, under the cloak of the lunacy act, *lettres de cachet*\(^a\) may be issued by unscrupulous individuals able to pay tempting fees to two hungry practitioners. Another question is, whether a Secretary of State will be allowed to condone for a public crime by a private compromise. It has now oozed out that during the present year, while investigating into the state of a Yorkshire asylum, the Lunacy Commissioners discovered a man, in the full possession of his mental faculties, who, for several years, had been immured and secreted in a cellar. On a question being put in the House of Commons by Mr. Fitzroy, in regard to this case, Mr. Walpole answered that he had found "no record of the fact," an answer which denies the record but not the fact. That things will not be allowed to rest at this point, may be inferred from Mr. Tite's notice that "on an early day next session he would move for

\(^a\) Warrants for arrest and imprisonment.—*Ed.*
a select committee to inquire into the operation of the Lunacy act."

Written on July 23, 1858

First published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5393, August 4, 1858 and reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 1377, August 6, 1858, and also in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 882, August 7, 1858

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*
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There is, perhaps, no better established fact in British society than that of the corresponding growth of modern wealth and pauperism. Curiously enough, the same law seems to hold good with respect to lunacy. The increase of lunacy in Great Britain has kept pace with the increase of exports, and has outstripped the increase of population. Its rapid progress in England and Wales during the period extending from 1852 to 1857, a period of unprecedented commercial prosperity, will become evident from the following tabular comparison of the annual returns of paupers, lunatics and idiots for the years 1852, 1854 and 1857:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Patients in County or Borough Asylums</th>
<th>In licensed houses.</th>
<th>In Work-houses.</th>
<th>With friends or elsewhere</th>
<th>Total of Lunatics and Idiots</th>
<th>Proportion to population.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1852</td>
<td>17,927,609</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>21,158</td>
<td>1 in 847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1854</td>
<td>18,649,849</td>
<td>11,956</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>24,487</td>
<td>1 in 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1857</td>
<td>19,408,464</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>27,693</td>
<td>1 in 701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of acute and curable cases to those of a chronic and apparently incurable kind was, on the last day of 1856,
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estimated to be somewhat less than 1 in 5, according to the following summary of official returns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients of all classes in Asylums</th>
<th>Deemed curable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In County and Borough Asylums</td>
<td>14,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hospitals</td>
<td>1,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Metropolitan licensed Houses</td>
<td>2,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Provincial licensed Houses</td>
<td>2,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                             | 21,311          |
| Deemed curable                    | 3,327           |
| Deemed incurable                  | 17,984          |

There exist in England and Wales, for the accommodation of lunatics and idiots of all sorts and of all classes, 37 public asylums, of which 33 are county and 4 borough asylums; 15 hospitals; 116 private licensed houses, of which 37 are metropolitan and 79 provincial; and lastly, the workhouses. The public asylums, or lunatic asylums properly so called, were, by law, exclusively destined for the reception of the lunatic poor, to be used as hospitals for the medical treatment, not as safe places for the mere custody of the insane. On the whole, in the counties at least, they may be considered well regulated establishments, although of too extensive a construction to be properly superintended, overcrowded, lacking the careful separation of the different classes of patients, and yet inadequate to the accommodation of somewhat more than one-half of the lunatic poor. After all, the space afforded by these 37 establishments, spreading over the whole country, suffices for the housing of over 15,690 inmates. The pressure upon these costly asylums on the part of the lunatic population may be illustrated by one case. When, in 1831, Hanwell (in Middlesex) was built for 500 patients, it was supposed to be large enough to meet all the wants of the county. But, two years later, it was full; after another two years, it had to be enlarged for 300 more; and at this time (Colney Hatch having been meanwhile constructed for the reception of 1,200 lunatic paupers belonging to the same county) Hanwell contains upward of 1,000 patients. Colney Hatch was opened in 1851; within a period of less than five years, it became necessary to appeal to the rate-payers for further accommodation; and the latest returns show that at the close of 1856 there were more than 1,100 pauper lunatics belonging to the county unprovided for in either of its asylums. While the existing asylums are too large to be properly conducted,
their number is too small to meet rapid spread of mental disorders. Above all, the asylums ought to be separated into two distinct categories: asylums for the incurable, hospitals for the curable. By huddling both classes together, neither receives its proper treatment and cure.

The private licensed houses are, on the whole, reserved for the more affluent portion of the insane. Against these "snug retreats," as they like to call themselves, public indignation has been lately raised by the kidnapping of Lady Bulwer into Wyke House, and the atrocious outrages committed on Mrs. Turner in Acomb House, York. A Parliamentary inquiry into the secrets of the trade in British lunacy being imminent, we may refer to that part of the subject hereafter. For the present let us call attention only to the treatment of the 2,000 lunatic poor, whom, by way of contract, the Boards of Guardians and other local authorities let out to managers of private licensed houses. The weekly consideration per head for maintenance, treatment and clothing, allotted to these private contractors, varies from five to twelve shillings, but the average allowance may be estimated from 5s. to 8s. 4d. The whole study of the contractors consists, of course, in the one single point of making large profits out of these small receipts, and consequently of keeping the patient at the lowest possible expense. In their latest report the Commissioners of Lunacy state that even where the means of accommodation in these licensed houses are large and ample, the actual accommodation afforded is a mere sham, and the treatment of the inmates a disgrace.

It is true that a power is vested in the Lord Chancellor of revoking a license or preventing its renewal, on the advice of the Commissioners in Lunacy; but, in many instances, where there exists no public asylum in the neighborhood, or where the existing asylum is already overcrowded, no alternative was left the Commissioners but to prevent the license to continue, or to throw large masses of the insane poor into their several workhouses. Yet, the same Commissioners add that great as are the evils of the licensed houses, they are not so great as the danger and evil combined of leaving those paupers almost uncared for in workhouses. In the latter about 7,000 lunatics are at present confined. At first the lunatic wards in workhouses were restricted to the reception of such pauper lunatics as required little more than ordinary accommodation, and were capable of associating with the other inmates. What with the difficulty of obtaining
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admission for their insane poor into properly regulated asylums, what with motives of parsimony, the parochial boards are more and more transforming the workhouses into lunatic asylums, but into asylums wanting in the attendance, the treatment and the supervision which form the principal safeguard of patients detained in asylums regularly constituted. Many of the larger workhouses have lunatic wards containing from 40 to 120 inmates. The wards are gloomy and unprovided with any means for occupation, exercise or amusement. The attendants for the most part are pauper inmates totally unfitted for the charge imposed upon them. The diet, essential above everything else to the unhappy objects of mental disease, rarely exceeds in any case that allowed for the healthy and able-bodied inmates. Hence, it is a natural result that detention in workhouses not only deteriorates the cases of harmless imbecility for which it was originally intended, but has the tendency to render chronic and permanent cases that might have yielded to early care. The decisive principle for the Boards of Guardians is economy.

According to law, the insane pauper should come at first under the care of the district parish surgeon, who is bound to give notice to the relieving officers, by whom communication is to be made to the magistrate, upon whose order they are to be conveyed to the asylum. In fact, these provisions are disregarded altogether. The pauper lunatics are in the first instance hurried into the workhouses, there to be permanently detained, if found to be manageable. The recommendation of the Commissioners in Lunacy, during their visits to the workhouses, of removing to the asylums all inmates considered to be curable, or to be exposed to treatment unsuited to their state, is generally outweighed by the report of the medical officer of the Union, to the effect that the patient is "harmless." What the workhouse accommodation is, may be understood from the following illustrations described in the last Lunacy Report as "faithfully exhibiting the general characteristics of workhouse accommodation."

In the Infirmary Asylum of Norwich the beds of even the sick and feeble patients were of straw. The floors of thirteen small rooms were of stone. There were no water-closets. The nightwatch on the male side had been discontinued. There was a great deficiency of blankets, of toweling, of flannels, of waistcoats, of washing basins, of chairs, of plates, of spoons and of dining accommodation. The ventilation was bad. We quote:

"Neither was there any faith to be put in what, to outward appearance, might have been taken for improvement. It was discovered, for example, that in
reference to a considerable number of beds occupied by dirty patients, the practice exists of removing them in the morning and of substituting, merely for show during the day, clean beds of a better appearance, by means of sheets and blankets placed on the bedsteads, which were regularly taken away at night and the inferior beds replaced."

Take, as another example, the Blackburn Workhouse:

"The day rooms on the ground floor, occupied by the men, are small, low, gloomy and dirty, and the space containing 11 patients is much taken up by several heavy chairs, in which the patients are confined by means of straps, and a large, projecting fire-guard. Those of the women, on the upper floor, are also much crowded, and one, which is used also as a bedroom has a large portion boarded off as a privy; and the beds are placed close together, without any space between them. A bedroom containing 16 male patients was close and offensive. The room is 29 feet long, 17 feet 10 inches wide, and 7 feet 5 inches high, thus allowing 2.39 cubic feet for each patient. The beds throughout are of straw, and no other description is provided for sick or bed-ridden patients. The cases were generally much soiled and marked by the rusty iron laths of the bedsteads. The care of the beds seems to be chiefly left to the patients. A large number of the patients are dirty in their habits, which is mainly to be attributed to the want of proper care and attention. Very few chamber utensils are provided, and a tub is stated to be placed in the center of the large dormitory for the use of the male patients. The gravelled yards in which the patients walk are two for each sex, surrounded by high walls, and without seats. The largest of these is 74 feet long, by 30 feet 7 inches wide, and the smallest 32 feet by 17 feet 6 inches. A cell in one of the yards is occasionally used for secluding excited patients. It is entirely built of stone, and has a small, square opening for the admission of light, with iron bars let in to prevent the escape of the patient, but without either shutter or casement. A large straw bed was on the floor, and a heavy chair in one corner of the room. Complete control of the department is in the hands of an attendant and the nurse: the master seldom interferes with them, nor does he inspect this as closely as he does the other parts of the workhouse."

It would be too loathsome even to give extracts from the Commissioners' report on the St. Pancras Workhouse at London, a sort of low Pandemonium. Generally speaking, there are few English stables which, at the side of the lunatic wards in the workhouses, would not appear boudoirs, and where the treatment received by the quadrupeds may not be called sentimental when compared to that of the poor insane.

Written on July 30, 1858
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5407, August 20, 1858 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
The campaign in India has been almost completely suspended during the hot and rainy summer months. Sir Colin Campbell having secured, by a vigorous effort in the beginning of summer, all the important positions in Oude and Rohilcund, very wisely put his troops into quarters, leaving the open country in the possession of the insurgents, and limiting his efforts to maintaining his communications. The only episode of interest which occurred during this period in Oude, was the excursion of Sir Hope Grant to Shahgunge for the relief of Maun Singh, a native chief, who, after a deal of tergiversation, had lately made his peace with the British, and was now blockaded by his late native allies. The excursion proved a mere military promenade, though it must have caused great loss to the British by sun-stroke and cholera. The natives dispersed without showing fight, and Maun Singh joined the British. The easy success of this expedition, though it cannot be taken as an indication of an equally easy subjection of the whole of Oude, shows that the insurgents have lost heart completely. If it was the interest of the British to rest during the hot weather, it was the interest of the insurgents to disturb them as much as possible. But instead of organizing an active guerrilla warfare, intercepting the communications between the towns held by the enemy, of waylaying small parties, harassing the foragers, of rendering impassable the supply of victuals, without which no large town held by the British could live—instead of this, the natives have been satisfied with levying revenue and enjoying the leisure left to them by their opponents. Better still, they appear to have squabbled among themselves. Neither do they appear to have profited by the few quiet weeks to reorganize their forces, to refill
their ammunition stores, or to replace the lost artillery. The bolt at Shahgunge shows a still greater want of confidence in themselves and their leaders than any previous defeat. In the mean time, a secret correspondence is carried on between the majority of the chiefs and the British Government, who have after all found it rather impracticable to pocket the whole of the soil of Oude, and are quite willing to let the former owners have it again on reasonable terms. Thus, as the final success of the British is now beyond all doubt, the insurrection in Oude bids fair to die out without passing through a period of active guerrilla warfare. As soon as the majority of the landholders come to terms with the British, the insurgent bodies will be broken up, and those who have too much to fear from the Government will turn robbers (dacoits), in the capture of whom the peasantry will gladly assist.

South-west of Oude the Jugdispore jungles appear to offer a center for such dacoits. These impenetrable forests of bamboo and underwood are held by a party of insurgents under Ummer Singh, who shows rather more activity and knowledge of guerrilla warfare; at all events, he attacks the British whenever he can, instead of quietly waiting for them. If, as it is feared, part of the Oude insurgents should join him before he can be expelled from his stronghold, the British may expect rather harder work than they have had of late. These jungles have now for nearly eight months served as a retreat to insurgent parties, who have been able to render very insecure the Grand Trunk Road from Calcutta to Allahabad, the main communication of the British.

In Western India, the Gwalior insurgents are still followed up by Gen. Roberts and Col. Holmes. At the time of the capture of Gwalior, it was a question of much consequence, what direction the retreating army might take; for the whole of the Mahratta country and part of Rajpootana appeared ready for a rising as soon as a sufficiently strong body of regular troops arrived there to form a nucleus for the insurrection. A retreat of the Gwalior force in a south-westerly direction then seemed the most likely maneuver to realize such a result. But the insurgents, from reasons which we cannot guess at from the reports before us, have chosen a north-westerly direction. They went to Jeypore, thence turning south toward Oodeypore, trying to gain the road to the Mahratta country. But this roundabout marching gave Roberts an opportunity of coming up with them, and defeating them totally without any great effort. The remnants of this body, without guns, without organization and ammunition, without leaders of repute, are not the men who are likely to induce fresh risings. On the
contrary, the immense quantity of plunder which they carry along with them, and which hampers all their movements, appears already to have excited the avidity of the peasantry. Every straggling Sepoy is killed and eased of his load of gold mohurs. If it has come to that, Gen. Roberts may safely leave the final dispersion of these Sepoys to the country population. The loot of Scindiah’s treasures by his troops saves the British from a renewal of the insurrection in a quarter more dangerous than Hindostan; for a rising in the Mahratta country would put the Bombay army upon a rather severe trial.

There is a fresh mutiny in the neighborhood of Gwalior. A small vassal of Scindiah, Maun Singh (not the Maun Singh of Oude) has joined the insurgents, and got hold of the small fortress of Paoree. This place, is, however, already invested by the British, and must soon be captured.

In the meantime, the conquered districts are gradually pacified. The neighborhood of Delhi, it is said, has been so completely tranquillized by Sir J. Lawrence that a European may travel about with perfect safety; unarmed, and without an escort. The secret of the matter is, that the people of every village have been made collectively responsible for any crime or outrage committed on its ground; that a military police has been organized; and, above all, that the summary justice of the Court-Martial, so peculiarly impressive upon Orientals, is everywhere in full swing. Still, this success appears to be the exception, as we do not hear anything of the kind from other districts. The complete pacification of Rohilcund and Oude, of Bundelcund and many other large provinces, must yet require a very long time and give plenty of work yet to British troops and Court-Martials.

But while the insurrection of Hindostan dwindles down to dimensions which deprive it of almost all military interest, there has occurred an event far off, at the utmost frontiers of Afghanistan, which is big with the threat of future difficulties. A conspiracy to murder their officers and to rise against the British has been discovered among several Sikh regiments at Dera Ismael Khan. How far this conspiracy was ramified, we cannot tell. Perhaps it was merely a local affair, arising among a peculiar class of Sikhs; but we are not in a position to assert this. At all events, this is a highly dangerous symptom. There are now nearly 100,000 Sikhs in the British service, and we have heard how saucy they are; they fight, they say, to-day for the British, but may fight to-morrow against them, as it may please ‘God. Brave, passionate, fickle, they are even more subject to sudden and unexpected
impulses than other Orientals. If mutiny should break out in earnest among them, then would the British indeed have hard work to keep their own. The Sikhs were always the most formidable opponents of the British among the natives of India; they have formed a comparatively powerful empire\(^{583}\), they are of a peculiar sect of Brahminism, and hate both Hindoos and Mussulmans. They have seen the British “raj” in the utmost peril; they have contributed a great deal to restore it, and they are even convinced that their own share of the work was the decisive one. What is more natural than that they should harbor the idea that the time has come when the British raj shall be replaced by a Sikh raj, that a Sikh Emperor is to rule India from Delhi or Calcutta? It may be that this idea is still far from being matured among the Sikhs, it may be that they are so cleverly distributed that they are balanced by Europeans, so that any rising could be easily put down; but that this idea exists among them must be clear, we presume, to everybody who has read the accounts of the behaviour of the Sikhs after Delhi and Lucknow.

Still, for the present, the British have reconquered India. The great rebellion, stirred up by the mutiny of the Bengal army, is indeed, it appears, dying out. But this second conquest has not increased England’s hold upon the mind of the Indian people. The cruelty of the retribution dealt out by the British troops, goaded on by exaggerated and false reports of the atrocities attributed to the natives, and the attempt at confiscating the Kingdom of Oude, both wholesale and retail, have not created any particular fondness for the victors. On the contrary, they themselves confess that among both Hindoos and Mussulmans, the hereditary hatred against the Christian intruder is more fierce than ever. Impotent as this hatred may be at present, it is not without its significance and importance, while that menacing cloud is resting over the Sikh Punjaub. And this is not all. The two great Asiatic powers, England and Russia, have by this time got hold of one point between Siberia and India, where Russian and English interests must come into direct collision. That point is Pekin. Thence westward a line will ere long be drawn across the breadth of the Asiatic Continent, on which this collision of rival interests will constantly take place. Thus the time may indeed not be so very distant when “the Sepoy and the Cossack will meet in the plains of the Oxus,”\(^{584}\) and if that meeting is to take place, the

\(^{a}\) Amu Darya.— Ed.
anti-British passions of 150,000 native Indians will be a matter of serious consideration.

Written on about September 17, 1858

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5443, October 1, 1858 as a leading article
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
Venice and Genoa. (Trieste was linked with their Mediterranean trade...) Genoa. Latter half of the 13th century: Very substantial privileges accorded the Genoese in consequence of their support of the Greeks against the Catholic monarchs (privileges in Constantinople—Galata and Pera). Superior to the Venetians here; (in Constantinople and the Black Sea) Venetians favoured by the Catholic monarchs, commercial supremacy in Dalmatia, the Morea, Asia Minor, Cyprus, Syria, etc.

Causes of decline. Since the beginning of the 15th century, conquest of the Greek empire by the Turks; notably Constantinople in 1453. Italians lost their privileges there and their settlements in Constantinople, Syria, Armenia, on the Black Sea, etc. Accorded privileges by the sultans of Egypt, etc.

From the end of the 15th century the Portuguese sailing round the Cape of Good Hope. Market for Indian goods shifted to Lisbon. Very marked decline from mid-16th century. Moreover the discovery of America was of less use to them than to other states, etc. Venice severely handicapped since Constantinople no longer centre for trade and goods traffic from Asia.

Towards the end of the 18th century under French rule; war with England; trade declined in all Italian maritime towns.

Treaty of 1815 restored only small proportion of trade enjoyed even before the French Revolution; most of it went to Trieste, much favoured by the Austrian government. Trieste's volume of trade was three times greater than that of Venice. Trieste especially

---

a The words "Black Sea" are in English in the original.—Ed.
b Peloponnesus.—Ed.
favoured by the growing prosperity of the Russian ports, particularly Odessa, on the Black Sea. Captured the grain trade which had still been conducted by Venice as recently as the final decades of the 18th century.

Trieste. (1838) 1,700 houses, 52,000 inhabitants; on the Gulf of Trieste; also hemmed in by steep Karst Hills; 1,000 merchants; 700 brokers; English, French, German, Greek, Armenian, Jewish business houses.

Prior to the treaty of Campoformio of 17 October 1797 Napoleon had already dissolved the Venetian Republic in favour of the Cisalpine Republic consisting of Milan, Mantua, etc., the Valtellina, Romagna, etc. The greater part of the Venetian Free State as far as the Adige was annexed to Austria.

Treaty of Luneville 9 February 1801: The Adige thalweg became the boundary between Austria and the Cisalpine Republic; she acquired Venice with the greater part of the former Venetian Free State as far as the Adige thalweg, together with Istria, Venetian Dalmatia, the islands belonging thereto, and the Bocche di Cattaro.

1805. 26 September: Treaty of Pressburg. Austria loses her share of Venice to Italy.

1807. 10 October. Austria compelled to cede the county of Monfalcone to Italy, the result being that the Isonzo thalweg became her boundary.

14 October 1809 Treaty of Vienna: Napoleon created the so-called Illyrian Provinces out of the Villach District in Carinthia, the duchy of Carniola, the Trieste district, the county of Gorizia, Friuli, that part of Croatia on the right bank of the Sava including Fiume, as well as the Hungarian littoral and Austrian Istria, and annexed them to Istria, Dalmatia and Ragusa; he reserved these for himself and handed them over to a special governor-general.

Convention Money
About 1844 Trieste's Volume of Trade

1842-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>58,400,000</td>
<td>Hamburg, 1843</td>
<td>215,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>40,500,000</td>
<td>Havre, 1842</td>
<td>168,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Venice

*Florins C. M.*

*Austria's Mercantile Marine*

1 Jan. 1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>176,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Austrian Commerce**

(Figures in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sea-borne Trade</th>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1842</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Fiume</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trieste</strong></td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venice</strong></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Maritime</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1839

*Commerce of Trieste and Venice.*

Imports into Venice: into Trieste = 1:2.84
Exports = 1:3.8

**Commerce of Trieste**

(Value in fl. C. M.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57,000,000</td>
<td>44,000,000</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shipping Traffic of Trieste*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1835</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1837</th>
<th>1838</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
<td>Ent.</td>
<td>Cl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1839

**Foreign vessels entering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trieste</th>
<th>Venice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td>3,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>11,592</td>
<td>3,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of vessels entering Venice:
Number entering Trieste = 1:4

- **Tonnage of foreign vessels**
  - Austrian
    - Imports: 133,343
    - Exports: 20,254
    - Combined: 153,597

**Value in Turkish Piastres**

_**Smyrna: Imp. and Exp. 1835-9**_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the forefront</td>
<td>England. 126,313,146</td>
<td>(Malta. 2,979,040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then</td>
<td>Trieste. 93,500,456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then</td>
<td>America, etc. 57,329,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England.</td>
<td>44,618,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Malta.</td>
<td>3,361,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste.</td>
<td>52,477,765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America.</td>
<td>46,608,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Egypt: Imports and Exports (1837) fcs._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imp.</th>
<th>Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Austria (Trieste)</td>
<td>13,858,000</td>
<td>14,532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Turkey</td>
<td>12,661,000</td>
<td>12,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) France</td>
<td>10,702,000</td>
<td>11,463,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) England and Malta</td>
<td>15,158,000</td>
<td>5,404,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled in November 1856

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
SUPPLEMENT
M. de Chateaubriand, in his *Congrès de Vérone*, accuses the Spanish Revolution of 1820-23 of having been nothing but a servile parody of the first French Revolution, performed on the Madrid stage, and in Castilian costumes. He forgets that the struggles of different peoples emerging from the feudal state of society, and moving toward middle class civilization, cannot be supposed to differ in anything but the peculiar coloring derived from race, nationality, language, stage customs and costumes. His censure reminds us of the foolish old woman who strongly suspected all enamored girls of mimicking her own better days.

A whole library has been written *pro* and *con* upon the Constitution of 1812, the proclamation of which, in 1820, gave rise to a three years’ struggle between the prejudices and interests of the old society and the wants and aspirations of the new one. The Constitution of 1812 had strongly impressed upon it that same stamp of impracticability which characterizes all charters originally drawn up by modern nations at the epoch of their regeneration. At the revolutionary epoch, to which they owe their origin, they are impracticable, not in consequence of this or that paragraph, but simply because of their constitutional nature. At the Constitutional epoch they are out of place, because of their being impregnated with the generous delusions, inseparable from the dawn of social regeneration. The French Constitution of 1791, for instance, at its own time justly considered to be reactionary, would have been found guilty of Jacobinism in 1830. Why so? In 1791 the royal power and the ruling forces of the

---

*a* F. R. Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérone*, T. I, pp. 33-34, 37.—*Ed.*
ancient society it represented, had not yet undergone those transformations which were to enable them to enter into combination with, and to take place within the elements of the new society. What was then wanted was revolutionary action to break down the resistance of the old society, and not a Constitution sanctioning an impossible compromise with it. In 1830, on the contrary, when limited monarchy had become possible, it was generally understood that it meant the rule of the bourgeoisie instead of the emancipation of the people. The Constitution of 1791 must then have appeared an incendiary anachronism. The same argument holds good for the Spanish Constitution of 1812, but there is still that distinction to be drawn between France in 1791, and Spain in 1820, that the Constitution of 1791 only pretended to make a halt, in a two years' revolutionary march, while the Constitution of 1812 was to supersede revolution altogether. Spain, the day before an Oriental despotism, was to be a day later—a democracy with a monarch at its head. Such sudden changes belong exclusively to Spanish history. Ferdinand VII, when restored to absolute power, in 1823, as well as in 1814, expunged, by one stroke of the pen, all that had been done in the revolutionary interregnum. The Revolutionists, on their part, acted in the same manner. In 1854, the Spanish people began with Espartero, with whom they ended in 1843. In 1814 the revolution was terminated by Ferdinand's refusing to swear to the Cadiz Constitution. In 1820, it began with forcing upon him the oath to that same Constitution. He reassembled the same Cortes he had dissolved two years before, and made the very men Ministers he had banished or imprisoned in 1814. All parties in Spain, with equal obstinacy, tear out all those leaves from the book of their national history which they have not written themselves. Hence these sudden changes, these monstrous exactions, this endless, uninterrupted series of contests. Hence, also, that indelible perseverance which may be defeated, but can never be disheartened or discouraged.

The first Constitutional Ministry, as the chief of which Don Augustin Arguelles may be considered, was, as we have seen, formed of the martyrs of 1814. Martyrs are, on the whole, very dangerous political characters, deflowered, as it were, by the consciousness of their past failures; inflated by exaggerated notions of their past merits; inclined to attribute to themselves the greater capacities because of their damped courage; prone to declare the era of revolution closed with their arrival in the government; from the very fact of their restoration likely to
assume the character of revolutionary legitimists or of legitimate revolutionists; overjealous of the new men whom they are astonished to find their rivals; constantly vacillating between the fear of counter-revolution and the apprehension of anarchy; by the very force of circumstances induced to compromise with the former, in order not to be swept away by the latter, or to see overthrown what they used to call the true boundaries of progress. Such was the Ministry of Arguelles. During the four months which elapsed from its formation till the meeting of the Cortes, all public authority was, in fact, suspended. Junta in the provinces and in the capital, public clubs backed by secret societies, for the first time a popular and unbridled press, stormy petitions, patriotic songs, the erection of constitutional monuments, demonstrations of effervescence natural with a nation on the recovery of its liberty, but yet no acts of vengeance, no crimes committed, and a magnanimity displayed which was not to be expected from southern natures wont to abandon themselves to the impetuosity of their passions.

The Cortes at last opened their first session on July 9, 1820. They made Don José Espiga, Archbishop of Seville, their president. Ferdinand VII swore before them, as he had done before the Ayuntamientos,\(^{598}\) on the Gospel, to observe the Cadiz Constitution.

“So soon”, he said, “as the excess of undeserved suffering brought the long-suppressed wishes of the people to a distinct expression, I hastened to pursue the course they indicated, and professed the oath of fidelity to the Constitution of the Cortes of 1812. From this moment the king and the people entered on their legitimate rights. My resolution was free and voluntary.”\(^{a}\)

Ferdinand VII, a despotic coward, a tiger with the heart of a hare, a man as greedy of authority as unfit to exercise it, a prince pretending to absolute power in order to be enabled to renounce it into the hands of his footmen,\(^{599}\) proud, however, of one thing, namely, his perfect mastery in hypocrisy. He enjoyed a sort of satisfaction in exaggerating his own self humiliation before a victorious enemy, resolved, as he was, to avenge, at the opportune moment, his abjection by still more astounding perfidy. When a prisoner of Napoleon,\(^{600}\) he humbly thanked him for the refuge he had afforded him, and begged for the hand of a princess of the Bonaparte family. When Bonaparte negotiated with him for his restoration to the Spanish throne, he protested, in an adulatory

\(^{a}\) Marx quotes Ferdinand VII’s speech of July 9, 1820 from his notes on H. Davis’ book *The War of Ormuzd and Ahriman in the Nineteenth Century.*—*Ed.*
letter, that he should be the meanest of mortals, and become a byword in Europe, if he ever proved ungrateful to his imperial benefactor, simultaneously writing a secret letter to the Regency at Madrid, informing them that, once set at liberty, his first act would be to betray the French Emperor. When, on July 9, 1820, he swore anew to the Constitution, declaring that his “resolution was free and voluntary,” the Count of Espagne* and Mr. Pons were already negotiating in his name, at Paris, with the Pavillon Marsan—viz., the Count of Artois (afterward Charles X) and his coterie—on the means of subverting that same Constitution.

There were some moments in his political life, as for instance the decree of September 30, 1823, when he made false promises in the most solemn manner, for no other possible purpose than the mere pleasure of breaking them. The serious work of counter-revolution, he committed entirely to the partisans of the ancient régime, reserving to himself to encourage their efforts in every possible way, but with the mental reservation of disowning them if unfortunate, and quietly delivering them to the resentment of their enemies if beaten. No mortal ever bore others’ sufferings with more stoical apathy. For his own official part he limited himself to showing his disgust at the Constitution by playing the fool with it. One night, for instance, he writes to the head of the Cabinet, a letter to the effect that he had appointed Gen. Contador as War Minister. The Ministers, at a loss to find a Contador in the army list, are astonished at discovering at length that Contador was the ex-chief of a squadron, 84 years old, long since disabled for any kind of service. The Ministers so insolently mocked, tendered their resignation. Ferdinand, having succeeded in composing the difference, proposes to replace Contador by Gen. Martinez Rodriguez, as unknown as his predecessor. New troublesome researches having taken place, it appears that Martinez had been dangerously hurt in the head at Badajoz, by the explosion of a powder barrel, and had never recovered his senses since that accident. A sort of virtuoso in the art of passive audacity and active cowardice, Ferdinand VII never shrunk from provoking a catastrophe, resolved, as he was, to be beforehand with the danger.

The majority of the Cortes was composed of deputies to the Cadiz Cortes, the authors of the Constitution and their

---

* Presumably Count of Casa Irujo.—Ed.

b Presumably on August 23, 1821, the day R. Contador was appointed War Minister.—Ed.
adherents, while the minority consisted of men who had conspired to reestablish the Constitution. The majority considering the proclamation of the Constitution as the final term of the revolution, while the minority considered it as its beginning; the former having laid hold of the Government, while the latter were still striving to seize it; a schism between the Liberals of 1812 and the Liberals of 1820, between the Moderados and the Exaltados, became inevitable. If the influence of the Liberals of 1812 was preponderant in the Cortes, the Liberals of 1820 were the stronger in the clubs, the press, and the streets. If the former disposed of the Administration, the latter relied upon the army of the Isla, which, strengthened by some regiments that had not participated in the military revolt, was still concentrated in Andalusia, and placed under the supreme command of Riego, Quiroga having been sent as a deputy to the Cortes. In order to break the stronghold of the Exaltados, the Marquis de Las Amarillas, Minister-of-War, disbanded the army of the Isla, Riego having before been removed from his troops on the pretext of being installed as Captain-General of Galicia. Hardly was the army of the Isla disbanded—the only military corps in Spain that deserved the name of an army—when the first Bands of the Faith were seen to appear in Castile and in the North of Spain.

Riego, secretly summoned by his partisans, on the 31st August suddenly appeared at Madrid, where he became the idol of the people, who received him with turbulent ovations and with an overflow of enthusiasm, which the Ministry viewed as a general calamity. They resolved upon exiling him to Oviedo—several other Isla officers being also banished to different places. Although Riego did not resist this arbitrary act of proscription, the Ministers, apprehending an insurrection as likely to break out upon his nocturnal departure from Madrid, called the garrison to arms, occupied the principal places, filled the streets of Madrid with artillery, while on the following day, Arguelles proposed in the Cortes that measures should be taken against popular assemblies, which was warmly supported by Toreno and Martínez de la Rosa. From this day, (Sept. 7, 1820), is to be dated the open rupture between the two Liberal factions and the retrogression of the revolutionary movement. The same fanaticism of order, the same complaints of incessant agitation, and the same angry impatience at every symptom of popular effervescence, which Europe witnessed during the first weeks after the Revolution of 1848, now possessed at once the Liberal aristocracy and the higher ranks of the middle classes in the Peninsula.
The first session of the Cortes being closed on November 9, 1820, Ferdinand VII, who had retired to the Escorial, with Víctor Sáez, his confessor, thought the moment opportune for putting out his feelers. In spite of the Constitution, he nominated, by a royal decree, without the counter-signature of a responsible minister, Gen. Carvajal as Captain-General of New-Castile and Commandant of Madrid,\textsuperscript{610} in the place of Gen. Vigodet, who, however, refused to resign his place into the hands of Carvajal. The Ministry, believing themselves lost, now appealed to the very party they had commenced by persecuting. They applied to the directors of the Clubs, and received, in the most gracious manner, the violent address of the Madrid Ayuntamiento, which insisted upon the King's return to Madrid. A similar address was drawn up by the permanent Commission, who represented the Cortes during their absence. The garrison and the militia were put under arms; the sittings of the Clubs became permanent; the populace burst forth into insulting menaces against the King; insurrection was openly preached by the daily papers, and a mass expedition to the Escorial, to fetch the King, seemed imminent. Bending before the storm, Ferdinand revoked his offensive decree, dismissed his anti-liberal confessor, and returned, with his whole family, to Madrid, where he arrived on Nov. 21, 1820. His entry resembled that of Louis XVI, and his family, on their forced return from Versailles to Paris on October 6, 1789.\textsuperscript{611}

The Ministry had not obtained the support of the Liberals of 1820 without giving them due reparation, by removing the Marqués de las Amarillas, who afterward openly professed himself a zealous partisan of absolute monarchy, from the War Ministry, and by raising the Isla officers to separate commands. Riego was appointed Captain-General of Aragon, Mina, Captain-General of Galicia, and Velasco, Captain-General of Estremadura. The Ministry of the Martyrs,\textsuperscript{612} irresolutely floating between fear of reaction and alarm at anarchy, contrived to become equally discredited with all parties. As to the royal family, its position—to quote the words of a thorough Legitimist—"continued precarious, owing to the indiscreet zeal of the Royalists, which it became impossible to control."\textsuperscript{a}

At the opening of the second session, (March 1, 1821), the King acted his part quite in the tone and with the gestures of a stump-orator. Not content with simply reciting the speech drawn

\textsuperscript{a} Marx quotes from his notes on W. Walton, \textit{The Revolutions of Spain}, Vol. I, London, 1837, p. 249.—\textit{Ed.}
up by his Cabinet, he puzzled the ministers, by altering their text in a revolutionary sense, and laying higher colors upon the most decisive passages, such as that relating to the invasion of Naples by Austria. For a moment they fancied they had made a convert of him, but were soon disabused. Ferdinand terminated his speech with a fulminant accusation of his own ministers, who had suffered him to be exposed to menace and insults, which would not have taken place, if the Government had displayed that energy and vigor required by the Constitution and desired by the Cortes.

The King's constitutional speech was only the forerunner of the dismissal of the Ministry, and the nomination of a Cabinet which, to the great astonishment of the nation, contained not a single individual attached to the new institutions, or who had not figured as an agent of despotism in the former Government.

The chief of the new Cabinet, M. Felix, formerly a sub-lieutenant in a militia regiment of Lima, and Deputy to the Cortes of 1812 for Peru, was, even at the epoch of the Cadiz Cortes, known as a venal and subtle intriguer. Bardaji, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was a former diplomatist connected with the heads of the absolutist Cabinets, and Pelegrín, formerly a member of the Council of Castile, boasted that he was entirely devoted to the Holy Alliance. The avowed aim of this Ministry, which could not even pretend to any influence in the Cortes, was "to restore order and suppress anarchy." Accordingly, the Exaltados were again removed from their commands, and full sway was given to the servile party; the most important places were intrusted to men known for their hatred of the prevailing system, a vail being cast upon all the royalist conspiracies that had burst forth in the Peninsula, and their authors, nearly all imprisoned by the people, being set at liberty by the Government. Gen. Morillo, Count of Carthagena, had just arrived from Terra Firma, where he had rendered himself notorious for his ferocity, dictatorial manners, want of probity, and a six years fratricidal war, which he carried on with fanatical enthusiasm. On his return, he staid a few days at Paris, where he connected himself with the intrigues of the

---

a Marx gives the contents of Ferdinand VII's speech of March 1, 1822 according to the excerpts from Marliani's *Historia política de la España moderna*, pp. 70-71.—*Ed.*

b The reference is to R. Feliu.—*Ed.*

c Marx quotes from his notes on the book. *Examen critique des révolutions d'Espagne de 1820 à 1823 et de 1836.*—*Ed.*

d i.e. the Continent, in contrast to Spanish island possessions in Latin America.—*Ed.*
Pavillon Marsan, the ultra journals at Paris signalizing him as the man who was to restore the King to his ancient rights, and destroy the influence of the Cortes. When he arrived at Madrid, the Ministry lavished on him the strongest expressions of deference and respect, and appointed him Commander of the City and Province of Madrid. It was apparently this nomination which the servile party waited for to execute a coup d'état. The Brigadier Don José Martinez San Martin, a man of inflexible energy and strong Legitimist opinions, was joined to Morillo in the quality of _Jefe Político_ of the capital. While Madrid seemed overawed by the terror of Morillo's name, Catalonia and Galicia became the scenes of passionate contests. Cadiz, Seville and Badajoz broke out in open revolt, refused to admit the Government officers, and disclaimed acknowledging any royal orders unless the Ministry were dismissed. In a message dated Nov. 25, 1821, the King summoned the Cortes to check these disorders. The Cortes, in their answer, drawn up by Don José María Calatrava, blamed the conduct of Cadiz and Seville, but insisted upon the dismissal of the Ministry, who had lost the confidence of the country, and "the moral force to carry on Government." Notwithstanding this vote of distrust, Ferdinand did not think fit to appoint another Ministry till forty-eight hours before the opening of the new Cortes on March 1, 1822.

The elections to the new Cortes having taken place at the moment when the popular passions were exaggerated by the counter revolutionary course of the Government, by the news of Austria's armed interference to suppress the Spanish Constitution proclaimed at Naples, and by the plundering expeditions of the Bands of the Faith at different points of the Peninsula, the Liberals of 1820, then called Exaltados, had, of course, a large majority. "The large majority of the new Legislature," says a _Moderado_ "being possessed of nothing, had nothing to lose." They belonged almost exclusively to the plebeian ranks of the middle-class and the army. The difference between them and their predecessors may be understood from the single fact that, while the latter had appointed the Archbishop of Seville as their

---

*a* Governor.—*Ed.*

*b* Marx renders Ferdinand VII's message of November 25, 1821 according to the excerpts from _Examen critique des révolutions d'Espagne de 1820 à 1823 et de 1836._—*Ed.*

*c* Marx quotes from his notes on _Examen critique des révolutions d'Espagne de 1820 à 1823 et de 1836._—*Ed.*

*d* Ibid.—*Ed.*

*e* Don José Espiga.—*Ed.*
President, they, on their part, called to the presidential chair the hero of Las Cabezas—Don Rafael del Riego.

The new Ministry, consisting of Ex-Deputies to the Cortes of 1820, was formed by Martinez de la Rosa, who accepted the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Martinez de la Rosa—who has since acted an important part under the reign of the innocent Isabella; formerly a Deputy to the short-lived Madrid Cortes of 1814; persecuted during the period of reaction; a Moderado par excellence, one of the most elegant Spanish poets and prose-writers—has proved at all epochs a true partisan of the doctrinaire school of the Guizots, the moderation of which gentlemen consists in their fixed notion that concessions to the mass of mankind can never be of too moderate a character. They exult in the erection of a liberal Aristocracy and the supreme rule of the Bourgeoisie, blended with the greatest possible amount of the abuses and traditions of the ancient régime. Martinez de la Rosa—overwhelmed with politeness, courted and flattered by the successive French Ambassadors at Madrid—the Prince Laval de Montmorency and the Count Lagarde—aimed to modify the Constitution of 1812, by establishing a House of Peers—giving the King an absolute veto, introducing a property qualification for the Lower House, and laying restrictions upon the press. From 1834 to 1836 this incorrigible doctrinaire had the pleasure of witnessing the introduction and the downfall of the abortive Constitution he had hatched in 1822. The French diplomats made him understand that the Court of the Tuileries would approve of institutions similar to those which then existed in France, while he flattered himself that the King would not be averse to a charter which had enabled Louis XVIII to do what he liked. The King, on his part, cajoled the self-conceited Moderado, whom he intended, as was afterward proved, to send directly from the palace to the scaffold.

According to the plan concocted between the Camarilla and the Ministry, all conspiracies were to be winked at, and confusion was to be suffered to reign, so as, afterward, by the assistance of France, to introduce order, and give the nation a moderate Charter, capable of perpetuating power and influence in its original promoters, and winning over the privileged classes to the new system. Consequently, in opposition to the secret societies of the Liberals, a secret society was founded on moderate principles—the Society of the Anillo, the members of which were to act conjointly with the Ministry. Money was plentifully scattered among the Royal Life Guards, but these distributions being
denounced to the Ministry by members of the municipal police, they ridiculed them, treating the information as a symptom of radicalism and republicanism. The regiment of the Royal Cuirassiers, cantoned in Andalusia, was completely seduced; alarming reports were spread in the different provinces whither were sent, as Political Chiefs, members of the Society of the Anillo. At the same time the tribunals received secret instructions to treat with great indulgence all conspiracies that might fall under their judicial powers. The object of these proceedings was to excite an explosion at Madrid, which was to coincide with another at Valencia. Gen. Elío, the traitor of 1814, then a prisoner in that town, was to put himself at the head of the counter-revolution in the eastern part of Spain, the garrison of Valencia being composed of only one regiment, greatly attached to Elío, and hostile, therefore, to the Constitutional system. The Deputy Bertrán de Lys, in the Assembly of the Cortes, entreated the Ministers to withdraw this body of soldiers from Valencia, and when they remained inflexible, brought in a motion of impeachment. The day appointed for the explosion was the last day of May (1822), the feast of St. Ferdinand. The Court was then at Aranjuez. On a given signal the guards rushed into the streets and, backed by the Aranjuez mob, assembled in the front of the palace, shouting cries of "Long live our absolute monarch! Down with the Constitution." This riot was, however, instantly suppressed by Gen. Zayas, and the simultaneous revolt of the regiment of Valencia proved, after a bloody combat between the militia and the soldiers, no more successful. The failures of Aranjuez and Valencia served only to exasperate the Liberals. On all sides parties prepared for self-defense. The agitation becoming universal, the Ministers alone remained passive spectators in the midst of the confusion that announced an approaching storm.

Written on November 14, 1854

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune No. 4345, March 23, 1855

---

a Presumably this refers to Manuel Bertrán de Lis.— Ed.
b Marx quotes from his notes on The Last Days of Spain. By an Eye-Witness, London, 1823.— Ed.
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NOTES

1 Besides The People's Paper, Marx also sent this article to the New-York Daily Tribune, which published it without title and signature. In the Tribune certain passages were omitted.

The People's Paper was founded in May 1852 as a weekly of the revolutionary Chartist. Marx contributed to it and helped Ernest Jones, its chief editor, with the editing and organisational matters, especially in its early years. Between October 1852 and December 1856, besides publishing the articles Marx wrote specially for it, the paper reprinted the most important articles by him and Engels from the New-York Daily Tribune. At the beginning of 1856 Marx's contributions to The People's Paper became especially frequent. However, towards the end of that year Marx and Engels temporarily broke off relations with Jones and stopped contributing to his weekly because of Jones' increasing association with bourgeois radicals. The paper ceased publication in September 1858.

The New-York Daily Tribune was founded in 1841 and was published until 1924. Prior to the mid-1850s it was a left-wing paper and then it became the organ of the Republican Party. 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 contributed to the newspaper from August 1851 to March 1862. His contacts with the newspaper ceased entirely during the US Civil War.  

2 Guelphs and Chibellines—political parties in Italy formed in the twelfth century in the period of strife between the popes and the German emperors. The Chibellines included mostly feudal lords who supported the emperors and violently opposed the papal party of the Guelphs, which represented the upper trade and artisan strata of Italian towns. The parties existed till the fifteenth century.

3 Marx is referring to the wars of the Spanish (1701-14) (see Note 236) and the Austrian (1740-48) Succession. As a result of the first war, under the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) Savoy obtained Sicily, Montferrato and part of the duchy of Milan. The Duke of Savoy became King of Sicily. In 1720 Savoy, Piedmont and Sardinia, which had been ceded to Savoy in compensation for Sicily seized by Spain in 1718, formed the Kingdom of Sardinia ruled by the kings of the Savoy dynasty.
The War of the Austrian Succession ended with the Peace Treaty of Aachen (1748) under which the Kingdom of Sardinia received from Austria part of the Principality of Pavia and some other Austrian possessions in Italy.  

In conformity with a secret article of a treaty concluded between France and Austria on May 30, 1814 the Republic of Genoa was placed under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty.

This treaty also determined the future of Venice and Lombardy, officially fixed in Article 93 of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna on June 9, 1815.

The Holy Alliance—an association of European monarchs founded in September 1815 on the initiative of the Russian Tsar Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in the European countries.

There was vague information about the Sardinian memorandum in the press (see The Times, No. 22330, April 1, 1856). Presumably this refers to the Note by Count Cavour, the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Piedmont, of March 27, 1856, which he sent to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Count Walewski and the British Foreign Secretary Lord Clarendon. The Note concerned the situation in the Papal States, occupied by Austrian and French troops, and in the Kingdom of Naples.

The Italian question was discussed at a session of the Congress of Paris on April 8, 1856. Cavour used the text of the Note as the basis of his speech in which he came out against the Austrian domination in Italy and tried to persuade the audience to resolve the Italian question in favour of the Sardinian monarchy.

The domestic policy of King Ferdinand II of Naples was subjected to harsh criticism by Cavour and other speakers in the course of the discussion on April 8. On April 16, 1856, at the closing session of the Congress, the Piedmontese plenipotentiaries handed another memorandum on the same issue to Britain and France which Marx cites in this article.

The discussion of the Italian question did not lead to any decisions. However, it promoted the supremacy of the Kingdom of Sardinia in the Italian national liberation movement.

On December 2, 1851 Louis Bonaparte accomplished a coup d'état by dissolving the Legislative Assembly.

During the 1848-49 revolution, the Whig government, of which Lord Palmerston was Foreign Secretary, supported only in word the liberal movement in Italy which strove for moderate reforms and constitutional changes. In fact, however, Britain did not help Piedmont in its struggle against Austrian rule in Northern Italy either in 1848 or in 1849.

Marx is referring to the dispatch of an expeditionary corps to Italy in April 1849 under the pretext of defending the Roman Republic. Initiated by the President of the French Republic, Louis Bonaparte, this invasion of the Roman Republic aimed at restoring the Pope's temporal power (see K. Marx, The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850, present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 91-94).

The reference is to the brutal suppression of the Irish uprising in the summer of 1848 by Clarendon, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1847-52), which broke out as a result of the famine caused by the potato crop failure in 1845-47.
Marx means Louis Napoleon whose advent to power resulted in mass arrests of republicans and participants in the 1848-49 revolution.

Cayenne—a reference to French Guiana, where political prisoners were sent for penal servitude.

Lambessa (Lambèse)—a French penal colony founded on the ruins of the ancient Roman town of Lambessa in North Africa; from 1851 to 1860 it was a place of exile for political prisoners.

Belle Isle—an island in the Bay of Biscay, where political prisoners were detained in 1849-57, among others, workers who took part in the Paris uprising in June 1848 were imprisoned there.

It was Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, who abdicated after the defeat of the Piedmontese army at Novara on March 23, 1849, during the Austro-Italian war of 1848-49. His son Victor Emmanuel II, the new king, concluded an armistice with the Austrians on March 26, and on August 6 a peace treaty was signed restoring Austrian rule in Northern Italy and the Austrian protectorate over a number of states of Central Italy.

Marx is apparently referring to Napoleon III’s plans to marry his cousin Prince Napoleon nicknamed Plon-Plon to Clotilde, the daughter of King Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia. The wedding took place in 1859.

The Delphic oracle—Apollo’s oracle at Delphi reputed for its prophecies about political and religious events which enabled Delphi to conduct and support certain conservative tendencies in politics. The knowledge of the situation in different Greek states influenced the prophecies of the oracle’s medium, the Pythia.

The Trophonian oracle was in a cave at a temple near the town of Lebadea, Boeotia. Its prophecies were of a more private nature and concerned the human destinies in the main, and so it was much less important than the Delphic oracle.

Marx thought that M. P.’s speeches lacked originality and merely reflected Palmerston’s policy.

The Crédit Mobilier is short for the Société générale du Crédit Mobilier—a French joint-stock bank founded in 1852 by the Péreire brothers. The bank was closely connected with the Government of Napoleon III and, protected by it, engaged in speculation. It went bankrupt in 1867 and wasliquidated in 1871.

The first article on Crédit Mobilier was published by Marx in The People’s Paper without any indication that it was “to be continued”. The editors of the New-York Daily Tribune who published the subsequent articles on the subject printed them as a series and defined them by ordinal numbers.

In this volume the numbers of articles are put in square brackets as subtitles.

Louis Bonaparte was nicknamed “the Little” by Victor Hugo in a speech in the Legislative Assembly in November 1851; the nickname became popular after the publication of Hugo’s pamphlet Napoléon le Petit (1852).

In May 1852 Louis Bonaparte’s presidential powers were to expire and, according to the Constitution of the French Republic of 1848, new elections were to be held on the second Sunday in May. In view of this the Bonapartists began to prepare a coup d’état in the second half of 1851. They launched a propaganda campaign trying to intimidate the man in the street with the possible victory of democrats and socialists and with the anarchy which, they claimed, would set in if “the red spectre” was victorious.
18 The Society of December 10—a secret Bonapartist organisation founded in 1849 and consisting mainly of declassed elements, political adventurers and the military. For details see Marx’s work The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 148-51).

19 The Fronde, a movement in France against the absolutist regime from 1648 to 1653, involved various social sections—from radical peasant and plebeian elements and the bourgeoisie in opposition to high-ranking officials and aristocrats—which in many cases pursued opposite aims. The defeat of the Fronde led to the strengthening of absolutism.

20 The Corps Législatif was established, alongside the State Council and the Senate, under the Constitution of February 14, 1852, after the Bonapartist coup d’état of 1851. Its powers were confined to endorsing bills drawn up by the State Council. The Corps Législatif was an elected body. However, the elections were supervised by state officials and the police, so that a majority obedient to the government was ensured. In fact it served as a screen for Napoleon III’s unlimited powers.

21 This refers to an Act to remove doubts respecting promissory notes of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, for payment of sums of money under £5 of March 3, 1797 and An Act for continuing for a limited time, the restriction contained in the minute of Council of the 26th of February, 1797, on payment of cash by the bank of May 3, 1797 which established a compulsory rate of banknotes and gave temporary permission to the Bank to stop the exchange of banknotes for gold. In 1821 the exchange was resumed under the law of 1819.

22 In the 1850s, while studying the foreign policies of European states and endeavouring to disclose the inner springs of these policies, Marx often turned to the history of diplomacy. Working at the British Museum, he discovered, in the collection of an English historian and writer, William Coxe, a mass of eighteenth-century documents, including letters from English ambassadors in St. Petersburg. This find served as an immediate stimulus for writing the Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century which he conceived at the beginning of 1856, when the Crimean war was still in progress. Marx wrote later: “While looking through the diplomatic manuscripts in the possession of the British Museum I came across a series of English documents, going back from the end of the eighteenth century to the time of Peter the Great, which reveal the continuous secret collaboration between the Cabinets of London and St. Petersburg, and seem to indicate that this relationship arose at the time of Peter the Great” (see present edition, Vol. 17, p. 117).

Initially Marx intended to publish some of these documents, with his own comments, in the American Putnam’s Monthly Magazine, but he then decided to develop the theme and write an extensive (about 20 printed sheets) work on the history of Anglo-Russian relations in the 18th century. However, his negotiations with the German publisher in London Nikolaus Trübner in March-May 1856 on the publication of the work were fruitless. Marx failed to find another publisher and thought of printing it in one of the newspapers published by the followers of the English conservative journalist, David Urquhart, who was in opposition to the British Government and vigorously criticised its foreign policy. Marx had occasionally contributed to these papers, though he always dissociated himself from Urquhart’s anti-democratic stance (see, for example, present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 477-78; Vol. 17, p. 117). It was because of Urquhart’s political approach that Marx hesitated for some time before entrusting him with his work for publication. Marx wrote to Engels on
August 1, 1856: "...Should Urquhart come out with his counter-revolutionary nonsense in such a way that collaboration with him would discredit me in the eyes of the revolutionaries here, I would be obliged ... to decide against it" (present edition, Vol. 40, p. 62).

The Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century, which Marx wrote from June 1856 to March 1857, began to appear in instalments in The Sheffield Free Press, an Urquhartist newspaper, in late June 1856. But since the editors interfered with the text by arbitrarily making cuts without Marx's consent, he stopped publication and handed over the work to another Urquhartist periodical—the London weekly Free Press. The work was published from the very beginning without any abridgements, as the text was sent in by Marx, from August 16, 1856 to April 1, 1857.

The published text was, in Marx's own words, only an Introduction to a projected work that was never written. It is divided into five chapters. More than half consists of documents (reports, letters and pamphlets) concerning the history of diplomatic relations between England and Russia in the 18th century. Chapter I consists of documents and Marx's numerous comments. In chapters II and III the proportion of Marx's text proper is insignificant. The whole of Chapter IV was written by Marx; in Chapter V, where he profusely cites the pamphlet Truth Is But Truth... Marx gives a description of Peter I's foreign policy.

The Revelations was never reprinted during Marx's and Engels' lifetime. After Engels' death this work, like some other works written by Marx and Engels in the 1850s, was prepared for the press by Marx's daughter Eleanor. It appeared in London under the title Secret Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century after Eleanor's death in 1899. In this book, the pamphlet The Defenéve Treaty (see this volume, pp. 65-73) was printed as a separate chapter. Hence, as distinct from the publication during Marx's lifetime, this book contained six chapters. Moreover, in the 1899 edition the concluding part (about four pages) of the fifth (fourth in the original) chapter was omitted.

In English the Revelations was also published in London and New York in 1969; the French translation appeared in 1954; the German translation in 1960, 1977 and 1981; the Polish translation in 1967; the Italian translation in 1977.

All these publications, as a rule, reproduce or are based upon the 1899 edition but restore the concluding pages of the fifth (fourth in the original) chapter omitted in that edition. Commentaries in some of them are biased.

In this volume the text of the book is reproduced from The Free Press collated with the 1899 edition.

Some minor factual inaccuracies are silently corrected. p. 25

23 In this chapter Marx quotes letters of the British diplomats in Russia and the account of L. K. Pitt, Chaplain at the English trading station in St. Petersburg, which he discovered at the British Museum in the collection of William Coxe, an English historian and writer (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 17). p. 27

24 This letter, as well as other reports from British diplomats in Russia in 1736-39, was published, with the permission of the British Government, in full in Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva (Records of the Imperial Russian Historical Society), St. Petersburg, 1892, Vol. 80, pp. 13-19, from the original in the Public Record Office of Great Britain. p. 27

25 Marx is referring to the mediation offered by Britain and Holland in the Russo-Turkish war of 1735-39; it was rejected by Russia. p. 27
An allusion to the *Union of Kalmar* (1397-1523)—a personal union of Denmark, Norway (with Iceland) and Sweden (with Finland) under Danish kings. In the fifteenth century Sweden virtually withdrew from the union. Christian II of Denmark made an attempt to restore his rule over Sweden by staging a massacre in Stockholm in November 1520 (this came to be called "the blood-bath of Stockholm"). This caused a popular uprising led by Gustavus Eriksson (Gustavus Vasa) and as a result Sweden was restored as a state.

Marx is referring to a plan, drawn up by Russian diplomats in the 1760s, to unite the North-European states of Russia, Prussia, England, Denmark, Sweden and Poland. It came to be known as "the grand scheme uniting the Powers of the North" or the Northern Alliance, and was to be directed against France and Austria. Despite a number of treaties concluded by Russia (a defensive treaty with Prussia, 1764; a defensive treaty with Denmark, 1765; and a trade agreement with Great Britain, 1766), the project was not implemented because Prussia and England opposed it and Russia's foreign policy underwent some changes after the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74.

Presumably a reference to the preparation of the Russo-Prussian Treaty of Alliance which Peter III and Frederick II concluded on April 24 (May 5), 1762 during the Seven Years' War (1756-63). Frederick II received back all of his lands which had been conquered by Russian troops. Sir George Macartney's information was inaccurate: at that time Count Alexei Bestuzhev-Ryumin was relieved of his diplomatic duties.


This letter was published in *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris, First Earl of Malmesbury; containing an account of his missions to the courts of Madrid, Frederick the Great, Catherine the Second, and the Hague, and his special missions to Berlin, Brunswick, and the French Republic*. Edited by his grandson, the Third Earl. Vol. I, London, 1844, pp. 528-35.

Sir James Harris writes about the moods prevailing at the Russian Court, in which the British Government was much interested since it intended to win Russia's support in the war against the North-American colonies (1775-83).

The *Peace of Teschen* concluded between Austria and Prussia on May 13, 1779 ended the war of the Bavarian succession. The war had been caused by the claims of the German states to various parts of Bavaria after the death of the childless Bavarian Elector Maximilian Joseph, and also by the struggle between Austria and Prussia for domination over Germany. Under this treaty and the adjoining conventions, Prussia and Austria obtained some territories of Bavaria, while Saxony received money compensation. The Elector of the Palatinate became Elector of Bavaria. The Peace of Teschen confirmed a series of peace treaties which had previously been concluded by the German states. At first Russia and France acted as mediators between the warring countries, and in a special article of the treaty they were declared guarantor-powers.

Harris presumably means the document on Spain's declaration of war on Britain in June 1779.
The declaration of armed neutrality announced by Catherine II on February 28 (March 11), 1780, was directed against Britain during her war against the insurgent North-American colonies (1775-83). It proclaimed the right of neutral powers to trade freely with the belligerent countries and a series of other principles guaranteeing security to merchant shipping. The Declaration was joined in 1780-83 by Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Prussia, Austria, Portugal and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

In March 1781 the British Government offered Russia the Island of Minorca, an important strategic base in the Mediterranean, on the condition that Russia gave up her armed neutrality (see Note 34) and supported Britain in her war against the North-American colonies. This offer was rejected.

This refers to the negotiations which ended with the signing of the Versailles Peace Treaty on September 3, 1783 between Britain and the USA with its allies—France, Spain and the Netherlands. According to this treaty, Britain recognised the USA's independence.

On the initiative of Prussia, a convention on preliminary terms of partition of Poland was signed in St. Petersburg on 6 (17) February, 1772. Soon Austria also joined it. The partition undermined the national independence of Poland, which was undergoing a profound social and political crisis.

This refers to the aggravation of Russo-Swedish relations after the 1772 coup d'état of Gustavus III. Having abolished the 1719 Constitution and the power of the aristocratic oligarchy, who had enjoyed the support of Britain and Russia, Gustavus virtually restored absolutism in Sweden. Russia as a guarantor of Sweden's statehood under the Peace of Nystad (1721), feared the growing influence of France which was financing Gustavus III.

The Kuchuk-Kainarji peace treaty ended the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74. Russia obtained part of the Black Sea shore between the South Bug and the Dnieper with the fortress of Kinburn; she also gained Azov, Kerch and Yenikale and compelled Turkey to recognise the independence of the Crimea. Russian merchant ships won free passage through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles. In conformity with the treaty the Sultan also undertook to grant certain privileges to the Greek Orthodox Church.

The reference is to George III, King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820), and a group of Tories supporting him. George III belonged to the Hanover royal family which held the British throne under the provisions of the Act of Settlement (1701); up to 1815 the British kings of the Hanover dynasty were also the Electors of Hanover, and up to 1837 Kings of Hanover.

Marx draws a parallel here between the 18th-century events and the actions of the British Admiralty in 1854 when an attempt was made to raise a blockade of the Russian harbours on the Black Sea at the beginning of the Crimean war (1853-56). James Graham's statement, report about his dispatch of April 5, 1854 and Admiral James Dundas' replies are cited by Marx according to the material of the John Arthur Roebuck commission appointed to investigate the state of the British Army in the Crimea ("State of the Army before Sebastopol". The Times. No. 22054, May 15, 1855).

Marx quotes George III's speech on October 26, 1775, the words of Lord Cavendish and North's statement mentioned below from T. S. Hughes' The History of England... Vol. II, pp. 191, 113.

Marx is referring to the Versailles Peace Treaty (see Note 36).
Notes

44 A reference to the retirement of Rockingham's ministry after his death on July 1, 1782. p. 35


46 The Shelburne ministry (1782-83) succeeded Rockingham's ministry (see Note 44). p. 36


48 The reference is to the French Revolution. p. 36

49 A reference to Russia's secession from the second anti-French coalition in 1800. p. 37

50 Marx is referring to the diplomatic correspondence between Pozzo di Borgo, the Russian ambassador to France, and the Russian Chancellor Count Nesselrode; Marx got acquainted with it from a collection of diplomatic documents and material entitled *The Portfolio; or a Collection of State Papers* edited by David Urquhart and published in London from 1835 to 1837, and also from *Recueil des documents relatifs à la Russie pour la plupart secrets et inédits utiles à consulter dans la crise actuelle*, Paris, 1854. p. 38

51 A reference to the treaties on the partition of the Spanish possessions in Europe and elsewhere concluded by France with Britain, the Netherlands and Austria in 1698 and 1700 in anticipation of the death of the childless King of Spain, Charles II of Habsburg.

On October 2, 1700, Charles II made a will by which the Spanish crown was to go to Philip of Anjou, the grandson of Louis XIV of France, provided Philip renounced his right to the French crown. Despite this, in February 1701 Louis XIV made Philip of Anjou, who in 1700 became King of Spain under the name of Philip V, his heir, which led to the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14). In this war, Britain, Austria, the Netherlands and some other countries fought against France and Spain. France's failures in the war resulted in the realignment of forces in Europe (see Note 236). p. 41

52 Presumably Marx means here the annexation of Cracow by Austria after the 1846 insurrection. p. 41

53 After the rout of the Swedish army at Poltava, Charles XII fled to Turkey and settled in Bendery where he stayed till 1713. Marx used the Latin text of the manifesto (Carolus, *Espèce de Manifeste du Roi de Suède contre le Roi Auguste*) published in Lambert, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du XVIII siècle, contenant les négociations, traité, résolutions et autres documents authentiques concernant les affaires d'état*, Tome sixième, La Haye, 1728, pp. 434-36. p. 41

54 The *Glorious revolution* — the name given in English historiography to the coup d'état of 1688 which overthrew the Stuarts and established a constitutional monarchy, with William III of Orange at its head (from 1689), which was based on a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie. p. 41

55 The *Peace Treaty of Travendaal* signed on August 18, 1700, ended the war between Denmark and the duchy of Holstein. It was concluded under military pressure from England, Holland and Sweden. Denmark was forced to recognise the independence of Holstein and withdraw from the anti-Swedish coalition. p. 41
56 Marx is presumably referring to the fact that during the Northern War (1700-21) an abortive attempt was made in 1716 to unite the Danish and Russian naval forces.

57 An inaccuracy in the text: Count Gyllenborg calls himself the author of the pamphlet not in the letter to Baron Göertz of January 12 (23), 1717 but in a letter to his brother of October 16 (27), 1716. Marx quotes Gyllenborg's letter from *Letters which passed between Count Gyllenborg, the barons Göertz, Sparre, and others; relating to the Design of Raising a Rebellion in His Majesty's Dominions, to be supported by a Force from Sweden*, London, 1717.

The *Court of St. James's*, called so after St. James's Palace in London, the residence of British kings until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

58 The reference is to the decisions reached at a conference held by Peter I and Danish and Saxon ministers on October 22, 1711 in the town of Crossen (Krossen), Brandenburg. The conference drew up plans for immediate military-diplomatic action by the Allies against Sweden.

59 *Rix dollar*—continental silver coin in the sixteenth-nineteenth centuries.

60 This passage in *The Free Press* of September 20, 1856 was preceded by the following editorial note: "Our readers may, perhaps, require to be reminded that the following is a quotation from a pamphlet published in London, in 1716, and entitled the 'Northern Crisis'. Our last number contained the recital (copied from "The Northern Crisis") of the Danish Minister's reasons for delaying the descent upon Schonen."

61 That is, the War of the Spanish Succession (see Note 51).

62 This refers to an episode in the first stage of the Northern War (1700-21)—the defeat of the Russian troops at Narva on November 30, 1700.

63 A reference to the *Peace Treaty of Altranstadt* concluded on September 24, 1706 between Augustus II, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, and Charles XII of Sweden. Under the provisions of the treaty, Augustus II was to abdicate from the Polish throne in favour of Stanislaus Leszczynski and annul the union with Russia.

64 See Note 55.

65 This sentence opens the next instalment in *The Free Press* on October 4, 1856. The editors of the newspaper preceded it with the following comment: "We beg to remind our readers that the following is part of a pamphlet written in—, and entitled the 'Northern Crisis', and that it is a continuation of 'Important Reflections' on the Danish Minister's 'Reasons for delaying the descent upon Schonen'"

66 This refers to a 9,000-strong Russian detachment summoned by the Grand Duke Karl Leopold to Mecklenburg in 1716. The Duke was married to Peter I's niece Yekaterina Ivanovna. The same year the detachment was withdrawn from the duchy.

67 A reference to what is known as the *Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation* founded in 962 when Otto I, the German King, was crowned Holy Roman Emperor. By the eighteenth century the Empire, ruled by sovereigns from the Habsburg dynasty, lost its political influence: it ceased to exist on August 6, 1806.
A reference to the war waged by Austria and her ally, the Venetian Republic, against Turkey in 1716-18. p. 51

Augustus II, the Elector of Saxony (1694-1733) and King of Poland (1697-1706 and 1709-33), adopted the Catholic faith to facilitate his election to the Polish throne. p. 53

Marx means the pamphlet: [G. Mackenzie,] Truth is but Truth, as it is Timed! Or, our Ministry's present Measures against the Moscovite vindicated by Plain and Obvious Reasons, Tending to Prove, etc., London, 1719. p. 56

On August 2, 1718 Britain, Austria and France concluded an alliance against Spain with a view to retaining the provisions of the Peace Treaty of Utrecht, which confirmed the results of the War of the Spanish Succession (see notes 51 and 236). On August 22 of that year the British fleet attacked and destroyed the Spanish fleet near the Cape of Passaro (Sicily). p. 57


The Balance of Trade doctrine—one of the tenets of mercantilism. According to it a country’s prosperity depends totally on the constant inflow of bullion from abroad, and to secure this it is necessary to attain a favourable balance of foreign trade. p. 60

Marx has in mind the book: S. Puffendorf, De Rebus gestis Friderici Wilhelmi Magni, Electoris Brandenburgici, commentariorum Libri novendecim, Berolini, 1695. p. 60

The Russian or Muscovy Company (its real name: Merchant Adventurers for the Discovery of Lands, Countries, Isles, not before known or frequented by any English)—an English trade company founded in the mid-sixteenth century which enjoyed some privileges from the Russian Government. However, the Company's intentions to get hold of the Russian market and also its plans to seize the North of Russia and the Volga route in 1612 during the period of the Polish and Swedish intervention caused dissatisfaction on the part of the Russian Government and merchants. The result of it was that in 1649 the Company virtually ceased to exist. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, during the War of the Spanish Succession (see Note 51), the Company was re-established as England was in great need of shipbuilding materials. p. 61

The publication date of these petitions is not known. p. 61

This refers to the fact Marx wrote about as early as June 1854 in his article “The Formation of a Special Ministry of War in Britain.—The War on the Danube.—The Economic Situation”: “For the measure announced by Sir J. Graham in last Monday’s House of Commons, viz: The non-blockade of the port of Archangel, The Morning Herald accounts in the following laconic paragraph: There is a house at Archangel which bears the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer” (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 225-26). p. 61

See Note 54. p. 61

Marx has in mind the Polish emigrant to the USA and contributor to the New-York Daily Tribune Adam Gurowski, the French historian and writer Elias Regnault and the German philosopher and journalist Bruno Bauer, who wrote
a great deal on the Eastern question and European foreign policy during the Crimean war. p. 62

80 The fortress of Kars was captured by Russian troops during the Crimean war in November 1855. See K. Marx's series of articles "The Fall of Kars" (present edition, Vol. 14, pp. 621-54). p. 63

81 The Suez Canal was built from 1859 to 1869. Ferdinand de Lesseps, a French diplomat and engineer, obtained a concession for the building and exploitation of it on November 30, 1854. The British Government was against the project at first, fearing the expansion of French influence in Egypt and the Middle East. p. 63

82 The town of Narva was captured by the Russian troops in 1558 during the Livonian War (1558-83) fought by Russia against the Livonian Confederation, the Polish-Lithuanian state and Sweden. p. 63

83 The Treaty of Ryswick of 1697 ended the war between France and the Augsburg League (the Netherlands, England, Spain, the German Emperor and several German princes) which lasted from 1688. It confirmed the slightly changed pre-war state boundaries. France was obliged to recognise the 1688 coup d'état in England (see Note 54). p. 64

84 Marx has drawn on the anonymous pamphlet Reasons for the present conduct of Sweden in relation to the trade in the Baltic set forth in a letter from a gentleman at Danzig, to his friend at Amsterdam. Translated from the French original published in Holland; and now submitted to the consideration of all just and impartial Britons, London, 1715. p. 64

85 This is the nickname of the British statesman Robert Walpole, who habitually employed bribery to have his supporters elected to Parliament. p. 65

86 This pamphlet, which contains the text of the treaty and comments to it ("queries"), was published, as Marx supposed, in 1720. The author of the queries is unknown.

The Publishers express their gratitude to the British Museum Library for kindly granting them photocopies of this document and Truth is but Truth, the pamphlet Marx used in writing Chapter V (see this volume, pp. 92-96). p. 65

87 A reference to the war of the Spanish Succession (see Note 51). p. 67

88 The Treaty of Westphalia, signed in 1648, ended the Thirty Years' War. Sweden gained a considerable part of East Pomerania and also the Isle of Rügen, the port of Wismar and the bishoprics of Bremen and Verden, and became a member of the Holy Roman Empire (see Note 67).

The Peace Treaty of Roskilde ended the 1657-58 war between Denmark and Sweden. Denmark ceded her possessions in the South of the Scandinavian peninsular, the fief of Trondhjem in Norway and several islands in the Baltic Sea. Besides, Denmark pledged to open negotiations with the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp on relieving him of her suzerainty, to annul the alliances and treaties directed against Sweden and to free Sweden from payment of the sound duties.

The Copenhagen Peace Treaty ended the 1658-60 war between Denmark and Sweden. The war, provoked by differences connected with the implementation of the Treaty of Roskilde, was launched by Sweden with a view to completely abolishing Denmark's independence. Under the Copenhagen Treaty, the Isle of Bornholm and the fief of Trondhjem were returned to Denmark.
The Peace Treaty of Lunden ended the 1675-79 war between Denmark and Sweden. Denmark gave up her possessions in Skåne which went to Sweden.

89 See Note 55.

90 The great Battle of Poltava (the Ukraine) was fought between Russian and Swedish troops on July 8, 1709, in the course of the Northern War (1700-21). The Russian troops commanded by Peter I won a decisive victory over Charles XII.

91 This refers to the Act of Settlement of June 12, 1701 which fixed the succession to the throne on the Hanover royal family (see Note 40) and deprived the Stuarts of the right of succeeding to the English throne.

92 The reference is to the “glorious revolution” (see Note 54).

93 In this chapter Marx tried to outline Russia’s historical development from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries from the perspective of her role in international affairs, and attempted to reveal the historical roots of the foreign policy of Russian Tsarism in the nineteenth century. Marx did not intend to give a comprehensive analysis of Russian history and restricted himself to making “some preliminary remarks on the general history of Russian politics” (see p. 74). Marx’s main source was History of Russia and of Peter the Great (London, 1829), an English translation of a very unreliable book by the French aristocrat Philippe Paul Ségur. For comments on Marx’s other sources see pp. XXI and XXII.

94 Oleg, Prince of Kiev, raided Constantinople in 911. His successor Igor made war on Byzantium on two occasions, in 941 and 944, which resulted in the conclusion of a trade agreement in 944.

95 Anna, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Romanus II, was married to Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavich of Kiev (who after baptism adopted the name of Vasily) in 987, after her father’s death, by her brother, the Byzantine Emperor Basil II (976-1025). The name of Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavich is connected with the adoption of Christianity in Kiev Russia (988-989) and the latter’s growing might.

96 Presumably Marx is hinting at the so-called “Will of Peter the Great”—a spurious document, different versions of which were repeatedly published in Western Europe in the nineteenth century. Historians have since proved irrefutably that the “Will” was a complete forgery.

97 An inaccuracy in Marx’s text. The third prince of the Vladimir-Suzdal principality was Andrei Bogolyubsky’s brother, Vsevolod Bolshoye Gnezd (1176-1212), during whose reign the territory of the principality was extended and its political and cultural significance grew considerably.

98 The Tartar-Mongol yoke in Russia ended in 1480 as a result of the long and heroic struggle by the Russian people (see Note 109).

99 Marx presumably means the rise of the Moscow Principality in the fourteenth century and the victories of the Russian troops under Dmitry Donskoi over the Golden Horde (battles on the Vozha River in 1378 and on Kulikovo Field in 1380). Later, in his Chronological Notes (1882), Marx wrote in particular: “September 8, 1380—Battle on the broad field of Kulikovo; Dmitry’s complete victory; 200,000 said to be killed on both sides.”
An inaccuracy in Marx's text: Yury Danilovich, the elder brother of Ivan I Danilovich Kalita, bore the title of Grand Prince of Vladimir from 1317; his brother inherited it in 1328.

The reference is to a branch of the Rurik dynasty, the princes of the Principality of Tver which existed in Russia in the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries. In the struggle for power with Prince Yury Danilovich of Moscow (see Note 100), Prince Mikhail Yaroslavich of Tver (1271-1318) was defeated and killed in the camp of Uzbek Khan.

The episcopal seat of the primate was finally transferred to Moscow in 1328.

In 1492 Ivan III sent a deed to Sultan Bajazet II containing a protest against the harassment of Russian merchants in the Turkish possessions. Having received no answer from the Sultan (his envoy was detained in Lithuania), Ivan III sent his own man, ambassador Mikhail Pleshcheyev, to Turkey with instructions to confirm the claims contained in the 1492 deed and to "stand on his feet not knees" during the audience. Pleshcheyev's mission was successful. Sultan Bajazet II promised not to put obstacles in the way of Russian merchants within the Ottoman Empire.

The Golden Horde practically ceased to exist in the second quarter of the fifteenth century due to internecine strife and the liberation movement of the subject peoples, especially the Russian people (see notes 99 and 109). It was succeeded by a Tartar state, the Big Horde, which sprang up on the lower reaches of the Volga; the Nogai (Nogay) Horde, which occupied the territory from the Volga to the Irtysh River, virtually separated from the Golden Horde at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century; the final separation took place in 1426-40.

Timour (Tamerlane) dealt crushing blows to the Golden Horde in his three big campaigns (1389, 1391, 1394-95).

Marx means the free Cossack communities formed on the southern and south-eastern outskirts of the Moscow state in the second half of the fifteenth century by the peasants who had fled from the landowners, and the townsmen. They were used for defence purposes.

The Crimean Khanate separated from the Golden Horde in 1443 as a result of a prolonged struggle; in 1475 it became a vassal of the Ottoman Empire.

Ivan III ceased paying tribute to the Big Horde (see Note 104) in 1476.

The disintegration of the Golden Horde (see Note 104) and especially the heroic struggle of the Russian people were the principal factors which led to the liberation of the Grand Principality of Moscow from the Tartar-Mongol yoke. The events which culminated this struggle are presented by Marx inaccurately. Khan Akhmat launched two campaigns against Moscow: in 1472 and in 1480. In 1472 he captured the town of Aleksin but was forced to retreat before the Russians. In 1480 Khan Akhmat's troops were confronted by strong Russian detachments on the River Ugra (known as "Standing on the Ugra"). Khan Akhmat was forced to retreat in October and November and on January 6, 1481 he was killed by the Nogay Khan Ivak. The "Standing on the Ugra" put an end to the 240-year Tartar-Mongol yoke over Russia.
The Crimean Khan Mengli-Ghirai defeated the Big Horde, but much later, in 1502.

110 In 1459 the Vyatka territory was subordinated to Moscow though it had enjoyed certain autonomy. The reign of Ivan III in the second half of the fifteenth century was marked by the growing separatist movement of the Vyatka boyars and merchants. However, in 1485-86 the movement was suppressed and in 1489 the Vyatka territory was incorporated into the Grand Principality of Moscow.

111 The feudal republic of Pskov existed as an independent state from 1348 to 1510.

112 A reference to the victory of the Moscow army over the Novgorodians on the banks of the River Shelon in 1471. This victory predetermined the abolition of political independence for the Novgorod feudal republic, which existed ever since the twelfth century.

113 After 1475 despite the old statutes legal proceedings on the complaints of the Novgorodians were not taken in their native city but in Moscow.

114 The final incorporation of Novgorod in the Grand Principality of Moscow took place in 1478.

115 The reference is to a kind of a republic formed by the Ukrainian Cossacks (Zaporozhye Sech) in the mid-sixteenth century. It was defeated by Peter I in 1709 and finally abolished by Catherine II in 1775.

116 The last independent Prince of Tver, Mikhail Borisovich, was married to the granddaughter of the Lithuanian Prince Casimir. Trying to throw off the growing dependence on Moscow, he entered into an alliance with Lithuania. However, Ivan III succeeded in breaking Tver’s resistance and in 1485 Tver was finally annexed to Moscow. So ended the struggle of the Tver and Moscow princes for supremacy in Russia (see Note 101).

117 An inaccuracy in the text. Ivan III had four brothers, whose appanages were annexed to the possessions of the Grand Prince at different times. One of his brothers, Andrei Bolshoi, died in confinement.

118 After Casimir’s death in 1492, his son Jan Albrecht succeeded to the Polish throne, and another son, Alexander, to the Lithuanian throne.

119 Elena Ivanovna, the daughter of Ivan III and Sophia Palaeologus, was married to the Lithuanian Grand Prince Alexander on the initiative of and pressure from the Lithuanian nobles who hoped by this means to win concessions from Ivan III.

120 As a result of the wars waged by Ivan III against the Grand Principality of Lithuania (1487-94 and 1500-03) western Russian towns (Chernigov, Novgorod-Seversky, Gomel, Bryansk) and the lands adjoining them were appended to Moscow. Smolensk was incorporated into Russia in 1514, after Ivan III’s death.

121 The facts are inaccurate here. In an attempt to save the Byzantine Empire from the Turkish invasion the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church entered into union with the Catholic Church at the Council of Florence in 1439. Under the terms of the Union of Florence the Eastern Orthodox Church acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope and accepted the Catholic dogmas, while retaining its own rites. After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks
in 1453, Thomas, the brother of the last Byzantine Emperor Constantine XI Palaeologus, and his family, fled to Rome.

Pope Paul II, by planning to marry Thomas’s daughter Sophia (Zoë) Palaeologus to Ivan III, and basing himself on the decisions of the Union of Florence, hoped to consolidate his power over the Russian Orthodox Church.

Ivan III married Sophia Palaeologus on November 12, 1472, under Pope Sixtus IV. Ivan III used this marriage to enhance Russia’s prestige in international affairs and his own authority as a Grand Prince in Russia.

In this chapter, Marx drew on one of Engels’ articles about Pan-Slavism, written for the *New-York Daily Tribune* in 1856, but never published. The manuscripts of these articles, which the editors of the newspaper returned to Marx, have not been traced. Soon after the *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century* had been published, Marx wrote to Engels on April 9, 1857: “In the last one I used the text of one of your articles, in which you speak of Peter I” (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 120).

This refers to the Russo-Turkish wars of 1686-99 and 1710-13 and Peter I’s campaign to the Persian possessions near the Caspian Sea in 1722-23.

Peter I assumed the title of Emperor in 1721.

An ironic allusion to the actions of the English fleet commanded by Charles Napier (1854) and Richard Dundas (1855) during the Crimean war (1853-56).

The *Peace Treaty of Stolbowa* was concluded between Russia and Sweden with Britain’s mediation in 1617, after the failure of the intervention of Poland and Sweden in Russia at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Sweden returned several Russian towns to Russia, but retained the territories in Karelia and the Baltic lands, and thus cut off Russia from the Baltic Sea. The treaty envisaged the resumption of trade between Russia and Sweden. The state boundaries established by this treaty were intact till the Northern War (1700-21).

See Note 88.

See Note 55.

A reference to the treaty of 1711, signed during the Russo-Turkish war of 1710-13.

This refers to events in Madrid during the summer of 1856 which ended the fourth bourgeois revolution in Spain (1854-56). In July 1856 the conservative liberal opposition secured the resignation of the Espartero Progresista ministry and the formation of a conservative ministry headed by General O’Donnell. Disturbances organised by the left-democratic forces of the Cortes in Madrid, Barcelona, Saragossa and other towns were brutally suppressed by O’Donnell.

Marx is referring to the counter-revolutionary mutiny (pronunciamiento) organised in May 1843 by generals Narváez, Conche and others against the dictatorship of Espartero, leader of the Progresistas. Some of the Progresistas, dissatisfied with the dictator’s policy, supported the mutiny. On July 30, 1843, Espartero fled from the country and General Narváez, a leader of the
Moderados (see Note 136), who found support among the big landowners, became dictator. The reaction set in till the fourth revolution (1854-56).

**Notes**

133 *Ayacuchos*—the name given to Espartero’s followers during his Regency (1840-43), members of the pro-English military party headed by him. They were so called after the decisive battle at Ayacucho, Peru, on December 9, 1824, during the war of independence of the Spanish colonies in America. The metropolitan troops were led by Espartero and other generals. The battle was won by the insurgent army and put an end to Spain’s rule in South America. See also the article “Ayacucho” by Marx and Engels (present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 170-71).

134 A reference to Anglo-French diplomatic battles round the marriages of Queen Isabella II of Spain and her sister infanta María Luisa Fernanda. Their mother María Cristina (secretly married to Agustín Fernando Muñoz, a sergeant of the royal guards who later received the title of Duke of Ríánsares; hence, Marx calls her Madame Muñoz) made an agreement with King Louis Philippe of France and, as a result, despite the intrigues of English diplomats, in October 1846 Isabella married Don Francisco de Asis of the Spanish Bourbons, and María Luisa Fernanda married the Duke of Montpensier, Louis Philippe’s younger son.

135 A reference is to the second bourgeois revolution in Spain (1820-23). After an abortive attempt to overthrow the constitutional government in Madrid on July 7, 1822, King Ferdinand VII of Spain secretly appealed to the Holy Alliance (see Note 5) for help in suppressing the revolution. By decision adopted at the Congress of Verona of the Holy Alliance on October 20, 1822 France was to help Ferdinand. On April 7, 1823 a French expeditionary corps entered Spain and on October 1 the King’s absolute power was restored in the country. The French troops stayed in Spain until 1828.

136 *Moderados*, a party advocating a constitutional monarchy and representing the interests of the big bourgeoisie and liberal nobility, was organised at the beginning of the bourgeois revolution of 1820-23. In the 1840s and 1850s one of its leaders was General Narváez. The liberal-bourgeois *Progresista* party was formed in the 1830s. The Progresistas found support among the urban middle and petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals and some officers. Their principal demand was for restriction of the powers of the monarchy.

137 A reference to the events in Madrid in June-July 1854 which started the fourth bourgeois revolution in Spain (1854-56). In July 1854 the Cabinet reshufflings caused by an uprising in the army and disturbances in the city brought to power the Ministry of the Duke of Rivas (Ryos y Rosas also became its member). It was nicknamed “the shrapnel ministry” for the way it suppressed the uprising. The Ministry’s activity led to a new uprising, and the Ministry had to resign.

138 An allusion to the battle at Luchana bridge on December 25, 1836, during the first Carlist war (1833-40), in which the troops commanded by Espartero won a decisive victory over the Carlists and captured the town of Bilbao. Espartero was made Count of Luchana.

Below Marx alludes to Espartero’s speech in Madrid in July 1854, at the beginning of the fourth Spanish revolution (1854-56): “Men of Madrid, you have summoned me to establish for ever the liberties of our land. Here I am;
and if the enemies of our most Holy liberty would snatch it from us, with the sword of Luchana I will put myself at your head, at the head of all Spaniards, and will show you the way to glory.”

139 This refers to Espartero's resignation in July 1856. O'Donnell, Espartero's opponent in the government, succeeded in rallying all reactionary elements in the country, the Court and the Catholic clergy included, due to Espartero's irresolution and half-way policy. Behind Espartero's back he contacted Queen Isabella who was interested in suppressing the peasant movement which swept Spain in the spring and summer of 1856.

Unable to settle the differences in his government, Espartero chose Isabella as his arbiter. On July 13, 1856 he requested her to help him make peace between two members of the government: the radical Escosura and O'Donnell. Considering them both of great use in the government, Espartero declared that he would leave his post if one of them resigned. Therefore, when the Queen consented to Escosura's resignation, Espartero was forced to keep his promise.

On July 14, O'Donnell was appointed Prime Minister. Espartero gave up his struggle and did not head the democratic left wing of the Cortes which adopted a resolution against the new cabinet and called on the national militia and the people of Madrid to rebel.

140 Carlism, Carlists—a reactionary clerico-absolutist group in Spain consisting of adherents of the pretender to the Spanish throne Don Carlos, the brother of Ferdinand VII. Relying on the military and the Catholic clergy, and also making use of the support of the backward peasants in some regions of Spain, the Carlists launched in 1833 a civil war, which in fact turned into a struggle between the feudal-Catholic and liberal-bourgeois elements and led to the third bourgeois revolution (1834-43).

141 Marx is referring to the uprising of the Paris proletariat against the bourgeois regime of the Second Republic (June 23-26, 1848) and to an armed uprising which took place in Dresden on May 3-9, 1849.

142 A reference to the war of independence of the Spanish people against France (1808-14) which combined with the first bourgeois revolution in Spain. At the beginning of 1808, Napoleon I's troops entered Spain. The people answered with an uprising. Charles IV was forced to abdicate in favour of his son Ferdinand VII. Napoleon I, however, made Ferdinand VII give up his rights and proclaimed his brother Joseph King of Spain. Ferdinand VII was sent to France. A guerrilla war flared up and the organs of revolutionary power were set up. In 1810 the Cortes introduced a series of liberal reforms and in 1812 adopted the so-called Cadiz Constitution. This restricted the King's powers, and transferred legislative power to the one-chamber Cortes elected by universal suffrage. When the French troops were driven out of Spain, Ferdinand VII returned to Madrid. He refused to recognise the Constitution and restored the reactionary absolutist system.

143 A reference to the second bourgeois revolution in Spain (1820-23) which started on January 1, 1820 with a mutiny in the army directed by Rafael del Riego. It soon grew into a popular movement that swept the country. The revolution aimed at abolishing feudal relations in Spain. The Constitution of 1812 (see Note 142) which was abrogated in 1814 was reinstated. Some moderate reforms were adopted to liquidate the legal and administrative remnants of feudalism. However, an agrarian reform was not carried through, and this made the peasants withdraw from the revolution thereby facilitating its
defeat. The revolution was suppressed by the Holy Alliance in October 1823 (see Note 135).

144 On May 2, 1808 a popular uprising against the French interventionists flared up in Madrid. It was brutally suppressed by the commander-in-chief of the French army in Spain, Murat.

145 In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Spain and her colonies were divided into 17 military districts directed by captain-generals (hence the name Captain-Generalships). As viceroys, they possessed supreme power, both civil and military.

146 Marx is referring to the period of feudal absolutist reaction which set in after Ferdinand VII’s return from France to Spain in March 1814. These years were characterised by numerous army conspiracies, and by the impotence and instability of the Spanish Government. From 1814 to 1819, 24 ministries succeeded one another.

For the dynastic war of 1833-40 see Note 140.

147 A reference to the proclamation issued by generals O’Donnell and Dulce on July 1, 1854 after the mutiny of the Madrid garrison on June 28 with the aim of overthrowing San Luis’ ministry and seizing power. On July 7 in Manzanares, La Mancha, the proclamation, known as the Manzanares programme was adopted. It envisaged the preservation of the monarchy, but the removal of the Court camarilla, the observance of the laws, formation of a national militia and other points. By adopting this programme O’Donnell and his followers sought to win the support of the masses.

148 “The Croats of Radetzky”—a reference to the Croatian border regiments stationed in the Military Border Area, a special militarily organised region of the Austrian Empire along the frontier with Turkey. They were used by the Austrian command to suppress the national liberation movements in the provinces, in Northern Italy in particular.

By the “Africans of Bonaparte” Marx means the Zouaves—French colonial troops first formed in 1830. Originally they were composed of Algerians and French colonists and later of Frenchmen only, while Algerians were formed into special regiments of riflemen. They were notorious for their atrocities during the colonial wars in Algeria.

In November 1848 the troops commanded by Wrangel took part in the counter-revolutionary coup in Berlin and in the dissolution of the Prussian National Assembly. The troops included many men from Pomerania, Wrangel’s homeland.

149 An allusion to the methods employed by Louis Bonaparte to win supporters while preparing the coup d’etat of December 2, 1851. At the receptions and military reviews he held as President of the Republic at Satory and elsewhere, army officers and men were treated to sausages, cold meat and champagne (see Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 150, 151, 179 and 180).

150 The Deists recognise the idea of God as the rational creator of the universe, but deny God’s interference in nature and social life. In 1624, in Paris, Edward Herbert of Cherbury composed a Deist profession of faith.

151 Marx dwelt on this subject in his letter to Engels of September 26, 1836 in the part which is devoted to the state of the European money market at the time (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 72).
The Court of Chancery—one of England's highest courts, a division of the High Court of Justice following the Judicature Act of 1873. It was presided over by the Lord Chancellor and dealt with matters relating to inheritance, observance of contracts, joint-stock companies and similar legal problems. It was notorious for red tape and procrastination.

The banquets in support of the electoral reform were held in France in July 1847-January 1848 on the eve of the 1848 revolution.

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 start hostilities against the other cantons early in November. On November 23, 1847, the Sonderbund army was defeated by federal forces.

The United Diet—an assembly of representatives from the eight Provincial Diets of Prussia based on the estate principle. It sanctioned new taxes and loans, discussed new Bills and had the right to petition the King.

On the Spanish marriages see Note 134.

By decision of the Congress of Vienna (1815), the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were incorporated into the Kingdom of Denmark, 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 liberation movement among the German population of the duchies grew in strength, becoming radical and democratic and forming part of the struggle for the unification of Germany.

Prussia and other states of the German Confederation sent federal troops to the duchies. Fearing a popular outbreak and an intensification of the revolution, the Prussian Government sought an agreement with the Danish monarchy to the detriment of overall German interests. As a result, the duchies remained part of the Kingdom of Denmark.

The July revolution of 1830 in France greatly influenced the social and political life of Germany. Constitutions were proclaimed in Brunswick, Saxony, Hesse, Cassel and other German states. Like the "1830 Charter" in France, which was a compromise between the topmost bourgeoisie—the finance aristocracy—and the landed aristocracy, these constitutions were a compromise between the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the king and the nobility on the other.

In the spring of 1856 floods occurred in the valleys of the Rhône and the Loire. Napoleon III visited a number of the affected towns and villages in a boat and personally handed out money. He also directed a message to the Minister of Public Works recommending measures to prevent such calamities.

Rich gold deposits were discovered in California in 1848 and Australia in 1851. Apart from their great importance for the commercial and industrial development of the European and American countries, these discoveries whipped up stock-exchange speculation there.

"The Second Congress of Paris" is Marx's scathing name for the meeting of European countries which was being prepared in Paris. It took place in March 1857 and was devoted to the peaceful settlement of the so-called Neuchâtel conflict between Prussia and Switzerland.
In September 1856 an uprising by adherents of the King of Prussia flared up in Neuchâtel. The insurgents were arrested by the Swiss troops. In answer to the King’s demand to release the prisoners Switzerland suggested that the King should give up his rights to Neuchâtel. It was only under French pressure that Prussia was forced to officially renounce her claims in May 1857.

The *Naples question* was discussed at the Congress of Paris (1856) at the request of Piedmont’s representatives, who drew the attention of the Congress to the policy of terror in the Kingdom of Naples (the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies) (see Note 6). Fearing that this policy might set off a revolutionary explosion, France and England demanded in May 1856 that King Ferdinand II of Naples should give up this policy. Convinced that Austria would support him, Ferdinand II refused to comply with the demand. After this, in October 1856, diplomatic relations with France and England were broken off. The governments of France and England put their naval squadrons in the Mediterranean on alert. However, owing to differences between these countries the Neapolitan expedition did not take place.

On the *Neapolitan question* see Note 158.

The *Danubian question* was one of the central issues at the Congress of Paris (1856). The point of discussion was the status of the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. All participants in the Congress guaranteed them autonomy within the Ottoman Empire. In view of the growing social movement in the principalities for unification into a single state the Congress adopted a decision to hold a referendum on this issue. It was decided to convene a special conference to finally determine the status and rights of the Danubian principalities. Marx means here complicated diplomatic struggle around that issue during preparations of the conference which was convened in 1858.

The *Bessarabian question* was directly connected with that of the Danubian principalities at the Congress of Paris (1856). Under the Paris treaty of March 30, 1856, part of the Bessarabian lands that had formerly belonged to Russia were ceded to Moldavia which was still under Turkey’s protectorate.

On the new Congress of Paris see Note 157.

Marx is referring to the war of independence of the Spanish colonies in America which lasted from 1810 to 1826. As a result of this war Spain lost Mexico and the South-American colonies which became independent republics.

The *British East India Company* was founded at the beginning of the seventeenth century. It had the monopoly of trade with the East Indies and played a decisive part in establishing the British colonial empire.

The East India Company’s trade monopoly was abolished in 1813. The only exception was trade with China, the main articles of which were opium and tea. The Company was finally liquidated in 1858, during the popular Indian uprising of 1857-59. Marx gave a detailed description of the company in his article “The East India Company—Its History and Results” (see present edition, Vol. 12).

In 1850 popular unrest spread over a number of southern provinces in China and developed into a powerful peasant war. The insurgents established a state of their own over a considerable part of Chinese territory. It was called the Celestial Empire (Taiping Tankuo, hence the name of the movement—the Taiping uprising). The leaders put forward a utopian programme calling for
the existing social order to be transformed into a militarised patriarchal system based on the egalitarian principle. The movement, which was also anti-colonial in character, was weakened by internal strife and the formation of its own aristocracy in the Taiping state. It was dealt a crushing blow by the armed intervention of Britain and France. The Taiping uprising was put down in 1864.

Marx is referring to the manifestoes issued by Mazzini during the democratic popular movement for the liberation and unification of Italy. They had no decisive influence on the liberation struggle of the Italian people. Mazzini counted on the people as the main force of the national liberation struggle, but he did not take into account the specific interests of the Italian peasants who formed the bulk of the country's population. The conspiracies and uprisings instigated by him in the 1830s-50s were a failure because he was divorced from the masses and chose the moment for action on the impulse. Marx and Engels repeatedly criticised Mazzini's manifestoes for their vagueness, contradoritoriness and bourgeois limitations (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 528-32).

The additional 45-centime tax for every franc of all direct taxes was introduced by the French Provisional Government on March 16, 1848, and it became a heavy burden, above all for the peasants who made up the majority of France's population. This measure caused the peasant masses to turn away from the revolution and to vote for Louis Napoleon Bonaparte at the presidential elections on December 10, 1848.

The national workshops (ateliers) were instituted by the Provisional Government immediately after the February revolution of 1848. By this means the government sought to discredit Louis Blanc's ideas on the "Organisation of Labour" in the eyes of the workers and, at the same time, to utilise those employed in the national workshops, organised on military lines, against the revolutionary proletariat. Revolutionary ideas, however, continued to gain ground in the national workshops. The government took steps to reduce the number of workers employed in them, to send a large number off to public works in the province and, finally, to liquidate the workshops. The government's actions precipitated a proletarian uprising in Paris in June 1848. After its suppression, the Cavaignac Government issued a decree on July 3 disbanding the national workshops.


Presumably a reference to the events in Paris connected with the funeral of the well-known French sculptor David d'Angers, a republican. Many republican-minded students took part in the funeral procession in January 1856. Very popular among them was an anti-Bonapartist song ascribed to Béranger, who was also among the mourners and was greeted by the students with great enthusiasm.

Next comes this paragraph, inserted by the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune*: "Of one thing, too, we in America may be perfectly assured; and that is, that when the downfall of this vast structure of swindling comes we shall go with it. We boast of our prosperity, but it is hollow. We are mere colonists and dependents of Europe. Let Napoleon tumble, and the event will be deeply felt not only in the coffers of the Wall-street gambler, but still more in the workshop and the home of the American laboring man."

*Notes 164* Marx is referring to the manifestoes issued by Mazzini during the democratic popular movement for the liberation and unification of Italy. They had no decisive influence on the liberation struggle of the Italian people. Mazzini counted on the people as the main force of the national liberation struggle, but he did not take into account the specific interests of the Italian peasants who formed the bulk of the country's population. The conspiracies and uprisings instigated by him in the 1830s-50s were a failure because he was divorced from the masses and chose the moment for action on the impulse. Marx and Engels repeatedly criticised Mazzini's manifestoes for their vagueness, contradoritoriness and bourgeois limitations (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 528-32).

*Notes 165* The additional 45-centime tax for every franc of all direct taxes was introduced by the French Provisional Government on March 16, 1848, and it became a heavy burden, above all for the peasants who made up the majority of France's population. This measure caused the peasant masses to turn away from the revolution and to vote for Louis Napoleon Bonaparte at the presidential elections on December 10, 1848.

*Notes 166* The national workshops (ateliers) were instituted by the Provisional Government immediately after the February revolution of 1848. By this means the government sought to discredit Louis Blanc's ideas on the "Organisation of Labour" in the eyes of the workers and, at the same time, to utilise those employed in the national workshops, organised on military lines, against the revolutionary proletariat. Revolutionary ideas, however, continued to gain ground in the national workshops. The government took steps to reduce the number of workers employed in them, to send a large number off to public works in the province and, finally, to liquidate the workshops. The government's actions precipitated a proletarian uprising in Paris in June 1848. After its suppression, the Cavaignac Government issued a decree on July 3 disbanding the national workshops.


*Notes 167* Presumably a reference to the events in Paris connected with the funeral of the well-known French sculptor David d'Angers, a republican. Many republican-minded students took part in the funeral procession in January 1856. Very popular among them was an anti-Bonapartist song ascribed to Béranger, who was also among the mourners and was greeted by the students with great enthusiasm.

*Notes 168* Next comes this paragraph, inserted by the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune*: "Of one thing, too, we in America may be perfectly assured; and that is, that when the downfall of this vast structure of swindling comes we shall go with it. We boast of our prosperity, but it is hollow. We are mere colonists and dependents of Europe. Let Napoleon tumble, and the event will be deeply felt not only in the coffers of the Wall-street gambler, but still more in the workshop and the home of the American laboring man."

*Notes 653*
When working on this article, Marx made a rough draft, “Venice”, which is extant in his Notebook of excerpts for November 1854-beginning of 1857. It is published in this volume, in the section “From the Preparatory Materials”, pp. 615-18.

The editors have no sources used by Marx for the article. p. 139

The Treaty of Campo-Formio, signed on October 17, 1797, concluded the victorious war of the French Republic against Austria, a member-country of the first anti-French coalition. Under the treaty, a large part of the Venetian Republic, including Venice, and also Istria and Dalmatia, were given to Austria in exchange for concessions made to France on the Rhine frontier.

The Peace of Lunéville of 1801 between France and Austria ended the war between France and the second coalition. It confirmed the provisions of the Treaty of Campo-Formio. p. 139

Under the Treaty of Pressburg concluded on December 26, 1805 between France and Austria, the latter acknowledged France’s seizure of part of Italian territory (Piedmont, Genoa, Parma, Piacenza, etc.) and yielded to the Kingdom of Italy (i.e. to Napoleon I who became King of Italy) the Adriatic coast—the Venetian region, Istria and Dalmatia—keeping only Trieste.

Under the Treaty of Vienna, known under the name of Schönbrunn peace treaty concluded on October 14, 1809, between France and Austria, the latter ceded to France, Trieste, Craina, part of Carinthia and Croatia and also Istria. France undertook not to interfere with Austria’s transit trade via Fiume. p. 139

The Final (General) Act of the Congress of Vienna of June 9, 1815 annulled the Schönbrunn Peace Treaty (see Note 171). Austria acquired North-Eastern Italy (Lombardy and Venetia) and smaller Italian duchies. p. 139

The Austrian Lloyd—the name given by Marx to a maritime company founded in Trieste in 1833. Initially an insurance company, in 1836 the Austrian Lloyd became a steamship company entitled Die Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft des Österreichisch-Ungarischen Lloyd.

Many maritime insurance companies in Europe began to be named Lloyd’s after Edward Lloyd, the owner of a coffee-house in London where the first English maritime insurance company was established in the late seventeenth century. p. 140

A reference to the customs system introduced by Napoleon I during the Continental Blockade of 1806-14. It included a series of strict prohibitions in customs policy and exceptionally high tariffs for colonial products imported to Europe, which was highly detrimental to trade in the Adriatic Sea’s ports. p. 141

See Note 170. p. 146

See Note 171. p. 146

The civil wars in Rome reflected the class struggle between different groups in the slave-owning society in the second and first centuries B.C. They reached their peak in the 80s-40s B.C., particularly during Julius Caesar’s struggle for dictatorship and in the epoch of the second triumvirate. They resulted in the substitution of an empire—a new political system—for the Roman Republic. p. 146

The Uskoks (Serbian: fugitives)—Balkan Slavs who fled to the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic Sea following the seizure of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the
Turks in the second half of the fifteenth century. They waged a struggle against the Turks, making land and sea raids supported by local population. Their raids in the region of the Adriatic Sea also undermined Venice’s maritime trade.

179 See Note 115.

180 See Note 171.

181 The Battle of Austerlitz on December 2 (November 20), 1805 between the Russian and Austrian forces (the third European coalition) and the French ended in a victory for Napoleon I.

182 The article is based on Marx’s rough draft of an article which he entitled “Prussia (‘The Military State’)” and which is an annotated synopsis of A. F. Stein’s Preussisch-Brandenburgische Geschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Erinnerung und Belehrung.

183 In the eighteenth century the Principality of Neuchâtel and Valangin (in German, Neuenburg and Vallendis) was under Prussian rule. In 1815 by decision of the Vienna Congress it was incorporated into Swiss Confederation as the 21st canton, while remaining a vassal of Prussia. In 1848 a republic was proclaimed in Neuchâtel. However, Prussia laid constant claim to Neuchâtel up to 1857, which led to a sharp conflict with Switzerland.

184 This refers to the so-called Burgundian wars (1474-77) waged by Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, against France. The Principality of Neuchâtel, committed to Berne by an obligation (1406), sided with the Swiss Confederation, which was France’s ally and which declared war on Charles the Bold. The troops of Charles the Bold were defeated by the Allied forces at Nancy on January 5, 1477 and he himself was killed in the battle. This led to the disintegration of the Duchy of Burgundy and the strengthening of the ties of Neuchâtel and Valangin with the Swiss Confederation.

185 Under the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna (1815) Prussia received what was known as Swedish Pomerania from Denmark.

186 The Council of Constance (1414-18) was convened to strengthen the weakened position of the Catholic Church. It condemned the teachings of John Wycliffe and Jan Hus and ended the schism in the Catholic Church by electing a new Pope.

187 The Teutonic Order—a German religious Order of Knights founded in 1190 during the Crusades. The Order seized vast possessions in Germany and other countries. These were administered by dignitaries known as commandores (or comthurs). In the thirteenth century, East Prussia fell under the rule of the Order after it was overrun and the local population exterminated. In 1237 the Order amalgamated with the Livonian Order, which also had its seat in the Baltic area. The Eastern possessions of the Order became a seat of aggression against Poland, Lithuania and the adjoining Russian principalities. After the defeat at Chudskoye Lake in 1242 and in the battle at Grünwald in 1410, the Order rapidly declined and was only able to maintain a small part of its former possessions.

188 The Hussites—the followers of Jan Hus, a preacher, thinker and the exponent of the Bohemian Reformation. They participated in the popular movement of 1419-37 against the Catholic Church, feudal exploitation and German
domination in Bohemia. There were two trends in the Hussite movement: a moderate (the Calixtines, or Utraquists) and a radical (the Taborites—see Note 189) trend. The Hussites built up a strong army which rebuffed five crusades organised against Bohemia by the Pope and the German Emperor Sigismund I. The movement was suppressed as a result of the burghers' and knights' compromise with Sigismund I.

189 The Taborites (so called from their camp in the town of Tabor, Bohemia)—a radical trend in the Hussite movement. They were the revolutionary, democratic wing of the Hussites, and their demands reflected the desire of the peasantry and the urban lower classes for an end to all feudal oppression and all manifestations of social and political arbitrariness. The Taborites were the core of the Hussite army.

190 A reference to the League of Schmalkalden (February 27, 1531), named after the town in Thuringia where it was formed, was a union of Protestant princes and a number of Imperial towns for the protection of the Reformation against the Catholic princes headed by Emperor Charles V. From 1546 to 1548 the League and the Emperor were engaged in a war which ended in the latter's victory and the disintegration of the League.

191 The Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—a European war in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes, rallied under the banner of Catholicism, fought the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of Protestant German states. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Habsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the principal battle area and the main object of plunder and territorial claims. The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) sealed the political dismemberment of Germany.

192 This refers to what is known as the Peace of Prague, a separate agreement concluded by the Elector of Saxony Johann Georg and the Emperor Ferdinand II of Habsburg on May 30, 1635. They were joined by the Elector of Brandenburg Georg Wilhelm and certain Protestant princes. Under this agreement the Elector of Saxony received Upper and Lower Lužica and part of Magdeburg's possessions.

The Protestant princes consolidated their hold on the lands which they had seized from the Church in the sixteenth century.

193 In 1611, the Polish Diet adopted a decision on the unification of the Duchy of Prussia with Brandenburg under Hohenzollern rule. This was done despite the opposition of a group of deputies who advocated Poland's rights to East Prussia. However, the Duchy of Prussia remained a territory held in fee by Poland. This decision was implemented in 1618 when the Elector of Brandenburg, Johann Sigismund, received the Duchy of Prussia in fee from the Polish King in exchange for his promise to take part in the war against Sweden. Under the Wielawa-Bydgoszcz Treaty of 1657 Poland finally renounced her supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia in favour of Brandenburg.

194 On the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14) see Note 51.

The Elector of Brandenburg, Friedrich III, having secured the support of the Polish nobility by bribery, and that of Emperor Leopold I by sending him Brandenburg troops for his war in Spain, announced, on January 18, 1701, the establishment of the Kingdom of Prussia and proclaimed himself King Frederick I.
On February 1, 1720, Prussia, a participant in the Northern War on Russia's side, concluded a peace treaty with Sweden under which it received Eastern Pomerania with the town of Stettin.

The three partitions of Poland (by Austria, Prussia and Russia) took place in 1772, 1793 and 1795.

Polish lands, including Pomorze, Great Poland, and part of Mazovia with Warsaw, went over to Prussia; Russia gained Lithuanian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian territories; Austria received the Western Ukraine and part of Smaller Poland. As a result of the third partition, Poland ceased to exist as a state.

Under the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna signed on June 9, 1815 Prussia gained Northern Saxony (almost half of Saxony's territory), Torn and Poznan, the Rhine Province and the greater part of Westphalia. p. 157

This refers to the incident which sparked off the Second Opium War: the seizure by the Chinese authorities of the British lorchra Arrow carrying contraband opium in Canton in 1856. The British Government retaliated by sending a corps of 5,000 men to China under the command of Lord Elgin. Canton was brutally bombarded in October-November 1856 by the fleet commanded by Admiral Seymour and on December 29, 1857 it was captured by the British. p. 158

This refers to Article 9 of the Anglo-Chinese treaty of October 8, 1843 signed to supplement the Treaty of Nanking.

The Treaty of Nanking, concluded between Britain and China in 1842, was the first of a series of unequal treaties imposed by the Western powers on China, reducing it to the status of a semi-colony. The Nanking Treaty made China open five of its ports to British commerce—Canton, Shanghai, Amoy, Ningpo and Fu-chou, cede the Island of Hongkong to Britain "in perpetuity" and pay a large indemnity. It introduced import and export tariffs advantageous to Britain.

The supplementary protocol of 1843 concerning the general rules for trading in the five open ports contained articles (2, 7 and 13) envisaging cooperation between the British and Chinese authorities in inspecting the goods brought to the ports and in organising their work. According to its Article 9 the Chinese who cooperated with the British were not subject to China's jurisdiction.

According to Article 2 of the Treaty of Nanking of 1842 (see Note 197), British subjects with their families and their property were allowed to stay in Canton "to achieve their commercial aims". However, because of resistance on the part of the Chinese population, access to Canton was postponed, first, under the agreement of 1846 for indefinite time; then, in 1847, for two more years. p. 158

See Note 197. p. 162

In the 1850s William Walker, an American adventurer, made several expeditions to Central America actually pursuing expansionist aims. In 1855, he captured Granada, the capital of Nicaragua, and soon proclaimed himself president. He tried to establish a dictatorship and restore slavery. During an expedition to Honduras in the late 1850s, Walker was taken prisoner and shot in 1860. p. 162

As a pretext for the First Opium War (1839-42), Britain used the confiscation by the Chinese authorities in Canton of opium stocks owned by foreign merchants. p. 163
202 Here Marx is referring to the Taipings (see Note 163) who by the beginning of 1857 had established an Empire in the central part of China, its most fertile and rich regions along the middle reaches of the Yangtze. p. 163

203 In the New-York Daily Tribune this is followed by a note from the editors: “With regard to the reported destruction of a Chinese fort by the American frigate Portsmouth, we are not yet sufficiently informed to express a decided opinion.” p. 163

204 Engels wrote this article for the New-York Daily Tribune early in January 1857 at Marx's request. In his letter to Engels of January 10, Marx informed him of the receipt of the article (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 89).

The article was prompted by the Neuchâtel conflict (see Note 157) and the plans for the invasion of Switzerland by Prussian troops, widely discussed in the press. It consisted of two parts, the first being published in the New-York Daily Tribune on January 27, 1857. The editors of the Tribune decided not to print the second part, and Charles Dana informed Marx of this in a letter of March 5, 1857, because on January 16, 1857 the Swiss government made concessions to Prussia by releasing the arrested monarchists. “The miserable collapse of Switzerland's bragadocio”—such was Marx's appraisal of the latest events of the Neuchâtel conflict in his letter to Engels of January 20 (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 94).

In the present edition the first part of the article is reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune collated with an extant excerpt of the rough manuscript. The most important passages in the manuscript, which were omitted in the printed text, are given in the footnotes. The second part of the article is published according to the manuscript copied by Marx. p. 164

205 In the Battle of Sempach (Canton of Lucerne) on July 9, 1386 the Swiss defeated the Austrian troops of Prince Leopold III. The Battle of Morgarten between Swiss volunteers and the troops of Leopold of Habsburg on November 15, 1315 ended in victory for the volunteers. At Murten (Canton of Freiburg) on June 22, 1476 and at Granson (Canton Vaud) on March 2, 1476, the Swiss defeated the troops of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. p. 164

206 Engels is referring here to the wars of the League of Three Forest Cantons against the Habsburgs. As a result of them a Swiss Confederation consisting of eight lands was set up in 1389; the independence of Switzerland was recognised in 1499.

On the Burgundian wars see Note 184. p. 167

207 The troops of the French Directory entered Switzerland in the spring of 1798 to support the economically advanced cantons which were for the abolition of the feudal relations in the country. On April 12, 1798 a Helvetian Republic was proclaimed in Switzerland, and a constitution modelled on the French constitution of 1795 was adopted. The measures introduced by the new constitution favoured the economically advanced cantons and provoked stubborn resistance from the agrarian cantons in the central and eastern parts of the country. By the insurrections of the old forest cantons Engels means their actions against the French in April, May and August 1798. The Helvetian Republic became fully dependent on France with the conclusion of a defensive-offensive union, which led to the republic's participation in the war against the Second Coalition on France's side. The coalition was formed in
1798 and included Austria, England, the Kingdom of Naples, Russia, Turkey and other countries.

208 During the war of the Second Coalition (see Note 207) against France, the Russian and Austrian forces under the command of Alexander Suvorov freed almost the whole of Northern Italy from the French in the spring and summer of 1799. At the insistence of the Austrian Government Suvorov's army was then sent to Switzerland to link up with the Russian corps of Rimsky-Korsakov, which was being pressed by the forces of the French General Masséna. After the Russian army had heroically fought its way across the Saint Gotthard and several other mountain passes it was encircled by superior French forces, which had defeated Korsakov's corps at Zurich on September 25. Under extremely hard conditions Suvorov's troops succeeded in making their way through a number of Alpine mountain passes and on October 12 reached the upper Rhine. In his work *Po and Rhine* Engels wrote: "This passage was the most impressive of all Alpine crossings in modern times" (see present edition, Vol. 16, p. 222).

209 In 1830 the French Government launched a colonial war in Algeria. The Algerian people put up a stubborn resistance to the colonialists; it took the French 40 years to turn Algeria into their colony.

210 The *Tyrolean insurrection*—the insurrection of the Tyrol peasants which broke out in April 1809 and was headed by Andreas Hofer. It was directed against the French occupants and the Bavarian authorities. Under the Treaty of Pressburg of 1805 Tyrol was annexed from Austria to Bavaria by Napoleon I. The Austrian Government used the growing discontent of the Tyrolese with the new order in its own interests and supported the insurrection which at its initial stage was successful. After the Treaty of Schönbrunn (1809) by which Austria recognised the annexation of Tyrol to Bavaria, Napoleon I moved considerable forces against the Tyrolean peasants. The insurrection was suppressed in 1810.

On the *Spanish guerrilla war* see Note 142.

On the *Carlism* see Note 140.

211 A reference to the war waged by the peoples of the North Caucasus (Adyghe, Chechens, Avars, Lezghins, etc.) against the Tsarist government. In the 1820s the liberation struggle of these peoples against the Tsarist colonialists and the arbitrary rule of the local feudal lords was headed by Shamyl, who was proclaimed Imam of Daghestan in 1834. The movement reached its peak in the 1840s and was suppressed in 1859.

212 Engels is referring to the wars, which lasted from 1792 to 1815, between revolutionary and Napoleonic France and the coalitions of European states.

213 The *Landsturm*—an armed force, a second-rate militia. It was organised in Tyrol in 1809. In the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries the *Landsturm* existed in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Holland, Switzerland and Sweden. It was called out in the event of a national emergency. In Switzerland all citizens from seventeen to fifty years of age outside the regular army or the *Landwehr* were enrolled in it.

214 This article was compiled by the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* from Marx's two articles on the Anglo-Persian war, as can be seen from Charles Dana's letter of March 5, 1857. He wrote: "Two articles on Persia were
condensed into one and published in that form.” The rough copies of both articles are extant. The heading of the article was taken from them. p. 177

215 The Sikhs—a religious sect which appeared in the Punjab (North-West India) in the sixteenth century. Their teaching on the equality of people was used by the peasants who fought against the Hindu feudal lords and the Afghan invaders at the end of the seventeenth century. Subsequently a local aristocracy emerged among the Sikhs and its representatives ruled the Sikh state, which in the early nineteenth century included the Punjab and some border regions. In 1845-46 and 1848-49 Britain waged aggressive wars against the Sikhs which ended with the subjugation of the Punjab. The conquest of the Punjab completed the British colonisation of India. p. 177

216 Sunnites (Sunni) and Shiites (Shiahs)—members of the two main Islamic branches which appeared in the seventh century as a result of conflicts between the successors of Mohammed, founder of Islam.

The Shiites differ from the Sunnites in their views on the provenance of supreme power. They believe that the Caliph, as a successor of Mohammed, should not be elected by people. At their inception the Shiites, being a political party, defended the rights of Ali, Mohammed’s son-in-law, and his descendants from the Prophet’s daughter, to spiritual and secular guidance in the Moslem world. With the Sunnites the election of the Caliph rests on the “consent of the whole community”. Subsequently, the rites and laws of the Shiites too became slightly different from those of the Sunnites. p. 178

217 The Treaty of Ghulistan, which ended the Russo-Persian war of 1804-13, was signed on October 24 (November 5), 1813. Under this treaty the Russian Empire acquired Daghestan, Georgia with Shuragel province, Imeretia, Guria, Mingrelia and Abkhazia, and also the khanates of Karabakh, Ganja, Sheki, Shirvan, Derbent, Kuba, Baku and Talyshin. Russia also received the exclusive right to have a fleet in the Caspian Sea. In her turn Russia undertook to support the heir to the Persian throne chosen by the Shah. This treaty was in force until 1828, when the Turkmanchai Treaty between Russia and Persia was concluded. p. 178

218 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 Erivan and Nakhichevan khanates (Eastern Armenia), and Russia’s exclusive right to have a fleet in the Caspian Sea was confirmed. Persia was to pay war indemnities (see also K. Marx, Lord Palmerston, present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 355-56). p. 178

219 After the death of Abbas Mirza, the heir to the Shah of Persia, in October 1833 his son, Mohammed Mirza, who had been appointed the governor of Azerbaidjan was proclaimed his successor. After the death of Mohammed Mirza’s grandfather, Fath Ali Shah, in October 1834 several pretenders to the throne appeared. Supported by Russia and England, Mohammed Mirza became Shah of Persia at the beginning of 1835. With a view to consolidating their position in Persia the English sent a big military mission, which stayed in Persia till 1838, and a large shipment of arms. The British officer H. Lindsay Bethune commanded the Shah’s troops for some time. p. 178

220 Marx is referring to Article 9 of the Definitive Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between Great Britain and Persia, signed on November 25, 1814. p. 179
This was the first Anglo-Afghan war (1838-42) which began with the invasion of Afghanistan by British occupation troops in Sind. The immediate cause was Persia's attack of Herat in the autumn of 1837; the siege of it lasted till August 15, 1838. The invasion was carried out under the pretext of rendering assistance to the pretender, Emir Dost Mohammed's brother Shuja. However, a popular uprising in November 1841 against the British invaders and their puppet Shuja compelled the British, who sustained a severe defeat, to withdraw.

This unfinished work by Marx is devoted to the criticism of Bruno Bauer's views on foreign policy and especially his view of the role of Tsarist Russia in the destinies of European peoples. Bruno Bauer, a German idealist philosopher, was a bourgeois radical in politics. In 1854, during the Crimean war of 1853-56, he published several pamphlets in which he analysed the events of the war and the preceding history of the foreign policy of the European states. He came to the conclusion that the western powers were a failure, and that Russia was becoming the arbiter in European affairs. Back in 1855 Marx and Engels intended to come out against "its [Critical Criticism's] arrogant stupidity", i.e. against Bruno Bauer (see present edition, Vol. 39, p. 535). In the Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century Marx, alluding to Bauer (this volume, p. 62 and Note 79), expressed his intention of analysing his views. Presumably, this manuscript which he wrote in January 1857 was an attempt to realise his plan. In it Marx criticised in the main Bauer's two pamphlets La Russie et l'Angleterre (which was published in Scharlottenburg in June 1854 and was a translation from the German edition Russland und England) and Die jetzige Stellung Russlands (also published in Scharlottenburg in October 1854).

This manuscript opens Marx's Notebook of excerpts for 1857 marked on the first page: "I. Heft A."; on the second page: "Spada. Russian Ephémérides" (this refers to Spada, Ephémérides russes politiques, littéraires, historiques et nécrologiques ... jusqu'en 1816, St. Petersburg, 1816) and the date "1857 (Januar)". The text of the manuscript begins on the third page. It contains six pages altogether. The title of the manuscript is preceded by figure 1).

Some passages deleted in the manuscript are given in the footnotes. The manuscript was first published in Russian, in the magazine Letopisi marksizma, Vol. VI, 1928.
opposition; to Russia has fallen the role of an energetic government with might." It was first used by Bauer in his *La Russie et l'Angleterre*. It also opens his pamphlet *Die jetzige Stellung Russlands*. The words "quoted above" were inserted by Marx.

227 Marx gave a detailed criticism of Proudhon's theory of "People's Bank" (Banque du Peuple) and "labour money" in his *Economic Manuscripts of 1857-58* (the first version of *Capital*), Chapter on Money (see present edition, Vol. 28).

228 In 1774 Baron A. R. J. Turgot, who became controller general of finances, introduced free trade in corn and flour. This measure and his subsequent reforms roused strong opposition on the part of the Court, high priesthood, nobility and officialdom. In 1776 Louis XVI signed his resignation.

The *Anti-Corn Law League* was founded in 1838 by the Manchester textile manufacturers and free traders Richard Cobden and John Bright. It campaigned for the repeal of the high import tariffs on corn established in 1815 and for unrestricted free trade. The League ceased to exist after the repeal of the Corn Laws (see Note 287) in 1846.

229 A reference to the Crimean war, 1853-56.

230 The Reform Bill of 1831 (passed as a law in 1832) was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and finance aristocracy. It liquidated some "rotten boroughs" (see Note 243) and admitted the industrial bourgeoisie to Parliament. In the early 1850s a movement for a new electoral reform started in England. In February 1852, Russell declared in Parliament that he intended to present a new Reform Bill. However, the Bill was not discussed. Engels analyses this Bill in his article "England" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 205-09).

231 *Influence étrangère* (foreign influence)—an allusion to David Urquhart, who regarded Palmerston as a direct agent of the Tsarist Government.

232 The version that the British diplomat Robert Adair, a confidential agent of the leader of the opposition Charles James Fox, was sent to St. Petersburg so as to disrupt William Pitt's plans (see Note 233) was put forward in G. Tomline's *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honorable William Pitt*, in 3 volumes, London, 1821.

233 Disturbed by Russia's victories in the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91, William Pitt (the Younger) tried to wreck the Jassy Peace Treaty. Having employed the British press and entered into relations with Fox, the Russian diplomats managed to avert the rupture of diplomatic relations with Britain. Fox made a speech in the House of Commons severely criticising Pitt's policy. Having won a diplomatic victory over Pitt, Catherine II ordered a bust of Fox to be bought for her in London and installed in her palace in Tsarskoye Selo, between the statues of Demosthenes and Cicero. When writing about the "illicit liaison" Marx presumably meant these circumstances.

234 An allusion to the fact that the Marquis of Carmarthen paid £15,000 to Peter I for the monopoly of the tobacco trade in Russia.

235 Presumably Marx has in mind here the documents used by him in *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century* (see this volume, pp. 27-37).

236 The *Treaty of Utrecht of 1713* was one of the peace treaties concluded between
France and Spain, on the one hand, and the countries of the anti-French coalition (England, Holland, Portugal, Prussia and the Austrian Habsburgs) on the other, which ended the War of the Spanish Succession, begun in 1701 (see notes 51 and 71). Under the terms of the 1713 treaty, the Spanish throne was retained by Philip V, Louis XIV's grandson; the King of France, however, was to give up his plans to unite the French and Spanish monarchies and renounce his claims and those of his Bourbon heirs to the Spanish crown. Several French and Spanish colonies in the West Indies and North America, as well as Gibraltar, were ceded to England.

In 1716 England and France signed a secret treaty in Hanover, under which England became a guarantor country: in case Louis XV died childless, the French crown remained with the Orleans dynasty. For England the treaty was signed by Stanhope, George I's Foreign Secretary of State, and for France by Cardinal Dubois. This treaty served as a basis for the Triple Alliance between England, France, and Holland, concluded in 1717; in 1718 Austria joined it (in this way, the Quadruple Alliance was formed). Marx speaks about these events below in the text.

237 A reference to a convention signed by France, England, Spain and Portugal in London on April 22, 1834. It dealt with the problems concerning the Peninsula. p. 187

238 A reference to a convention signed by England, Russia, Austria and Prussia on July 15, 1840 on the help to the Sultan of Turkey against the Egyptian pasha Mohammed-Ali, who was supported by France. p. 187

239 The "Captain of Eton"—honorary title received by the students at Eton College for participating in political disputes conducted in the form of parliamentary debates. Canning was awarded this title on graduating from the college in 1788. p. 188

240 On December 12, 1826 Canning made a speech in the House of Commons in connection with the dispatch of British troops to Portugal where the civil war was waged at that time (the so-called Miguelist wars of 1823-34). He said: "The situation of England amidst the struggle of political opinions which agitates, more or less sensibly, different countries of the world, may be compared to that of the Ruler of the Winds, as described by the poet:—

"'Celsa sedet Aeolus arce,
Sceptr a tenens; mollitque animus et temperat iras;
Ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum
Quippe ferant rapidi secum; verrantque per auras.'"
(Virgil, Aeneid, I, 55-59).

[The tyrant Aeolus,
from his airy throne,
With power imperial
curbs the struggling winds,
And sounding tempests in
dark prisons binds.
(Dryden's translation)]

p. 188

241 This refers to the anti-French policy of the British Prime Minister William Pitt (Senior), who had much to do with unleashing the Seven Years' War (1756-63),
which enabled England to capture almost all the French possessions in India and North America.

242 The independence of the Spanish colonies in America (except for Cuba and Puerto Rico) was proclaimed in 1826; the independence of the Portuguese colony—Brazil—was obtained in 1822 as a result of the war of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in 1810-26.

243 *Rotten boroughs* (the name current in England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) were sparsely populated or depopulated towns and villages which had enjoyed the right to send representatives to Parliament since the Middle Ages. The Reform Acts of 1832 (see notes 230 and 292), 1867 and 1884 deprived the rotten boroughs of their privileges.

244 See Note 54.

245 The German "Stämme" used by Marx has been translated as "population" here, because the term "Stamm" had a wider range of meanings in the 1840s and 1850s than it has now. It denoted an historical community of people descended from a common ancestor.

246 The Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 was concluded by signing the Treaty of Adrianople in September 1829. It confirmed the autonomy of Serbia and secured the autonomy of the Danubian principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia). Their rights were to be guaranteed by Russia. Under the terms of the treaty the Organic Regulations which determined their socio-political organisation were introduced in the Danubian principalities in 1831-32. For Marx's estimation of these Regulations see also *Capital*, Vol. I (present edition, Vol. 35, Chapter X, Section 2).

247 Marx is referring to the siege of Enos on the Aegean Sea by the Russians during the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. Enos was taken by General Sivers' detachment on August 26, 1829.

248 The quotation from Lieven's dispatch cited by Bauer in his *La Russie et l'Angleterre* (p. 40) reads as follows: "It is in our camp that peace must be concluded; and it is only after its conclusion that Europe must know its conditions; the protests would be belated then and one must be patiently content with what could not be prevented."

249 On November 25, 1836 a Russian man-of-war captured the British merchant ship *Vixen* in the bay of Sujuk-Kale (the Caucasian coast of the Black Sea).


251 This article was written by Engels on Marx's request, made by him in the letter of January 23, 1857: "I should be grateful if you should let me have by Tuesday ... a military article on *Persia*" (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 98). There is no evidence that the article was sent on the following Tuesday, January 27. However, it must have been sent not later than February 6, because after this date Marx temporarily stopped sending articles to the *Tribune*; this can be seen from his letter to Engels of February 6, 1857 (present edition, Vol. 40, p. 99).

252 The object of the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57 was to establish British influence in Persia, pave the way for further colonial expansion in the Middle
East and Central Asia and prevent the Shah of Persia from establishing his power over the independent principality of Herat. When Persian troops occupied Herat in October 1856, Britain used this as a pretext to open hostilities. The war took an unfavourable turn for Persia. However, the national liberation uprising that flared up in India in 1857 and continued up to 1859 compelled Britain to conclude a peace treaty with Persia in all haste. Under the terms of the treaty, signed in Paris in March 1857, Persia repudiated her claims to Herat, which, in 1863, was incorporated into the possessions of the Afghan Emir.

See Note 218.

The Khanate of Khiva acknowledged its dependence on Russia only as a result of the treaty signed by Russia and Khiva on August 12, 1873. Between 1853 and 1857 V. A. Perovskiy, Military Governor of Orenburg, erected a number of fortifications on the Syr-Darya River.

The Russian expedition to the Khanate of Khiva in November 1839 was undertaken under General Perovskiy. His 5,000-strong detachment, with artillery and a food convoy, proved unprepared for a winter march through the barren steppes and lost half its men through epidemics. Perovskiy failed to reach Khiva and was forced to return to Orenburg.

At the Battle of Inkermann on November 5, 1854, during the Crimean war of 1853-56, the Anglo-French forces defeated the Russian army. Engels described the battle in detail in his article “The Battle of Inkermann” (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 528-35).

Sepoys—mercenary troops in the British-Indian army recruited from the Indian population and serving under British officers. They were used by the British to subjugate India and to fight the wars of conquest against Afghanistan, Burma and other neighbouring states.

In Marx’s Notebook for 1857, in his entry for February 20, this article is entitled “The Budget of Lewis”. The rough drafts which are extant consist of two parts: “The Budget of Sir G. Lewis” and “Direct and Indirect Taxation”.

The Free Traders advocated removal of protective tariffs and non-intervention by the government in economic life. They were supporters of the Manchester School—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. 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 (see Note 228). In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were a separate political group, which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party.

This refers to the peace treaty signed in Paris in March 1856 after the end of the Crimean war.

A reference to Aberdeen’s coalition ministry of 1852-55. The “Cabinet of All the Talents” included Whigs, Peelites (see Note 262) and representatives of the Irish faction in the British Parliament.

A reference to an intensive bombardment of Canton by the British in October-November 1856, which sparked off the Anglo-Franco-Chinese war of 1856-60 (known as the Second Opium War).
The Peelites—adherents of Robert Peel, who favoured concessions to the trading and industrial bourgeoisie in the sphere of economics and the continued political supremacy of the big landowners and financial magnates. In 1846 Peel secured the repeal of the Corn Laws in the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie; this aroused great discontent among the Protectionist Tories and led to a split in the Tory Party and the formation of an independent group by the Peelites. After Peel’s death in 1850, the Peelites had no definite programme. At the end of the 1850s and the beginning of the 1860s they joined the Liberal Party, which was then being formed.

In February 1852 the Peelites seconded Palmerston’s amendment to the militia Bill, which led to the resignation of Lord Russell’s Government. In December of that year they opposed the budget suggested by Derby. Derby’s cabinet was also forced to resign. In February 1855, Aberdeen’s Ministry also fell. The Peelites helped Palmerston come to power by agreeing to enter his cabinet. However, when their leaders, William Gladstone, Sidney Herbert and James Graham, resigned shortly afterwards, Palmerston immediately replaced them by Whig representatives.

The workhouses—public institutions for the maintenance of paupers—first appeared in England in the seventeenth century. By the Poor Law of 1834 they were the only form of relief for the able-bodied poor. In the workhouses with a prison-like regime the workers were engaged in unproductive, monotonous and exhausting labour. The people called these workhouses “Bastilles for the poor”.

In Marx’s Notebook for 1857 there is an entry about this article on February 26: “Chinese debates”. The drafts of the first part of the article are in the Notebook of excerpts for 1857. The most important divergences are given in the footnotes.

The greatest happiness of the greatest number—the principal tenet of the theory of Jeremy Bentham, the father of the English philosophy of utilitarianism.

The Peace Society—a pacifist organisation founded by the Quakers (see Note 310) in London in 1816. The society was actively supported by the Free Traders, who thought that in conditions of peace free trade would enable England to make full use of her industrial superiority and thus gain economic and political supremacy. The society had branches in other towns.

The reference is to the campaign for a second electoral reform in England in the 1850s. Its aim was to extend suffrage and finally abolish the “rotten boroughs” (see Note 243). Palmerston was against the reform.

Marx has in mind the unsuccessful attack of the British troops on the Big
Redan (Bastion No. 3 of Sevastopol's defences) on June 6 (18) and August 27 (September 8), 1855.


Assisted by the British, the Turks had turned Kars into a bridgehead for the invasion of Transcaucasia. The successful operations by the Russian forces against the Turks in the Caucasian theatre of the Crimean war resulted in the capture of Kars on November 28, 1855 and this accelerated the conclusion of peace.

On the Treaty of Paris see Note 259.

By the "misunderstandings with the United States" Marx means the conflict that arose in 1855 because the US Government supported the American adventurer William Walker (see Note 200) who proclaimed himself President of Nicaragua. This was done with the aim of countering Britain in her aspirations to entrench herself on the Mosquito Coast in Central America. The conflict was settled in October 1856, when the US Government censured Walker's actions and Britain gave up her territorial claims.

On the expedition to Naples see Note 158.

Ostensible squabbles with Bonaparte—a reference to disagreements between England and France which arose after the Paris Congress of 1856. The rapprochement between France and Russia evident during the Congress prevented England from achieving her aims in the Crimean war. However, these disagreements had no serious consequences.

On Persian invasion see Note 252.

On the Chinese massacres see Note 261.

On the Peelites see Note 262.
On the Manchester men see Note 258.

Old Bailey—the London Central Criminal Court, so called because it stands in the ancient bailey of the city wall.

In June 1844 the Bandiera brothers, who were members of a conspiratorial organisation, landed 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 the Austrian rule. But the members of the expedition were betrayed by one of their number and taken prisoner; the Bandiera brothers were executed.

On the orders of Sir James Graham, then British Home Secretary, the letters of Italian emigrants were opened and their contents made known to the Austrian Government, which thus obtained information about the intended landing.

In Marx's Notebook for 1857 this article is entitled "Palmerston and the General Election".

The name "resurrectionists" was given in England to people who secretly exhumed corpses and sold them to dissecting rooms. In the 1820s this practice was particularly widespread; for example, there was the notorious case of William Burke, who murdered people in Edinburgh solely for this purpose and left no traces of the crime.

A reference to the First Opium War (1839-42)—an aggressive war waged by
Britain against China which started China's transformation into a semi-colony. One of the clauses of the Nanking Treaty imposed on China provided for the opening of five Chinese ports to foreign trade. See also Note 197. p. 220

283 The Grand Cophtha was the name of the omnipotent and omniscient Egyptian priest who headed the non-existent Masonic "Egyptian Lodge" which the famous eighteenth-century impostor "Count" Cagliostro (Giuseppe Balsamo) claimed to have founded.

p. 220


p. 221

285 Louis Bonaparte's appeal to the National Assembly of November 4, 1851, contained a demagogic demand for the re-establishment of universal suffrage in France. After the National Assembly's rejection of the Bill, introduced on the occasion by Bonaparte's ministry, Louis Bonaparte accomplished a coup d'état on December 2, 1851.

p. 222

286 Marx is referring here to the six laws passed by the British Parliament, on Castlereagh's proposal, following the massacre (known as Peterloo) of the workers, participants in a mass meeting in support of electoral reform and in protest against the Corn Laws at St. Peter's Field, Manchester, on August 16, 1819. Known as the "gagging laws", they virtually abolished the Habeas Corpus act and restricted the freedom of the press and assembly.

The Habeas Corpus Act was passed by the British Parliament in 1679 and envisages the issue of a writ requiring an imprisoned person to be brought before a court or a judge within three to twenty days or to be set free. The procedure does not apply to persons accused of high treason and could be suspended by decision of Parliament.

p. 222

287 On the butchery of the people at Manchester see Note 286.

The Corn Laws (first introduced in the fifteenth century) imposed high import duties on agricultural produce in the interests of landowners in order to maintain high prices for these products on the home market. The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in 1846 with their repeal (see also Note 228).

p. 222

288 A reference to an additional article to the Treaty of Kiakhta of 1727 dealing with the demarcation and Russo-Chinese trade, which was adopted in October 1768. It also specified the legal stipulations concerning the violation of the state borders.

p. 224

289 See Note 163.

p. 224

290 A reference to the Amur expedition of 1849-55 under a naval officer, Gennady Nevelskoi. Its aim was to investigate the Amur and the adjoining territories, as well as Sakhalin and the Ussuri area. The Governor-General of Eastern Siberia, Nikolai Muravyev-Amursky, took an active part in it. Poor knowledge of the Amur territories was the main reason why Russia's border with China had not been precisely defined by the Nerchinsk Treaty of 1689.

As a result of the expedition, accurate maps were drawn up and the area described, with valuable data on the geography and population of the area. It served as a basis for establishing the state border between Russia and China laid down by the Treaty of Aigun of 1858. Under this treaty the left bank of the Amur from the Argun River to its estuary was confirmed as belonging to Russia.

p. 225

The Reform Bill of 1832 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. p. 226

The Legitimists, supporters of the main branch of the Bourbon dynasty overthrown in 1830, expressed the interests of the big hereditary landowners and upheld the claim to the French throne of the Count of Chambord, King Charles X's grandson, who called himself Henry V. Some of the Legitimists remained outside the bloc of monarchist groups. p. 227

The Orleanists were supporters of the House of Orleans (a lateral branch of the Bourbon dynasty) overthrown by the February revolution of 1848; they represented the interests of the financial aristocracy and the big industrial bourgeoisie; their candidate for the throne was Louis Philippe Albert, Count of Paris and grandson of Louis Philippe. p. 227

See Note 258. p. 228

A reference to the talks, sponsored by Emperor Francis Joseph, between the British, French and Russian Ambassadors and Austrian Minister Buol, which opened in December 1854. Their official purpose was to work out a basis for peace negotiations between the belligerents in the Crimean war.

In mid-March 1855 representatives of Austria, Britain, France, Turkey and Russia met at a higher level at the Vienna Conference (Britain was represented by Special Envoy Lord John Russell). The conference produced no results. p. 228

The Test Act of 1673 demanded recognition of the dogmas of the Church of England by persons occupying government posts. At first directed against attempts to re-establish Catholicism, this Act was subsequently applied against various religious sects and trends which deviated from the dogmas of the Established Church. Repealed in 1828.

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. Repealed in 1828.

On the Parliamentary Reform Bill see Note 292.

The Municipal Corporation Acts, adopted for Scotland in 1833 and for England in 1835 introduced a single system of government in all big cities except London. In Scotland municipal corporations were elected by landlords with an annual income of no less than ten pounds; and in England by all taxpayers.

Under the Commutation Act of 1838, the tithes, which the native Catholic population of Ireland had allotted to the Anglican Church from the sixteenth century, were commuted; payment in kind was changed to a special money-rent which was part of the rent of land.

Dissenters or Dissidents were members of various Protestant sects and trends in England who to some degree or other rejected the dogmas of the Established Church. Under the Dissenters' Marriage Bill introduced by Russell into the House of Commons in 1834, the dissenters were to be allowed to conduct marriage rituals in their churches. The adoption of the Bill was postponed. p. 229
Stamp duty and advertisement duty on newspapers introduced in 1712 were the sources of state revenue and a means of fighting the opposition press. In 1836 Parliament was compelled to reduce stamp duty and in 1855 to abolish it altogether. Advertisement duty was annulled in 1853.

The annulment of these duties was not in the interests of the few expensive newspapers because it encouraged the appearance of many cheap rival newspapers, thus lowering the profits of the older newspapers. p. 230

See Note 228.

After this comes a passage inserted by the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune: "For the sake of Christian and commercial intercourse with China, it is in the highest degree desirable that we should keep out of this quarrel, and that the Chinese should not be led to regard all the nations of the Western World as united in a conspiracy against them." p. 235

In this article Marx used the information in Engels' letters of March 11, 20 and 31, 1857 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 104, 110, 115-16). p. 238

The Whigs—a political party in England in the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries that arose as a faction expressing the interests of the aristocracy which had become bourgeois and the big commercial and finance bourgeoisie. In the mid-nineteenth century, they united with the Peelites and began to call themselves the Liberal Party.

On the Peelites see Note 262. p. 238

See Note 20.

See Note 258.

See Note 243.

In his speech to the electors in the Free Trade Hall in Manchester on March 18, 1857 Cobden criticised Palmerston's home and foreign policy, in particular his aggressive policy against China and Persia. He also gave an unfavourable appraisal of Bob Lowe. p. 239

See Note 228.

By the "parliamentary godfathers of the penny press" Marx means the Manchester bourgeois radicals (in particular John Bright) who, both inside and outside Parliament, took an active part in the agitation for the abolition of the stamp and advertisement duties (see Note 298). p. 240

The Free Traders' leaders John Bright and Richard Cobden opposed England's participation in the Crimean war, 1853-56, maintaining that by free trade alone England could use her industrial superiority substantially to strengthen her economic and political might. p. 241

Quakers (or the Society of Friends)—a religious sect founded in England during the seventeenth-century revolution and later widespread in North America. They rejected the Established Church with its rites and preached pacifist ideas. p. 241

The Rump Parliament or the Rump—the remnant of the Long Parliament (convened by Charles I in 1640) after the expulsion of its Presbyterian majority in December 1648. The Rump—about a hundred Independents, supporters of the Protestant Church—was dissolved by Cromwell in April 1653. p. 241
"The truly British minister"—this ironic reference to Lord Palmerston is based on a passage from Lord Russell's speech in the House of Commons on June 20, 1850, who said: "...So long as we continue the government of this country, I can answer for my noble friend that he will act not as the minister ... of any other country, but as the minister of England." p. 242

A reference to the bombardment of Chinese maritime towns and posts on the Yangtze and other rivers by the British naval and land forces in 1839-40, during the First Opium War (1839-42). See also Note 282. p. 243

See Note 197. p. 245

Engels is referring to the Taiping uprising in China (see Note 163). In March 1853 the Taipings captured Nanking and made it the capital of their empire. p. 246

On the Peelites see Note 262. p. 247
On the Manchester men see Note 258.
See Notes 228 and 287. p. 247
See Note 260. p. 248

A reference to the bombardment of Odessa by the British and French fleets on April 10 (22), 1854, during the Crimean war.

The ruling party of Peelites was criticised by the Parliamentary opposition for irresolute military actions. p. 249

See Note 296. p. 249
See Note 152. p. 251
During the bombardment of Canton in 1856 (see Note 261) the British Navy lost three men. p. 252
See Note 312. p. 253

A reference to the Act to Regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom (1833) and the Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Labour in Factories (1844) on the employment of children, juveniles and women in the English textile industry.

Under the 1833 law children from nine to thirteen years of age worked nine hours a day (48-hour week) and had to attend school (two hours a day). The working day for juveniles from fourteen to eighteen years of age was twelve hours a day (69-hour week).

The 1844 law forbade the employment of children under eight years of age and introduced for children from eight to thirteen years half-shift work (six and a half hours a day). It restricted for the first time the working day for women: it was the same as for juveniles under the 1833 law. p. 261

The title is given in accordance with an entry in Marx's Notebook for 1857: "April 17. Changes in the Russian army." p. 262

The "Great Unpaid"—magistrates or justices. p. 266

The title is given in accordance with the entries in Marx's Notebook for 1857: "May 12. Crédit Mobilier (1)", "May 15. Crédit Mobilier (II)". p. 270

For Corps Législatif see Note 20.

The law on the Bank of France was passed on May 28, 1857. For details, see this volume, pp. 289-92. p. 277
329 Marx’s Notebook for 1857 has the following entry: “May 22. China-Persian (War) (Artikel an Tribune)”. p. 278

330 Engels is referring to the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57 (see Note 252) and to the Second Opium War, 1856-60 (see Note 196). p. 278

331 A reference to what is known as the First Opium War, 1838-42 (see Note 282). p. 278

332 The Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 was launched by the Tsarist government in support of the national movement of the Christian population of Greece against the Turkish yoke. The Turkish troops, partly trained by European instructors and well armed, at first offered a strong resistance to the Russian army concentrated on the Danube (at Silistria, Shumla and Varna). However, the victorious offensive of the Russians on May 30 (June 11), 1829, put the Turkish army to flight. The war was ended by the treaty of Adrianople on September 2 (14), 1829, under which Russia obtained the Danube delta including the islands, and a considerable part of the eastern Black Sea coast south of the Kuban estuary. Turkey was to recognise the autonomy of Moldavia and Wallachia and also the independence of Greece, whose only obligation to Turkey was to pay an annual tribute to the Sultan. p. 278

333 The Russo-Turkish war of 1806-12 broke out over the violation by Turkey of certain terms of the previously concluded Russo-Turkish treaties (in particular the abolition of free passage for Russian men-of-war and merchant ships through the Bosporus and the Dardanelles). Neither side gained the advantage for long. In 1811 the threat of Napoleon’s invasion of Russia forced the Russian government to take measures to conclude the war. After Mikhail Kutuzov had been appointed commander of the Danubian army the war took a turn in favour of Russia who concluded the Treaty of Bucharest with Turkey on May 16 (28), 1812. Under its terms, Russia obtained Bessarabia and certain areas in Transcaucasia. Turkey was to grant internal autonomy to Serbia and confirm its earlier agreements with Russia, extending a measure of autonomy to Moldavia and Wallachia. p. 279

334 At Oltenitza (south-east Wallachia) in the Danubian theatre of operations, the Russian and Turkish forces fought one of the first battles of the Crimean war (November 4, 1853). A Russian detachment attacked the Turkish forces which had crossed to the left bank of the Danube. The attack failed, but the Turkish troops were soon compelled to withdraw to the right bank. Engels described the battle in his article “The War on the Danube” (see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 516-22).

The battle of Citate, in the Danubian theatre of operations, between the Turkish and Russian armies, took place in the early period of the Crimean war, on January 6, 1854. After a stiff fight the Russian detachment was compelled to retreat under pressure from considerable Turkish forces (about 18,000 men), but following the arrival of Russian reinforcements the Turks were forced to go over to the defensive and eventually retreated to Kalafat. For a description of these events see Engels’ article “The Last Battle in Europe” (present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 579-82).

On the capture of Kars see Note 275. In this case, Engels is referring to the abortive assault on the fortress by the Russians on September 29, 1855. For details see present edition, Vol. 14, pp. 563-68).

In the battle on the Inguri in Mingrelia on October 25 (November 6), 1855
the nearly 30-thousand-strong Turkish army met the 18.5-thousand-strong Russian army, the Russians were defeated.

335 *Renegades* was the name given in the Middle Ages to Christians in Moslem Spain who adopted Islam. Among Christians in Europe the word was afterwards applied generally to Christians in the Eastern countries who became Mohammedans.

336 See Note 163.

337 A reference to dissension among the Taiping leaders in the autumn of 1856. As a result, three of the leaders were killed and many thousands of insurgents in Nanking were massacred. The discord was caused by the fact that private and group interests prevailed over class and national considerations among the insurgent leaders. This had a detrimental effect on the further progress of the Taiping uprising.

Marx’s Notebook has the following entry concerning this article: “May 26. O’Donnell’s speech in the Senate, on the 18th of May.”

339 The *Polacos* was the name adopted in the mid-eighteenth century by the admirers of the de la Cruz theatre in Madrid. In the mid-nineteenth century it was applied to the coterie of the Count San Luis (former journalist Sartorius), whose government ruled Spain from September 1853 to July 1854, i.e., up to the outbreak of the fourth Spanish revolution (1854-56).

340 See Note 132.

341 Marx means the beginning of the fourth bourgeois revolution in Spain (1854-56) (see notes 137 and 147) which brought to power the Espartero government of the Progresistas and Right-wing liberals.

342 See Note 147.

343 The draft of the *Loi portant prorogation du privilège de la Banque de France* was published in *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 130, on May 10, 1857. After it was passed by the Corps Légitatif on May 28, the final text appeared in the same paper, No. 162, on June 11, 1857.

344 See Note 20.

345 The bureaux were formed by the President of the Corps Légitatif out of its deputies for the preliminary discussion of various questions. Usually there were several bureaux, their composition changing periodically.

346 A reference to the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57 (see Note 252). The official cause for England and Persia breaking off diplomatic relations at the end of 1855 was a conflict between the British envoy to Teheran and the Persian Sadir Asam (Prime Minister): Mirza Hashim, secretary of the British mission who was a Persian subject, was accused of spying for England.

347 This title was given according to the entry in Marx’s notebook for 1857.

348 *Scinde*, a province of India bordering on Afghanistan, was finally colonised by the British in 1843.

On the subjugation of the Punjab see Note 215.

349 In 1856 the British authorities in India proclaimed the ruler of Oudh (a principality in the north of India) deposed and his possessions incorporated in
the territories controlled by the East India Company (see also this volume, pp. 533-38).

350 The Presidency—any of the three original provinces of British India (Bengal, Madras and Bombay). The term was derived from the word “president”, a title of the chief of the Council of the principal factory under the East India Company. The title of President was used until 1784, when a parliamentary act was adopted by which governors were appointed instead of presidents.

351 This refers to the major national liberation uprising of the Indian people against the British rule in 1857-59. It was caused by the indignation of broad sections of the Indian population at colonial exploitation—the exorbitantly high tax burden which led to the complete ruin of the Indian peasants and the expropriation of certain strata of feudal lords; the policy of annexing the remaining independent Indian territories; the system of torture to extort taxes and the colonial reign of terror; gross violation of time-honoured national traditions and customs. The revolt broke out in the spring of 1857 (preparations for it began in mid-1856) among the sepoys units (see Note 256) of the Bengal army quartered in Northern India. They became the military core of the revolt, which assumed wide scope and spread to large areas of Northern and Central India, chiefly Delhi, Lucknow, Cawnpore, Rohilkhand and Bundelkhand. The chief driving force were peasants and urban artisans, but the leadership was in the hands of the feudal lords, the overwhelming majority of whom betrayed the revolt after the colonial authorities promised in 1858 to leave their possessions intact. The main reasons for the defeat of the revolt were: British military and technical superiority, the lack of a single leadership and a general plan of action among the insurgents, as well as contradictory aims largely resulting from the feudal disunity of India; the ethnic heterogeneity of the population and the latter’s religious and caste division. Though the revolt did not involve directly certain parts of India (the English managed to prevent its spreading to the Punjab, Bengal and the south of India), it shook the whole country and compelled the British authorities to reform the system of government there.

Marx and Engels regularly described the course of the revolt in the columns of the New-York Daily Tribune.

352 A reference to the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57 (see Note 252) and the Second Opium War of 1856-60 (see this volume, pp. 158-63, 207-12, 292-35, 243-46, 278-83).

353 The Indian army was equipped with Enfield rifled guns. When loading a rifle the paper wrapping of a cartridge had to be bitten off. In January 1857 a rumour spread among the Sepoys that the cartridges were greased with the fat of bullocks and pigs. The Sepoys refused to use these cartridges because to touch them meant insult to the religious convictions of the Hindus and Moslems.

354 The Moguls—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 in Northern India. The Great Mogul was the title the Europeans gave to the rulers of the Mogul Empire who called themselves Padishahs and resided in Delhi. The Mogul Empire reached considerable power, having subjugated most of India and part of Afghanistan by the mid-seventeenth century. However, due to peasant rebellions and the growing
feudal separatist tendencies, the Empire of the Great Moguls began to decline and practically disintegrated in the first half of the eighteenth century, though formally it lasted until 1858.

Here the reference is to Bahadur Shah II, son of Akbar II.

**Fort William**—an English fortress built in Calcutta in 1696 and named in honour of William III of Orange, King of England at the time. After the English conquered Bengal in 1757, government institutions were quartered in that fortress and its name began to denote “the English government of India”.

This title is given in accordance with the entry in Marx's notebook for 1857.

A reference to the elections to the Corps Législatif in the summer of 1857. Despite the police measures taken by the government to secure success to the official candidates, the anti-Bonapartist opposition supported by the workers managed, for the first time in the history of the Second Empire, to get five of its representatives elected to the Chamber.

See Note 15.

Marx refers here to the revolution in Spain in 1856 (see this volume, pp. 97-108) and to the events in Italy in 1857. At the end of June 1857, Mazzini, who secretly arrived in Genoa, and other supporters of revolutionary action attempted to start an uprising in Italy with a view to liberating and uniting the country. A detachment of revolutionaries led by Pisacane seized a ship bound for Tunis from Genoa and landed in the Kingdom of Naples. Attempts were also made to start uprisings in Leghorn and Genoa but, like the expedition to the South, they also failed.

See notes 256 and 351.

**Rajputs**—a higher caste and a people in India inhabiting mainly Rajputana (present Rajasthan) and also some other districts of Northern India.

**Brahmins**—one of the four ancient Indian castes which originally consisted mainly of privileged priests; like other Indian castes, it subsequently embraced people of different trades and social standing, including impoverished peasants and artisans.

Only Hindus belonging to higher castes were recruited to the sepoy army of Bengal (as distinct from those of Bombay and Madras) and hence Brahmans and Rajputs made up a considerable part of it.

The **Residency**—an official abode of a British Resident (a political counsellor in an Indian principality); in this case the Resident of Oudh.

A reference to the war of independence the Spanish people waged in 1808-14 against the French occupation (see Note 142).

See Note 162.

Marx is apparently referring to the fact that members of the British House of Commons often preferred personal pursuits and recreation to their parliamentary duties during the summer sessions of Parliament. For this reason, speakers often had to address an almost empty house.

**Mechanics' Institutions** or **Institutes** were evening schools in which workers were taught general and technical subjects. Such schools first appeared in Glasgow in 1823 and in London in 1824. In the early 1840s there were over 200 of them,
mainly in the factory towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire. The bourgeoisie used these institutions to train skilled workers for industry and to bring them under the influence of bourgeois ideas, though initially this was resisted by the working-class activists.  

p. 310

367 A reference to the Tories, the party of the big British landed and financial aristocracy, which was founded in the seventeenth century. With the development of capitalism in Britain, the Tories gradually lost their former political influence and their monopoly in Parliament, especially after the 1832 Electoral Reform and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. The mid-1850s witnessed a process of disintegration in the Tory party. Its class composition changed, and in the late 1850s-early 1860s the British Conservative Party arose on its basis.  

p. 310

368 This refers to the Council under the Governor-General of India. The Council was instituted in 1773 under the Governor-General of Bengal, whom the Act of 1833 also made Governor-General of India. By the Act of 1853 the council of four, enjoying the functions of an executive body, was supplemented by a larger legislative council which included the Governor-General, the Commander-in-Chief, the Lord Chief Justice of Bengal and a judge of the Supreme Court. This statute of the Council under the Governor-General of India was in force until 1858.  

p. 311

369 Jaguedar or jagirdar—a Moslem feudal lord in the Great Mogul Empire (see Note 354) who received for temporary use a large estate (jagir) in return for which he rendered military service and supplied a specified contingent of troops. When the Empire began to disintegrate, the jagirdars became hereditary feudal owners.  

Enamdar—an owner of an enam, a grant of land to be held in perpetuity rent free or on favourable terms. Enams were granted mainly to Hindu and Moslem priests and religious and charitable institutions, and sometimes, in Southern India, to the men at the top of the village community.  

Freeholders—a category of English small landowners originating in feudal times. They paid their lord an insignificant fixed rent for plots of land which were at their complete disposal.  

p. 312

370 The title is given according to the entry in Marx's notebook for 1857.  

p. 314

371 The Board of Control was instituted under the 1784 Act for the better regulation and management of the affairs of the East India Company, and of the British possessions in India. The Board of Control consisted of six members appointed by the King from among the members of the Privy Council. The President of the Board of Control was a Cabinet Minister, and, in effect, the Secretary of State for India and India's supreme ruler. The decisions of the Board of Control, which sat in London, were conveyed to India by the Secret Committee, which consisted of three East India Company directors. In this way the 1784 Act established a dual system of government in India—the Board of Control (British Government) and the Court of Directors (East India Company). The Board of Control was dissolved in 1858.  

p. 314

372 See Note 215.  

p. 315

373 See Note 355.  

p. 316

374 See Note 361.  

p. 316

375 In early October 1854, when the Crimean war was at its height, a rumour spread in Paris that the Allies had captured Sevastopol. This hoax was taken up
by the official French, British, Belgian and German press. However, a few days later, the French newspapers were compelled to publish a refutation. Sevastopol did not fall until September 9, 1855.  

Martello towers—circular forts armed with two or three guns—used for coastal defence. They were first thus used by the British Navy who occupied one on the Cape Mortella, Corsica, in 1794, during the wars against revolutionary France.

See Note 259.

See Note 159.

In 1849 and 1850 the reactionary Prussian Government, pressed by the broad sections of the German public who aspired to unification, took measures to reorganise the impotent German Confederation, seeking Prussia's victory over Austria in the struggle for supremacy over German states. In October 1850, Nicholas I, who did not want Prussia to grow stronger at Austria's expense, summoned to Warsaw Austrian Chancellor Prince Schwarzenberg and Prussian Prime Minister Count Brandenburg. Also present at the meeting, known as the Warsaw Conference, were Prince William of Prussia and Emperor Francis Joseph I of Austria. Nicholas I made it clear that he most decidedly supported Austria against Prussia.

Internuncio—a second-rank diplomat (envoy), Austria's representative at Constantinople.

See Note 11.

See Note 375.

Saragossa became famous for its heroic defence during the national liberation struggle of the Spanish people against Napoleon's troops, which besieged the town twice, in 1808 and 1809. Saragossa fell only on February 20, 1809 after the second, two-month siege.

See Note 159.

The German duchies of Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg were under the rule of the Danish Crown for centuries. The London protocol on the integrity of the Danish monarchy signed on May 8, 1852 by Russia, Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, Sweden and the representatives of Denmark recognised the right of the duchies to self-government, but preserved the supreme power of the Danish king over them. In spite of the protocol, however, the Danish Government promulgated a Constitution in 1855 which ruled out the independence and self-government of these duchies. This caused a protest on the part of their representatives in the Danish Parliament, who were supported by Prussia and Austria. The Schleswig-Holstein question was finally solved in the Danish war of 1864 when Schleswig was incorporated into Prussia and Holstein into Austria. After the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 Holstein was annexed to Prussia.

An inaccuracy in the text. According to the London protocol of May 8, 1852, the childless King Frederick VII of Denmark was to be succeeded by Christian of Glücksburg (later King Christian IX).

This article, according to the entry "India (Torture)" in Marx's notebook for 1857, was written by him on August 28, 1857, but for some unknown reason the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune published it after the article "The
Indian Revolt" written on September 4 and mentioned here. In the present edition the articles are published in chronological order according to the date of their writing.

See Note 284.

Collector—a British governor of a district in India who had unlimited powers. He performed the duties of the main tax collector (sued those who did not pay taxes), the chief judge (sentenced them) and an administrative official (executed the sentence).

Ryot—an Indian peasant who enjoyed full rights of a community member prior to the introduction of new land taxation laws by the English colonialists in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century and the destruction of the Indian community by them. In districts, where the so-called Zemindari system was introduced in 1793, the ryot became a land tenant of a Zemindar (see Note 402). After the introduction of the Ryotwari land taxation system in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras in the early nineteenth century, the ryot became a holder of state land. He paid rent-tax for his plot, the rate of which was fixed by the British Government in India at its own discretion.

Jamabundy—an annual account of land tax.

Puttah—an official document drawn up by a landowner or a tax-collector to the tenant. It defined the nature of the tenure and fixed the sum of the rent.

Agramante—the Moorish king in Lodovico Ariosto’s poem *L'Orlando furioso*. At war with Charlemagne, Agramante besieged Paris, concentrating the bulk of his forces by the walls of that city. But soon dissensions began in their camp. When Marx compared the English camp near Delhi with that of Agramante he meant a line in Ariosto's poem, "There is dissent in Agramante’s camp" which had become a dictum.

This refers to the law of 1853 on the East India Company Charter which curtailed to some extent the Company’s monopoly rights in India. The Court of Directors was placed under a greater control of the British Crown, the directors lost the right to appoint officials. Their number was reduced from 24 to 18, of whom six were appointed by the Crown. The President of the Board of Control (see Note 371) was put on a par with the Secretary of State for India. However, the Company's shareholders were guaranteed fixed dividends out of revenues from Indian taxes.

On the Bengal Council see Note 368. Councils consisting of the senior officials of the East India Company also existed under the Governors of the Bombay and Madras Presidencies.

Marx means the second Anglo-Burmese war of 1852 which resulted in the annexation of the Burmese province of Pegu to the East India Company's possessions. However, Burma did not sign a peace treaty and refused to recognise the seizure of Pegu.

Marx means the first Anglo-Afghan war of 1838-42 (see Note 221), the Second Opium War of 1856-60 and the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57 (see Note 252).
In the Vendée (a province in western France) the royalists used the backward peasants to engineer a counter-revolutionary revolt in 1793 which was put down by the republican army. Its soldiers, like all the supporters of the Convention in general, were called the “Blues”.

During the national liberation war against France in 1808-14 (see Note 142) the Spanish guerillas, mainly the peasants, offered stubborn resistance to the conquerors.

The counter-revolutionary Austrian forces which suppressed the revolutionary movement in Austria and Hungary in 1848 and 1849 included Serbian and Croat troops (see also present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 503-06).

The Guard Mobile was formed by the French Provisional Government’s decree of February 25, 1848 to fight the revolutionary masses. Its units consisted mainly of the lumpenproletarians and were used to crush the June uprising of the Paris workers.

Decembrists—members of the secret Bonapartist Society of December 10 (see Note 18). After the coup d’état of December 2, 1851 (see Note 7) they were active organisers of massive repressions against the republicans and especially against participants in the February 1848 revolution. p. 353

See Note 282. p. 354

Zemindars—in the Great Mogul Empire, feudal lords mainly from among the conquered Hindus who retained the right to hold land by heredity on condition that they paid to the government a certain share of the rent-tax they collected from the peasants. In the seventeenth and the eighteenth century the term “Zemindars” applied also to big land-revenue collectors in Bengal and some other areas. In the provinces of British India it began to denote various groups of feudal lords enjoying the rights of landed proprietors. p. 355

On Peace Society see Note 270.

During the suppression of a popular uprising against the French conquerors, in Algeria in 1845, General Pélissier, later Marshal of France, gave orders for a thousand Arab insurgents, who had hidden in mountain caves, to be suffocated by the smoke from fires. p. 355

Charles V’s criminal law (Constitutio criminalis Carolina), adopted by the German Imperial Diet in Regensburg in 1532, was distinguished for extremely harsh punishments. p. 356

Juggernaut (Jagannath)—an incarnation of Vishnu. The famous place of worship was the temple in Puri near Cuttack (Eastern India). The priests of the temple enjoyed the protection of the East India Company and received large incomes from mass pilgrimages and sumptuous festivals in honour of Juggernaut. Particularly large number of pilgrims flocked to celebrate Rathayatra, when the idol of Juggernaut was carried on a chariot. Under its wheels many devotees immolated themselves. p. 356

At the end of the second millennium B.C., Jericho was destroyed by the Israelites who invaded Palestine. According to the Bible, the walls of Jericho fell at the blasts of the conquerors’ trumpets. p. 356

This sentence was added by the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune who meant here their correspondent Ferencz Pulszki, a Hungarian writer and journalist, who emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. They received from him mainly reviews of international affairs. p. 361
Goorkas (or Gurkhas)—a conventional name of peoples inhabiting central and south-western areas of the Nepal. Part of them live in India—in the State of Uttar Pradesh (former United Provinces of British India) and West Bengal districts adjoining Nepal.

Mahurran (or Muharram)—the first month of the Moslem calendar. During its first ten days a great fast in commemoration of Imam Hosain is held; the religious ceremonies are usually accompanied by self-torture.

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 (see Note 354), thus contributing to its decline. In the course of the struggle the Mahrattas formed their own independent state, 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 and by internal feudal strife, the Mahratta principalities fell prey to the East India Company which annexed a considerable part of their territories in the three Anglo-Mahratta wars (1775-82, 1803-05 and 1817-18).

The reference here is to Tukaji II Holkar and Ali Jah Jaiagi Sindhiya, princes of Mahratta.

See Note 221.

When writing this article Marx drew on the information about the uprising in India contained in Engels' letter to him of September 24, 1857 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 182-85).

Marx is referring to the British naval expedition to the mouth of the Schelde River in July 1809, during the war of the fifth European coalition against Napoleonic France, at the moment when Napoleon's main forces were drawn to the war with Austria. After seizing the island of Walcheren, the British failed to use it as a base for action against Antwerp and other French fortified points in Belgium and Holland and were forced to withdraw in December 1809 having lost from hunger and disease about a quarter of their 40,000-strong landing force.

This sentence was interpolated by the newspaper editors.

The Doab—here the reference is to the territory in India between the Ganges and the Jumna.

The Santhals—a people inhabiting mainly Bihar, the western areas of Bengal, and Orissa; Dravidian by origin.

The table compiled by Marx was sent to the New-York Daily Tribune presumably simultaneously with this article, but the editors published the table separately, in the same issue on p. 6. Marx quoted this table, somewhat enlarged, in his letter to Engels of October 20, 1857 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 192-93).

Concerning this article Marx wrote to Engels on December 8, 1857: "I've had a gratifying experience with the Tribune. On 6 November I wrote an exposé for them of the 1844 Bank Act in which I said that the next few days would see the farce of suspension, but that not too much should be made of this monetary panic, the real affaire being the impending industrial crash."
Notes 681

article was published on November 21 as a leader but on the 24th the New-York Times came out against the author's assertions, declaring the "TALK of an 'INDUSTRIAL CRASH' in England to be 'SIMPLY ABSURD'," However, "the following day the N.Y.T. received a telegram ... with the news that the Bank Act had been suspended, and likewise news of 'INDUSTRIAL DISTRESS'" (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 215).

Marx is referring to An Act to Regulate the Issue of Bank Notes, and for Giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England Certain Privileges for a Limited Period, introduced by Robert Peel on July 19, 1844.


When describing the influence of the Bank Act of 1844 on the course of the 1847 crisis, Marx presumably drew on Th. Tooke's A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation... [Vol. IV], pp. 318-19 and 449. p. 382

In Marx's notebook for 1857 this article is entitled "English Monetary Crisis. Suspension of Peel's Act." p. 385

Here follows a sentence added by the New-York Daily Tribune editors: "This view of the case is confirmed by the news by the Fulton, reported in our columns by telegraph this morning". p. 385

Mincing Lane—a street in London, the centre of wholesale trade in colonial goods. p. 388

The Zollverein, a union of German states, which established a common customs frontier, was set up in 1834 under the aegis of Prussia. Brought into being by the need to create an all-German market, the Customs Union subsequently embraced all the German states except Austria and a few of the smaller states. p. 390

Napoleon III's decree of November 10, 1857 revoked the laws of September 8, 1856 and September 22, 1857 which prohibited the export of corn, flour and other food products. p. 390

Here the newspaper's editors added the following passage: "If we are not much mistaken, something of the same sort was put forth in this country, when philosophers like our neighbors of The Times and The Independent thought the catastrophe might be prevented, if people would only determine to be jolly, and give three cheers." p. 391

This and other articles by Engels on the subject published in this volume show how closely he followed the developments in India. This is also proved by his correspondence with Marx who was constantly interested to know his friend's opinion on these events, and on the military aspects of the uprising in particular. This article reflects some of Engels' ideas as expressed in his letter to Marx on September 24, 1857, namely, about the siege of Delhi from the point of view of England's political consideration (see also Note 412). Engels mentioned his writing of this article in the letters to Marx of November 16 and 17, 1857 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 204 and 207). p. 392

See Note 256. p. 392
The Battle of Balaklava took place on October 25, 1854 during the Crimean war of 1853-56. Units of the Russian army tried to cut off the British and Turkish troops taking part in the siege of Sevastopol from their base in Balaklava. They succeeded in inflicting serious losses on the enemy, especially on the British cavalry, but failed to achieve their main objective. For the description of this battle see Engels' article “The War in the East” (present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 518-27).

See Note 376.

See Note 425.

See Note 287.

The title is given according to the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune.

The big London banks and discounting houses are located in Lombard Street which has become a synonym for the London money market. As distinct from the Bank of England, where only banks’ first class papers were discounted, all bills of exchange could be discounted in Lombard Street and the discount interest there, being called market interest, was always higher than that of the Bank of England.

In Threadneedle Street (London) the Bank of England is situated.

Marx’s notebook for 1857 contains the entry: “December 25. Französische Krisis”. Marx also expressed his ideas about the crisis in France in his letter to Engels written on the same day, December 25, 1857 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 228-32).

See Note 424.

See Note 15.

Crédit Foncier (Land Credit)—a French joint-stock bank set up in 1852 on the basis of the former Paris Land Bank. It granted short- and long-term loans on security of immovable property at a definite interest and received considerable government subsidies.

Comptoir national d’Escompte de Paris (National Discount Bank of Paris) was founded in 1848 by the Provisional Government of the French Republic. Originally it discounted bills and granted credits on the security of goods stored in public warehouses. At the time of Napoleon III it became a joint-stock society (from 1853 on) and acquired the privilege of making advances on government bonds and shares of industrial and credit companies.

Engels wrote this article on Marx’s request (see Marx’s letters to Engels of December 30, 1857 and January 1, 1858, present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 233 and 237). Engels expressed his ideas about the siege of Lucknow in his letter to Marx of December 31, 1857 (see ibid., pp. 233-36) and partly in this article.

Mess-house—premises of the officers’ club and dining-room of the Lucknow military garrison.

The Residency—see Note 362.

On the occupation of Scinde, see Note 348.

Sir Charles Napier was formally given command of all the troops in Scinde and was empowered to exercise control over all civil and political officials as well as military officers within his command.
The Battle of the Alma took place on September 20, 1854 during the Crimean war (1853-56). The Russian forces were commanded by A. S. Menshikov, and the numerically superior forces of the French, British and Turks by Saint-Arnaud and Raglan. It was the first battle after the Allies' landing in the Crimea (at Eupatoria) on September 14. The defeat and withdrawal of the Russian troops opened up the way to Sevastopol for the Allies. p. 424

See Note 429. p. 424

See Note 256. p. 424

The castle of Hougoumont and the farm La Haye Sainte on the approaches to Waterloo were used by the English and Prussian troops as strong natural fortifications. In the battle of Waterloo on June 18, 1815 the defenders of these camps put up a stubborn resistance despite their small numbers (there were 7 companies and one battalion in Hougoumont and one battalion in La Haye Sainte). All attempts of the French to capture the first point failed, and only after a heavy bombardment and a pitched battle did they take the second. p. 424

At Borodino, near Moscow, a full-scale battle was fought by the French and Russian forces on September 7, 1812. During the battle the French had 135,000 men and 587 guns, the Russians 120,000 men and 640 guns. The French lost 58,000 men killed and wounded, the Russians about 44,000. p. 427

Engels wrote this article on Marx's request (see Marx's letter to Engels of January 11 and Engels' reply of January 14, 1858, present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 244 and 247) who thought very highly of it. "Your article is splendid and in style and manner altogether reminiscent of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in its heyday," Marx wrote to Engels on January 16, 1858 (ibid., p. 249). p. 435

Informing Marx of this article in the letter of January 14, 1858, Engels wrote with irony: "The Lucknow garrison's greatest act of heroism consisted in the fact that they had to face every day the 'coarse beef' cooked by the ladies, 'entirely unaided'. Must have been damned badly cooked" (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 247). p. 441

In October 1832 the Anglo-French troops, reinforced by the Belgian artillery and engineers, under Marshal Gérard blocked the ports of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and besieged the citadel of Antwerp so as to compel the Netherlands to comply with the London treaty of 1831 on Belgium's independence and the transfer of Antwerp to it. At the end of December 1832, after the fortress was in ruins, its commandant General Chassé and his garrison surrendered.

Venice, which rose against the Austrian rule in March 1848, was besieged by the Austrian troops from land and sea for over a year. The Austrians under Marshal Haynau directed their main attack on the Fort of Marghera which was defended by 2,500 men under Colonel Ulloa. Only when all the fortified works were destroyed and most of the guns put out of order did the defenders abandon it on the night of May 26, 1849. p. 441

In his articles "Progress of the War", "From Sevastopol", "The Armies of Europe" and "Aspects of the War" dealing with the Crimean war of 1853-56 and the heroic defence of Sevastopol in particular (see present edition, Vol. 14), Engels, more than once, highly appreciated the activity of General
E. I. Todtleben, chief engineer and organiser of the defence, and said that he was "the only man in either camp who has shown a spark of genius" (ibid., p. 487).

453 The fortress of Danzig, occupied by the French garrison under General Rapp after the defeat of Napoleon's army in Russia in 1812, was besieged from land and sea by the Russian and Prussian troops in early 1813. During the eleven and a half months the fortress withstood three regular sieges. The French lost 19,000 men, the Allies 10,000. On January 2, 1814, the Allies entered the city.

454 Engels alludes to the events of the Crimean war of 1853-56. Colonel Windham commanded a British brigade during the abortive attack on Bastion No. 3 (the Great Redan) of the Sevastopol fortifications on June 18, 1855. His actions were extremely slack, moreover, during the heat of the battle, he twice left for the rear, allegedly to bring up reinforcements (see this volume, pp. 447-52).

455 The commercial existence of the East India Company was terminated by the Parliamentary Act of 1833 which abolished its monopoly of the China trade. Though the Act left the Indian possessions of the Company in its hands for a further period of twenty years, it put the Company under stricter government control through a Crown-appointed official on the Bengal Council (see also Note 368).

456 Engels' letter to Marx of January 28, 1858 testifies to his work on this article (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 254) but he did not manage to finish it by Friday, January 29, and sent Marx only three articles for The New American Cyclopaedia. Nevertheless, on their receipt, Marx made the following entry in his notebook: "Windham's defeat, Berme, Blenheim, Borodino." In the letter of January 30, Engels definitely stated: "'Windham' will be ready for Tuesday" (ibid., p. 257), i.e. February 2, 1858.

457 See Note 443.

458 See Note 454.

459 See Note 415.

460 See Note 402.

461 Lord Raglan, the British commander-in-chief, gave order for a cavalry attack on the Russian batteries at the battle of Balaklava on October 25, 1854 (see Note 429) which led to the destruction of the British light cavalry under Lord Cardigan. (General command of the light and heavy cavalry was under Lord Lucan.) This event produced a grave impression on the British public. Later, trying to justify himself, Lord Raglan sought to put the blame on Lucan and Cardigan who, he alleged, had misunderstood him, and on Captain Nolan who was said to have passed the order inaccurately. There was no possibility of verifying the fact because Nolan was killed a few minutes after he had given the order.

462 This title is given according to the entry made by Marx in his notebook on February 5, 1858: "Bonaparte Attempt".

463 Marx is referring here to Louis Bonaparte who attempted a coup d'état on August 6, 1840. Profiting by a certain revival of pro-Bonapartist sentiments in France, he landed with a handful of conspirators at Boulogne and tried to raise
a mutiny among the local garrison. His attempt failed. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, but escaped to England in 1846.

On January 14, 1858 the Italian revolutionary Felice Orsini made an attempt on the life of Napoleon III, thus hoping to provoke revolutionary actions in Europe and intense struggle for the national unification of Italy. His attempt failed, and Orsini was executed on March 13, 1858.

The editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* inserted the following paragraph here: "Or as an eminent American, now in France, writes in a letter received by the *Africa*: 'There is a frightful foreboding in the bosoms of the French themselves. I was talking with a friend the other day, a very devout and clear-headed woman, and she told me *sotto voce* that she talked with no one who did not feel a stifling fear of what was coming, of a day of vengeance too black to contemplate. She told me that the receipts of the *mont-de-piété* were falling off so much that the truth was becoming evident that the people had nothing left to dispose of, and this to her and her friends was a sure sign that the final crash was near.'"

A reference to *La loi relatif à des mesures de sûreté générale* (Law on Public Security Measures) known as *La loi des suspects* (Suspects Law) adopted by the Corps législatif on February 19 and promulgated on February 28, 1858. It gave the emperor and his government unlimited power to exile to different parts of France or Algeria or to banish altogether from French territory any person suspected of hostility to the Second Empire.

In Ancient Rome Praetorians were privileged soldiers in the personal guard of a general or the emperor. Here Marx is referring to the French military on whom Napoleon III relied (see also this volume, pp. 464-67).

Under Napoleon III's decree of January 27, 1858 the whole of French territory was divided into five military districts, with Paris, Nancy, Lyons, Toulouse and Tours as their capitals and Marshals Magnan, Baraguay d'Hilliers, Bosquet, Castellane and Canrobert as their commanders. Marx calls these districts *pashaliks* (a comparison earlier used by the French republican press), to emphasise the similarity of the unlimited powers of the reactionary Marshals and the despotic power of the Turkish pashas. Pélissier's proposed appointment as marshal general in 1858 remained unrealised.

Marx is referring to Louis Bonaparte who, during the July monarchy, attempted to stage a coup d'état by means of a military mutiny. On October 30, 1836 he succeeded, with the help of several Bonapartist officers, in inciting two artillery regiments of the Strasbourg garrison to mutiny, but they were disarmed within a few hours. Louis Bonaparte was arrested and deported to America.

In March 1855 Napoleon III planned to go to the Crimea with the aim of suppressing the discontent in the army and the country, invigorating military actions and speeding up the capture of Sevastopol. His trip did not take place.

After Orsini's attempt on the life of Napoleon III, Count Walewski, the French Foreign Minister, sent a dispatch to the British Government on January 20,
1858 expressing dissatisfaction that England should be giving asylum to French political refugees. The dispatch served as a pretext for Palmerston to move a new Alien Bill (also called *Conspiracy to Murder Bill*) on February 8, 1858. It stipulated that any Englishman or foreigner living in the United Kingdom who became party to a conspiracy to murder a person in Britain or any other country, was to be tried by an English court and severely punished. During the second reading of the new Alien Bill on February 19, 1858 the radicals Milner Gibson and John Bright moved an amendment censuring the Palmerston Government for not giving a fitting reply to Walewski's dispatch. By a majority vote, the House of Commons adopted the amendment and rejected the Bill. The Palmerston Government was compelled to resign.

In July 1854, during the Crimean war (1853-56), Marshal Saint-Arnau ordered to organise an expedition under General Espinasse against the Russian troops in Dobrudja. However, having taken no military actions (except minor skirmishes with the retreating Cossacks) and having lost over half of the expeditionary corps due to epidemics of cholera and malaria among the soldiers, Espinasse returned to Varna.

See Note 470.

On October 10, 1850 Louis Bonaparte, then President of the French Republic, held a general review of troops on the plain of Satory (near Versailles). During this review Bonaparte, who was preparing a coup d'état, treated the soldiers and officers to sausages in order to win their support.

A counter-revolutionary coup d'état of the *Ninth Thermidor* (July 27-28, 1794) overthrew the Jacobin government and established the rule of the big bourgeoisie.

The *Palais-Royal* in Paris was the residence of Louis XIV from 1643; in 1692 it became the property of the Orel branch of the Bourbons. During the Second Empire it was the residence of Napoleon III's uncle, ex-King of Westphalia Jérôme, and his son Joseph Bonaparte, hereditary Prince until the birth of Napoleon III's son.

Here Marx hints at the strained relations between Jérôme and Louis Bonaparte.

The title is given according to the entry of February 26, 1858 in Marx's Notebook: "Derby Ministry. Palmerston's sham resignation".

As a result of the Anglo-Chinese conflict, which arose in October 1856 (see Note 196) and marked the beginning of the Second "Opium" War (the main role in the conflict was played by Yeh Ming-Chin, Governor-General of Kwantung and Kwangsi, who objected to the unlawful demands by the British), and the debate over it in the House of Commons of February 26-March 3, 1857, the Palmerston Government was given a vote of no confidence by 263 against 247. Making use of this, Palmerston dissolved the Parliament. The new elections brought victory to the government candidates even in the bulwark of the Opposition—Manchester and secured a majority in the House for the champions of aggression against China.

On *Palmerston's resignation* in 1858, see Note 474.

*Carbonari*—members of secret political societies in Italy and France in the first half of the nineteenth century. In Italy they fought for national
independence, the unification of the country and liberal constitutional reforms. In France the movement was above all directed against the restored monarchy of the Bourbon (1815-30). In the first half of the nineteenth century the word “Carbonari” was synonymous with “revolutionary”. p. 468

484 The Emancipation of the Catholics—in 1829 the British Parliament, under pressure of a mass movement in Ireland, lifted some of the restrictions curtailing the political rights of the Catholic population. Catholics were granted the right to be elected to Parliament and to hold certain government posts. Simultaneously the property qualification for electors increased fivefold. With the aid of this manoeuvre the British ruling classes hoped to win over to their side the upper crust of the Irish bourgeoisie and Catholic landowners and thus split the Irish national movement. p. 469

485 A reference to the campaign for an electoral reform carried out by the British Government in 1832 (see Note 292). p. 469

486 See Note 228. p. 469

487 Richard Cobden’s campaign in 1845 for the repeal of the Corn Laws facilitated the fall of the Peel Cabinet. Lord John Russell, the leader of the Whig Party, who was charged to form a new Cabinet, offered Cobden the post of Vice-President of the Board of Trade, but the latter declined on the ground that he would be more efficient as the out-of-doors advocate of Free Trade than in an official capacity. Owing to internal dissensions among the Whig chiefs, the Cabinet was not formed, and on December 20 Peel returned to office. p. 469

488 See Note 371. p. 469

489 The phrase “Take care of Dowb” was used by British Secretary at War Panmure in a dispatch to General Simpson, appointed commander-in-chief in the Crimea in June 1855. It became widely known in England and was considered as proof that Panmure cared more for his nephew, a young officer named Dowbiggin, than for the whole British army. p. 469

490 See Note 260. p. 470

491 See Note 474. p. 470

492 See Note 474. p. 470

493 In the New-York Daily Tribune the article ended with the text added by the editors: “Every capital of Europe breathes more freely in consequence; every Liberal feels sure that the triumphant uprising of the People is much nearer than it was a month ago. We cite in confirmation a single passage from the speech of England’s foremost orator, and one of her most promising statesmen—Mr. Gladstone, long the bosom friend of Sir Robert Peel, the representative of the University of Oxford—who, in the great debate which hurled Palmerston from office, said:

“ ‘These times are grave for liberty. We live in the nineteenth century. We talk of progress; we believe that we are advancing; but can any man of observation who has watched the events of the last few years in Europe have failed to perceive that there is a movement, indeed, but a downward and backward movement? There are a few spots in which institutions that claim our sympathy still exist and flourish. They are secondary places, nay, they are almost the holes and corners of Europe, so far as mere material greatness is concerned, although their moral greatness will, I trust, insure them long
prosperity and happiness. But in these times more than ever does responsibility
center upon England; and if it does center upon England, upon her principles,
upon her laws, and upon her governors, then I say that a measure passed by
this House of Commons—the chief hope of freedom—which attempts to
establish a moral complicity between us and those who seek safety in repressive
measures, will be a blow and a discouragement to that sacred cause in every
country in the world.' [Loud cheers.]

“Bear in mind that Mr. Gladstone was urged by Lord Derby to accept a
very high place in his Cabinet, and that there has not recently been, and is not
likely soon to be, a Premier who would not gladly share with him the gravest
responsibility.”

p. 471

494 An allusion to the atrocities committed by the French colonialists on the Arab
tribes during the war in Algeria. See also Note 403.

p. 472

495 In the spring of 1847 at Buzançais (department of the Indre) the starving
workers and the neighbouring villagers looted storehouses belonging to
profiteers, which led to a clash between the population and troops. Four of
those who took part were executed and many others sentenced to hard labour.

p. 472

496 In August 1847 Altarice-Rosalba-Fanny, the Duchess of Praslin, was found
murdered in her home. Suspicion fell on her husband, the Duke of Praslin,
who was arrested and who poisoned himself during the investigation.

p. 472

497 On Carbonari see Note 483.

In the latter half of the 1850s several attempts were made on the life of
Napoleon III, including one by the Italian patriot Orsini (see Note 464). In
European circles some of these actions were ascribed to the desire to punish
Napoleon III, who was member of the Italian Carbonari organisation in 1831,
for breaking his commitments to it.

p. 474

498 See Note 11.

p. 475

499 See Note 471.

p. 476

500 See Note 475.

p. 476

501 The expression “intelligent bayonets” (baïonnettes intelligentes) is ascribed to the
French general Changarnier. When in 1849, Marrast, President of the
Constituent Assembly, felt a threat on the part of the Bonapartists and
requested Chângarnier to call up troops for the defence of the Assembly,
Changarnier refused to do that with the remark that he did not like baïonnettes
intelligentes. In this way he made it clear that the army should not be guided by
political motives in its actions. Marx is alluding ironically here to the
pro-Bonapartist French army which, in fact, played a considerable part in the
policy of the Second Empire.

p. 476

502 See Note 467.

p. 476

503 In this article Marx made use of Engels’ letter to him of March 17, 1858 (see

p. 477

504 The phrase “L’horizon politique s’obscurcit” (the political horizon is darkening)
appeared daily in Le Constitutionnel on the eve of the revolution in France in
1848.

p. 478

505 See Note 148.

p. 478

506 See Note 293.
507 A reference to the rejection of the Alien Bill in the House of Commons in February 1858 and the resignation of the Palmerston Government that followed (see Note 474).

508 Marx is referring to the convention signed between France and Belgium on September 22 and ratified on October 11, 1856. It restricted Belgium's right to give asylum to political emigrants accused of the attempt on the life of or assassination of foreign sovereigns or members of their family.

509 See Note 472.

510 On December 10, 1848 Louis Bonaparte was elected President of the French Republic by a majority vote.

511 See Note 464.

512 See Note 471.

513 Albion—an old name of the British Isles; the expression "perfidious Albion", current from the time of the French Revolution, was taken from a poem by Augustin, Marquis de Ximénes. Britain was so called for its government's numerous intrigues against the French Republic and organisation of anti-French coalitions.

514 It is said that in 362 B.C. a deep gulf opened in the forum, which the seers declared would never close until Rome's most valuable possession was thrown into it. Then Curtius, recognizing that nothing was more precious than a brave citizen, leaped into the chasm, which immediately closed. The spot was afterward covered by a marsh called the Lacus Curtius.

515 At the Battle of Waterloo (June 18, 1815) Napoleon's army was defeated by British and Prussian forces commanded by the Duke of Wellington and Blücher.

516 Myrmidons, in Homer, the inhabitants of Phthiotis in Thessaly. A fierce and devoted followers of Achilles. In modern times their name is used to mean subordinates who carry out orders implacably.

517 An allusion to the fact that, while in emigration in England, Louis Bonaparte volunteered for the special constabulary (a police reserve consisting of civilians) which helped the regular police disperse the Chartist demonstration on April 10, 1848, organised to present a petition to Parliament for the adoption of the People's Charter.

518 The Holy Alliance—an association of European monarchs founded on September 26, 1815, on the initiative of the Russian Emperor Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich, to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries.

519 The Triumvirs—Mazzini, Saffi and Armellini—of the Roman Republic (1848-49) pursued a moderate policy. Although their measures towards peasants were progressive, in practice they neither changed agrarian relations in the countryside nor improved the hard condition of the peasants, who did not support the revolution in the greater part of the Italian states.

520 See Note 464.

521 The Marianne, founded in France in 1850, was a secret republican society which opposed Napoleon III during the Second Empire.
522 A great massacre of Huguenots by Catholics took place in Paris on St. Bartholomew’s Day (August 24) in 1572. Marx calls Louis François Veuillot the upholster of St. Bartholomew’s Day because he was a rabid Catholic. p. 488

523 After the death of Pius VIII on November 20, 1830, the Holy See remained vacant until February 2, 1831. This created favourable conditions for uprisings against the Pope’s secular power in a number of provinces of the Papal States—Romagna, Marca, Umbria—and also in the dukedoms of Modena and Parma. They were instigated by the Carbonari (see Note 483). Louis Bonaparte took part in the plot in Rome which was denounced by one of the conspirators. Expelled from Rome, Louis Bonaparte left for Florence. In late March 1831 the uprisings were suppressed by the Austrian troops and the government forces of small Italian states. p. 488

524 Marx’s main source for this article were Papers relating to the Negotiations carried on between Great Britain and France, between the conclusion of the Treaty of Amiens, 25th March, 1802, and the recall of Lord Whitworth from Paris, 12th of May, 1803, including divers Papers from the English Ministers at the Hague, Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburgh, Copenhagen, and Hamburg; to which is added an Appendix, containing offensive Papers, published by France. Laid before the Parliament by His Majesty’s Command on the 18th of May, 1803. This material was published in Cobbett’s Annual Register, Vol. III, from January to June 1803 and Marx informed Engels about this in his letter of February 14, 1858 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 265-66). p. 490

525 The Peace of Amiens signed by France on March 25 and by Britain on March 27, 1802 ended the war between France and the second European coalition. But peace did not last long. Napoleon I soon resumed the war under the pretext of Britain’s failure to fulfil one of the conditions of the Amiens peace, namely to evacuate Malta, which she had occupied in 1800, and return it to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. p. 490

526 The Alien Bill was passed by the British Parliament in 1793 and renewed in 1802, 1803, 1816, 1818 and, finally, in 1848. The Bill authorised the Government to expel any foreigner from the Realm at any moment. It remained in force for one year. Subsequently conservative circles repeatedly urged its renewal. p. 491

527 The Court of King’s (Queen’s) Bench is one of the oldest courts in England; in the nineteenth century (up to 1873) it was an independent supreme court for criminal and civil cases competent to review the decisions of lower judicial bodies. p. 494

528 Marx alludes here to the introduction of a 12-pound cannon in the French army on Napoleon III’s initiative, the so-called Louis Bonaparte’s howitzer; it was planned that this cannon would replace all four calibres of field artillery but the appearance of rifled guns hindered this measure. p. 499

529 See Note 11. p. 499

530 See Note 15. p. 499

531 “The savior of property” was the name given to Louis Bonaparte in addresses which municipal councils of various French towns sent him in July 1849. p. 500
Notes

532 On Praetorian camps see notes 470 and 471.
On the attempt of January 14 see Note 464.

533 This title is given according to the entry in Marx's notebook for 1858.

534 This refers to the first Anglo-Afghan war of 1838-42 (see Note 221).

535 Marx means the proposals on the budget made on April 18, 1853 by Chancellor of the Exchequer Gladstone and adopted by the House of Commons.

536 The French surgeon Simon Bernard, residing in England, was accused of being an accomplice of Felice Orsini in the attempt on the life of Napoleon III (making bombs, etc.) and tried in London between April 12 and 17, 1858. By decision of the Central Criminal Court, Bernard was acquitted on April 17.

537 Le Moniteur universel published French colonels' addresses to Napoleon III on the occasion of his surviving after the attempt on his life on January 14, 1858 (see Note 464). These addresses abounded in threats against England.

538 See Note 463.

539 Marx presumably used the Monthly Comparative Return of Paupers relieved in each month in each year [1857, 1858]. Somewhat later The Economist, No. 769, May 22, 1858 carried the article "Pauperism and the State of Trade". Its author analysed the same official reports and gave some statistical data which are also quoted by Marx.

540 Engels is referring to the oldest form of defences raised by the Burmese around their towns and camps.

541 The Spanish fortress of Badajoz occupied by the garrison under General Phillipon was stormed and taken by English troops commanded by Wellington on April 8, 1812.

The French-held Spanish fortress of San Sebastian was stormed on August 31, 1813. Its commandant, General Rey, surrendered on September 8.

The capture of those towns was accompanied by plunder, violence and atrocities against local inhabitants.

542 On March 3, 1858, Lord Canning, the Governor-General of India, issued a proclamation on the confiscation of land in the province of Oudh in favour of the British Government. The confiscated property included the landed estates of big local feudal lords who had joined the Indian uprising. Canning's point of view was not shared by a number of prominent colonial officials and MPs who favoured a more flexible policy towards the Indian feudal lords and hoped to win them over by promises to leave their domains intact. Marx criticised the proclamation in the articles "The Annexation of Oudh" and "Lord Canning's Proclamation and Land Tenure in India" (see this volume, pp. 533-38 and 546-49).

543 Engels is referring to the battles fought during the first Anglo-Sikh war of 1845-46. Despite the well-organised army and strong artillery the Sikhs were defeated by the British at Moodka (near Lahore) on December 18, at Ferozeshah (near Ferozapore) on December 21, 1845 and at Aliwal (near the Sutlej) on January 28, 1846 and lost the war. The main cause of their defeat was the treachery on the part of their supreme command.
This title is given according to the entry Marx made in his notebook on May 14, 1858: "India (Politics) (Annexation of Oude)."
p. 533

Marx is referring to the Polish national liberation insurrection of 1830-31. The majority of its participants were revolutionary nobles and most of its leaders came from the aristocracy, whose estates were confiscated.
p. 533

The Battle of Novara between Piedmontese and Austrian troops lasted the whole day of March 22 and ended at dawn on March 23, 1849, in the defeat and withdrawal of the Piedmontese army.
p. 533

In 1739 Oudh seceded from the Great Mogul Empire and became an independent principality with Lucknow as its capital. Under the treaty of Allahabad (1765) Robert Clive, Governor of Bengal, concluded a subsidiary alliance with Shuja ud-Daulah; the latter had virtually lost power, which passed into the hands of the British Resident. To camouflage this state of affairs the English often referred to the ruler of Oudh as King.
p. 534

Under the treaty concluded between the East India Company and the Nawab Vizier of Oudh in 1801 Oudh lost a considerable part of its territory between the Ganges and the Jumna, and also Rokhilkhand and Gorakhpur (known as the Ceded Districts) in compensation for failing to repay the Company's subsidies. The Nawab disbanded his troops, and the strength of the Company's troops in Oudh increased.
p. 535

Marx informed Engels about the response to his article among the Hungarian émigrés in the USA in his letter of July 2, 1858 (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 324).
p. 539

Almost all India was under British rule by the middle of the nineteenth century. Cashmere, Rajputana, part of Hyderabad, Mysore and other smaller principalities were vassals of the East India Company.
p. 546

On Zemindars see Note 402.

Talookdars—big feudal lords in Oudh, the majority of whom came from the ranks of the land-tax collectors who turned the districts taxed by them into their own property.

Sirdars—big Sikh feudal lords.
p. 546

The reference is to the promulgation of the Permanent Settlement on March 22, 1793 by the Indian Governor-General Charles Cornwallis. It declared almost all lands in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa permanent property of zemindars and the sum of taxes they paid was also established in perpetuity.
p. 547

In his dispatch of April 19, 1858 the President of the Board of Control, Lord Ellenborough, severely criticised Lord Canning's proclamation of March 3, 1858 (see Note 542). However, Ellenborough's dispatch was not approved of by the British ruling classes and on May 10, 1858 he had to resign.
p. 549

In his letter to Engels of May 31, 1858 Marx wrote that during the past week he had prepared two articles for the New-York Daily Tribune, presumably this and the preceding one.
p. 550
On June 4, 1858, Marx wrote in his notebook: “Army in India”, and in the letter to Engels on June 7 he acknowledged the receipt of Engels’ article for the *New-York Daily Tribune*: “very amusing one, too” (see present edition, Vol. 40, p. 319). He was probably referring to this article.

An allusion to the fact that Britain’s Prime Minister was also First Lord of the Treasury.

The *People’s Charter*, which contained the demands of the Chartists, was published in the form of a Parliamentary Bill on May 8, 1838. It contained six points: universal suffrage (for men of 21 and over), annual parliaments, vote by ballot, equal electoral districts, abolition of the property qualification of MPs and payment for MPs. Petitions urging the adoption of the People’s Charter were turned down by Parliament in 1839, 1842 and 1848.

The property qualification of MPs was abolished by Parliament in 1858.

The reference is to the policy of the Austrian ruling circles during a big peasant uprising in Galicia in February and March 1846 which coincided with the Cracow national liberation uprising. Taking advantage of class and national contradictions, the Austrian authorities provoked clashes between the insurgent Galician peasants and the Polish lesser nobility (szlachta) who were trying to come to the assistance of Cracow. The peasant uprising began with the disarming of the insurgent szlachta detachments and grew into a mass sacking of landowners’ estates. After dealing with the insurgent szlachta, the Austrian Government also suppressed the peasant uprising in Galicia.

A reference to a Bill tabled in Parliament by the Derby Ministry in March and adopted on August 2, 1858 as the *Act for the Better Government of India*. It placed India under the control of the British Crown, while the East India Company was dissolved, and its shareholders were compensated with £3 million from the Indian budget. The Act also provided for the formation of the Indian Council as a consultative body consisting of 15 military and civil officials in the Anglo-Indian service. The Governor-General of India became the Viceroy, virtually remaining a functionary of the Secretary of State for India in London; the latter kept full control over British colonial administration and the military forces of the former East India Company.

A critical analysis of the Act is given by Marx in his article “The Indian Bill” (see this volume, pp. 585-88).

This title was given in accordance with the entry in Marx’s notebook for 1858.

A reference to the colonial war in Algeria, launched by the French Government in 1830. The Algerian people put up a stubborn resistance to the French colonialists; it took them 40 years to turn Algeria into a French colony.
This title was given in accordance with the entry in Marx's notebook for 1858.

A reference to the Act for establishing certain Regulations for the better Management of the Affairs of the East India Company, as well in India as in Europe of 1773. Its main provisions were as follows: the qualification for a vote in the Court of Proprietors was raised from £500 to £1,000 and was restricted to those who had held their stock for at least twelve months. Measures were taken to prevent the collusive transfer of stock, and the consequent multiplying of votes. The directors were henceforth to be elected for four years, and one-fourth of their number must retire every year, remaining at least one year out of office. There was to be a Governor-General of Bengal assisted by four councillors. They were to have power to superintend the subordinate presidencies in making war or peace. The first governor-general and councillors, Warren Hastings, Clavering, Monson, Barwell and Philip Francis were named in the Act. They were to hold office for five years, and future appointments were to be made by the Company. The Act empowered the Crown to establish by charter a Supreme Court of Justice, consisting of a chief justice and three puisne judges.

Civis Romanus sum ("I am a Roman Citizen")—an expression used by Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston in his speech in the House of Commons on June 25, 1850. Palmerston declared that like the formula of Roman citizenship, Civis Romanus sum, secured universal respect for the citizens of Ancient Rome, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong.

Marx means the Anglo-Afghan war of 1838-42, in which the British forces were utterly defeated (see Note 221).

A reference to the Second "Opium" War with China, 1856-60.

About his letter to the Neue Zeit Marx wrote to Engels on August 18, 1858 (see present edition, Vol. 40, pp. 340-41).

This article was written by Engels, on Marx's request, between July 16 and 20, 1858 and sent to New York on July 27. The New-York Daily Tribune editors tampered with the text and this is particularly noticeable in the last paragraph. Moreover, the editors changed the title to "How the Indian War Has Been Mismanaged" and published it unsigned. In this volume the title is given in accordance with the entry in Marx's Notebook for 1858.

The American War of Independence (1775-83)—a revolutionary war fought by 13 British colonies in North America. As a result of their victory an independent state was formed, the United States of America. France fought on the side of the Americans.

Marx may have referred to his first article about Lady Bulwer-Lytton written on July 16, 1858, but not published in the New-York Daily Tribune.
The Sikh empire, a feudal Indian state on the territory of the Punjab, was founded at the end of the eighteenth century and reached its heyday at the beginning of the nineteenth century under Ranjit Singh who brought into subjection all local principalities and some neighbouring regions. Ranjit Singh created strong military organisation and the Sikh army was considered the best in India.

On the subjugation of the Punjab see Note 215.

This became a dictum in the 1840s. It originated with Lord Palmerston who wrote on February 14, 1840 to John Cam Hobhouse, Baron Broughton, President of the Board of Control: "It seems pretty clear that sooner or later the Cossack and the Sepoy, the man from the Baltic and he from the British islands will meet in the centre of Asia."

These notes are to be found in Marx's notebook of excerpts dated November 1854-early 1857. He made them during his work on the articles "Maritime Commerce of Austria" (see this volume, pp. 139-50).

The Genoese obtained privileges under the Nimpha Treaty of 1261 with the Byzantine emperor Mikhail VIII Palæolog.

On the Treaty of Campo-Formio and of Lunéville see Note 170.

A reference to the treaty between France and Austria signed in Fontainebleau on October 10, 1807. It specified the boundaries between the Austrian Empire and the Italian Kingdom.

Convention money (coin) was introduced in Austria in 1753. The standard of the 20-gulden, or convention, system was silver. 20 gulden contained 234 grams of pure silver. With the introduction and the growing quantity of paper money in circulation, particularly during the 1848-49 revolution, the rate of exchange of convention money for it constantly increased.

In the summer of 1854 when the fourth bourgeois revolution in Spain (1854-56) broke out, Marx began studying in earnest the history of the nineteenth-century bourgeois revolutions in that country with the aim of ascertaining the specific character of the new revolution, which, he believed, if a success, could give an impact to revolutionary events in other European countries. As can be judged by the notebook in which Marx put down the dates of dispatching the articles to New York and sometimes briefly disclosed their contents, in August-November 1854 he wrote for the New-York Daily Tribune nine articles with the general title "Revolutionary Spain". In September-December that year the newspaper published the first six articles dealing with the first (1808-14) and the beginning of the second (1820-23) revolutions and containing a short survey of Spain's preceding history. However, the editors arbitrarily divided the articles, printing them in eight numbers, and thus the printed series of articles "Revolutionary Spain" consisted of eight articles (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 389-452). The remaining three articles were not found in the newspaper columns and were regarded as unpublished. Only a small fragment from their draft manuscript has survived dealing with the causes that led to the defeat of the second revolution. It is probably part of the eighth article (Marx's numeration) and may be considered relevant to the entry in the Notebook made on November 21, 1854 (ibid., pp. 654-59).
In 1983, when Volume 14, Section I, of MEGA was being prepared for publication, research workers of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany discovered the seventh (ninth in the newspaper) article of the series. It was published in the morning edition of the New-York Daily Tribune for March 23, 1855. This issue is missing in the file of the newspaper available at the library of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CC CPSU. The content of the article corresponds to the entry in the Notebook made on November 14, 1854: “Tuesday, November 14. Spain 1820-July 1822.” The article substantially adds to the analysis of the laws governing bourgeois revolutions in general, given by Marx on the example of the nineteenth-century Spanish bourgeois revolutions, and also to the description of certain features of the revolution and counter-revolution in Spain itself determined by its specific historical development.

The article is reproduced here from the photocopy kindly placed at the disposal of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC SUPG.

593 A reference to the Constitution adopted by the Spanish Cortes in Cadiz on March 19, 1812 (see Note 142). Marx analysed it in one of the articles of this series (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 424-33).


595 An allusion to the description of the absolute monarchy in Spain given by Marx in the first article of this series, namely: “The absolute monarchy in Spain, bearing but a superficial resemblance to the absolute monarchies of Europe in general, is rather to be ranged in a class with the Asiatic forms of government” (see present edition, Vol. 13, p. 396).

596 Marx is referring to the second bourgeois revolution in Spain (1820-23).

597 Marx analysed these events in the article “Espartero” (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 340-46).

598 Ayuntamientos were organs of local government in Spain, which played a great political role during the Reconquest, or struggle for Spain’s liberation from the Arab yoke (eighth-fifteenth centuries), and which were liquidated later. The re-establishment of ayuntamientos was one of the democratic demands of the early nineteenth-century bourgeois revolutions.

599 An allusion to the fact that on the eve of the first bourgeois revolution (1808-14) the power in Spain was actually concentrated in the hands of Manuel Godoy (nicknamed “the sausage-maker”), the favourite of the royal couple, Carlos IV and Maria Luisa.

600 Ferdinand VII abdicated in May 1808 and lived in Talleyrand’s palace in France from 1808 to March 3, 1814.

601 The reference is to the negotiations between Ferdinand VII and the French Government concerning the terms of Ferdinand’s return to Spain terminated in the agreement of December 11, 1813. On December 15, Joseph Bonaparte
abdicated from the Spanish throne in Ferdinand's favour. The Spanish Regency, whom Ferdinand had sent his instructions immediately after December 11, did not fulfil the terms of the agreement. p. 624

Pavillon Marsan—a building in the Tuileries Palace; during the Restoration it was the residence of the Count of Artois. p. 624

This refers to the decree issued by Ferdinand VII on September 30, 1823. p. 624

In the course of the national liberation war of the Spanish people against Napoleon I the fortress of Badajoz was many a time the site of fierce battles. p. 624

The Cadiz Cortes—the constituent assembly in Spain convened on September 24, 1810 and dissolved on September 20, 1813, during the first Spanish revolution (1808-14). The Cortes promulgated a number of laws, and the adoption of the Constitution was of special importance (see notes 142 and 593). p. 624

The Moderados (see Note 136) were also called anilleros (see this volume, p. 629) during the second revolution (1820-23).

The Exaltados represented the Left wing in the revolution of 1820-23 and were supported by the democratic section among the officers, urban middle and petty bourgeoisie, artisans and workers. Marx called the Moderados the Liberals of 1812, and the Exaltados the Liberals of 1820. p. 625

During the 1820-23 revolution many democratic clubs and secret societies were set up in Spain. The most radical among the secret societies was the Confederation of Spanish Comuneros which numbered 70,000 members. Comuneros favoured resolute struggle against counter-revolution. After the defeat of the revolution the Comuneros were severely persecuted and abandoned their activity. p. 625

The army of the Isla (of the Island)—an expeditionary corps concentrated in 1819 near Cadiz and on the Isle of Leon to be dispatched to Latin America where the national liberation struggle was waged against the Spanish domination (see Note 615). A plan for an armed revolt against Ferdinand VII's despotism was being hatched in the expeditionary army formed of unreliable elements. The Riego battalion, which mutinied on January 1, 1820, and thus started the second revolution in Spain, was also part of this corps. p. 625

Marx is referring here to the detachments formed by the Catholic-absolutist group of Apostolics who called themselves the "army of faith" and staged a revolt against the revolutionary government in 1822 in Catalonia, Navarra and Biscay. In 1823 these detachments joined the French interventionists. p. 625

The decree nominating General Carvajal to the post of Captain-General of New Castile was signed by Ferdinand VII on November 16, 1820. Marx drew this information from a book by W. Walton, The Revolutions of Spain, 2 volumes, London, 1837. p. 626

On October 5-6, 1789, during the French Revolution, the Paris revolutionary masses marched to Versailles and frustrated the counter-revolutionary plot of the Court. The King and the Constituent Assembly were forced to return to Paris. p. 626
The Ministry that came to power in 1820 included active participants in the 1808-14 revolution—Evaristo Pérez de Castro, Manuel García Herreros, Augustin de Argüelles and others, who were victims of repressions after its defeat. p. 626

In July 1820 bourgeois revolutionaries (Carbonari) started a revolt in the Kingdom of Naples (the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies) and obtained a democratic constitution on the pattern of the Spanish Constitution of 1812. The Congress of the Holy Alliance which opened in Troppau in October 1820 and closed in Laibach in May 1821 took a decision to send Austrian troops to Italy. p. 627

The servile party (serviles)—a nickname given to the reactionary clerico-absolutist group which arose during the first bourgeois revolution in Spain (1808-14); later its members formed the Court camarilla of Ferdinand VII. p. 627

Marx is referring to the liberation war waged by the Spanish colonies in America (1810-26). General Morillo, who commanded the Spanish army there in 1815-20, was most brutal in suppressing the insurgents. p. 627

A reference to the Francisco Martínez de la Rosa Ministry appointed in late February 1822. p. 628

A reference to the suppression of the revolt in Naples by the Austrian troops (see Note 613). p. 628

Las Cabezas (Las Cabezas de San Juan)—a small town north-east of Cadiz, where Riego quartered his battalion at the end of December 1819 and whence he started his revolutionary march (see Note 608). p. 629

The doctrinaire school included French bourgeois politicians of the Restoration (1815-30), constitutional monarchists who wanted to form in France a bourgeois-aristocratic bloc like that in England. Most prominent among them were the historian François Guizot and the philosopher Pierre Paul Royer-Collard. p. 629

Marx is referring to the constitution, the so-called Charter, which was imposed by Louis XVIII in 1814, after Napoleon I’s defeat, and established constitutional monarchy in France. p. 629

General Elió, who was sentenced to imprisonment in 1820 for having organised a counter-revolutionary coup in 1814, was kept in the citadel of Valencia. p. 630
NAME INDEX

A

Abdul Mejid (1823-1861)—Sultan of Turkey (1839-61).—543, 595

Aberdeen, George Hamilton Gordon, Earl of (1784-1860)—British statesman, Tory, leader of the Peelites from 1850; Foreign Secretary (1828-30, 1841-46) and Prime Minister of the coalition cabinet (1852-55).—192, 204, 217-18, 248, 571

Achmet Effendi—Bangya’s Turkish secretary.—540

Ackroyd, Eduard—English manufacturer, Liberal M.P.—240

Adair, Sir Robert (1763-1855)—British diplomat, associate of Charles James Fox.—187

Addington—see Sidmouth, Henry Addington, Viscount

Aga Khan, Mirza—Persian statesman, War Minister, from 1852 head of government (Sadir Azim) under Shah Nasr-ed-Din.—296

Aguesseau, Henry Cardin Jean Baptiste, comte d’ (1746-1826)—French diplomat, envoy to Copenhagen (1803-05).—498

Ahmad (Ahmed) (d. 1481)—Khan of the Golden Horde (1459-81).—81

Ahmad Shah Durrani (or Durranee) (1724-1773)—Afghan Shah (1747-73), founder of the state of Afghanistan and of the Durrani dynasty.—177

Ahmed III (1673-1736)—Sultan of Turkey (1703-30).—96

Aiguillon, Emmanuel Armand de Vigerot du Plessis de Richelieu, duc d’ (1720-1788)—French military figure and politician, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1770-74).—32, 33, 35

Akbar II—Mogul ruler of India (1806-37).—299

Alba, Jacobo Luis, duque de (1821-1881)—Spanish aristocrat, married a sister of Eugénie de Montijo, Napoleon III’s wife.—98

Albert (Albrecht) III (c. 1350-1395)—Archduke of Austria (1365-95).—164

Albert (Albrecht) III Achilles (1414-1486)—Elector of Brandenburg (1470-86).—154

Albert (Albrecht) of Austria—see Albert (Albrecht) III

Albert Frederick (Albrecht-Friedrich) (1553-1618)—Duke of Prussia (1568-1618).—156

Alcoy, conde d’—see Roncali, Federico
Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—157, 178
Alexander II (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81).—263, 540, 544, 568
Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia or Borja) (c. 1431-1503)—Pope (1492-1503).—36
Alexander Jagiello (1460 or 1461-1506)—Grand Duke of Lithuania from 1492, King of Poland (1501-06).—85-86
Alexander Mikhailovich (1301-1339)—Grand Duke of Tver from 1326; killed with his son Fyodor in the Golden Horde, 1339.—77
Anna (d. 1011)—daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Romanus II; in 987 was married by her brothers, Emperors Basil II and Constantine IX, to Vladimir, Grand Duke of Kiev.—75
Anne (1576-1625)—daughter of Albert Frederick, Duke of Prussia; wife (from 1594) of Johann Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg.—156
Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—53, 93
Anne (Anna Ivanovna) (1693-1740)—Empress of Russia (1730-40).—27, 38, 40, 60
Anson, George (1797-1857)—British general, commander-in-chief of the British expeditionary corps in India (1856-57).—305
Appa Sahib—Rajah of the Indian principality of Sattara (1839-48).—311
Argout, Antoine Maurice Apollinaire, comte d' (1782-1858)—French statesman and financier, Director-General of the Bank of France (1834-57).—119, 289-90
Arguelles, Agustin de (1776-1844)—Spanish liberal statesman, prominent figure in the revolutions of 1808-14 and 1820-23, Minister of the Interior (1820-21).—622-23, 625
Argyll, George John Douglas Campbell, Duke of (1823-1900)—British statesman, Peelite; Lord Privy Seal (1853-55, 1859-66, 1880-81), Postmaster-General (1855-58, 1860), Secretary for India (1868-74).—389
Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—310
Armitage, Sir Elkanah—candidate M.P. for Salford (1857), a representative of the Manchester School.—238

Ashburnham, Thomas (1807-1872)—British general, in 1857 headed a military expedition to China; was recalled to India at the outbreak of the national liberation uprising there.—300

Ashraf (d. 1730)—Shah of Persia (1725-30).—177

As(s)ensio, Pedro Galvo—Spanish politician, deputy to the Cortes; took part in the bourgeois revolution of 1854-56.—101

Auckland, George Eden, Earl of (1784-1849)—British statesman, Whig, held several ministerial posts, Governor-General of India (1835-42).—179, 536, 538

Auerbach, Berthold (1812-1882)—German writer; liberal, later an apologist for Bismarck.—589

August(us) II (the Strong) (1670-1733)—King of Poland (1697-1706, 1709-33) and Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus I (1694-1733).—41, 48, 49, 51

B

Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans (1561-1626)—English philosopher, naturalist and historian.—56

Bahadur Shah II (1767-1862)—the last Great Mogul ruler in India (1837-58); from 1849 was pensioned off by the English and had no real power; in 1857, during the national liberation uprising in India, was again proclaimed Emperor by the insurgents; after the capture of Delhi in September 1857 was arrested by the English and exiled to Burma (1858).—299, 305, 365, 375

Baillie, Henry James (b. 1804)—British government official, Secretary of the Board of Control for India, Tory M.P.—536

Baird, Sir David (1757-1829)—British general, commanded the British expeditionary force in Egypt in 1800-02.—593

Baltaji Mohammed—Turkish statesman, Grand Vizier (1710-11).—49

Bandiera brothers, Attilio (1810-1844) and Emilio (1819-1844)—Austrian naval officers, participants in the Italian national liberation movement; members of the Young Italy society; executed for an attempt to raise an insurrection in Calabria (1844).—216

Bangya, János (1817-1868)—Hungarian journalist and army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; later Kossuth's emissary abroad; at the same time a secret police agent; under the name of Mehemed Bey served in the Turkish army and was a Turkish agent in the Caucasus (1855-58).—236, 540-45

Baraguay d'Hilliers, Achille, comte (1795-1878)—Marshal of France, took part in the Napoleonic campaigns, later sided with the Bourbons; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Bonapartist after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—465

Bardaji, Eusebio—Spanish diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1808, 1810, 1821, 1837).—627

Barnard, Sir Henry William (1799-1857)—British general, in 1854-55 took part in the Crimean war; in 1857 commanded British troops besieging Delhi during the national liberation uprising in India.—314, 318-21, 327-29, 342-44, 370

Baroche, Pierre Jules (1802-1870)—French lawyer and politician; dep-
uty to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Bonapartist; member of several cabinets before and after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—457

Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873)—French lawyer and politician, leader of the liberal dynastic opposition until February 1848; headed the monarchist coalition ministry (December 1848-October 1849).—302

Barrot, Théodore Adolphe (1803-1870)—French diplomat; Consul-General in Egypt (1845).—296

Bartrum, R. H.—British lieutenant in India.—355

Bates, Robert Makin (born c. 1791)—English banker, partner of a firm which went bankrupt in June 1855; was sentenced to penal servitude for financial machinations.—110

Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German philosopher and writer, Young Hegelian.—181-93

Baugh—British lieutenant in India.—298

Bayezid II (1447-1512)—Sultan of Turkey (1481-1512).—80

Beauharnais, Eugénie Hortense de (1783-1837)—Napoleon III’s mother, wife of King Louis Bonaparte of Holland.—490

Beaupép-Beaupré, Charles François (1766-1854)—French hydrographer.—148

Bedo, Marie Alphonse (1804-1863)—French general and moderate republican politician; Vice-President of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; expelled from France after the coup d’état of December 2, 1851; after the amnesty of 1859 returned to France.—476

Bentham, Jeremy (1748-1832)—English sociologist, proponent of utilitarianism.—209

Bentinck, Lord William Cavendish (1774-1839)—British general and statesman; fought in the wars against Napoleonic France; Governor-General of India (1827-35).—536

Bernal Osborne, Ralph (1808-1882)—British liberal politician, M.P., Secretary of the Admiralty (1852-58).—218

Bernard, Simon François (Bernard le Clubiste) (1817-1862)—French republican; emigrated to Britain after the defeat of the 1848 revolution; in 1858 was accused by the French Government of being an accomplice in Orsini’s attempt on the life of Napoleon III; acquitted by the British Court.—515, 516

Berryer, Arthur—agent of the French Government in the joint-stock company, Docks Napoléon; son of lawyer Pierre Antoine Berryer; in March 1857 was sentenced to two-year confinement for participating in the financial machinations of the company’s governors.—474

Berryer, Pierre Antoine (1790-1868)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Legitimist.—474

Berthier, Louis Alexandre, prince de Neuchâtel, duc de Valengin, prince de Wagram (1753-1815)—Marshal of France, chief-of-staff in Napoleon’s army (1799, 1805-07, 1812-14); after the fall of the Napoleonic Empire (1814) sided with the Bourbons.—465

Bertran de Lys (Lis), Manuel—Spanish statesman, deputy to the Cortes, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1851, 1852) and Minister of the Interior (1851).—630
Bestuzhev (Bestoucheff)-Ryumin, Alexei Petrovich, Count (1693-1766)—Russian statesman and diplomat, Chancellor of State from 1744; up to 1758 virtually directed Russia's foreign policy.—29

Bethell, Richard, Lord Westbury (1800-1873)—British lawyer and statesman, Liberal; Solicitor General (1852-56), Attorney-General (1856-58, 1860-61) and Lord Chancellor (1861-65).—215-16

Billault, Adolphe Augustin Marie (1805-1863)—French politician, Minister of the Interior (1854-58).—414, 455

Biron, Ernst Johann, Duke of Courland (from 1737) (1690-1772)—a Courland nobleman, favourite of the Russian Empress Anna Ivanovna, grand chamberlain at the Russian Court.—27

Blackstone, Sir William (1723-1780)—English lawyer, advocate of constitutional monarchy.—356

Boitelle, Symphorien Casimir Joseph (1810-1861)—French general, marshal from 1856; senator, participated in the Crimean war of 1853-56.—465, 483

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30), in Spain (1700-1808, 1814-68, 1874-1931 and since 1975) and in a number of Italian states.—29, 31

Bourchier, George (1821-1898)—British army officer, took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—370

Bowring, Sir John (1792-1872)—British politician, linguist and writer, follower of Jeremy Bentham, Free Trader; colonial official, consul at Canton (1847-52); in 1854-57 governor, commander-in-chief and vice-admiral in Hong Kong, performed various diplomatic functions and supervised trade with China.—160, 208-12, 216-18, 222, 233, 355

Bravo Murillo, Juan (1803-1873)—Spanish statesman, belonged to the Moderado Party, head of government (1850-52).—285, 286

Brereton—an English official in India, Commissioner of the Loothiana District in the Punjab (1855).—339-40

Briggs, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer and politician; a leader of the Free Traders and a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League; member of the House of Commons (from 1843).—229-30, 238-42, 567, 575-77, 579
Brofferio, Angelo (1802-1866)—Italian politician, poet and journalist, member of the Piedmont Chamber of Deputies from 1848, leader of the democratic opposition; follower of Garibaldi.—6

Brougham and Vaux, Henry Peter, Baron (1778-1868)—British Whig statesman, lawyer and writer; Lord Chancellor (1830-34).—469, 572

Brown, Humphrey—British businessman, M.P., a director of the Royal British Bank (1853-56), sentenced for machinations.—111, 266-69

Buckingham, Henry Stafford, Duke of (c. 1454-1483)—English feudal lord, helped Richard III to ascend the throne, later betrayed him and was executed.—219

Bulwer, William Henry Lytton Earle (Baron Dalling and Bulwer) (1801-1872)—British diplomat, Whig M.P. (1830-37); chargé d'affaires in the Danubian Principalities (1856-58); ambassador to Constantinople (1858-65).—325

Bulwer-Lytton—see Lytton, Edward George Earle Lytton, Bulwer-Lytton

Bunyan, John (1628-1688)—English writer.—457

Burat, Jules François (1807-1885)—French journalist.—115

Burke, Edmund (1729-1797)—British statesman and political writer, Whig M.P.; supported the Tories from 1791; at the beginning of his career advocated liberal principles, subsequently an opponent of the French Revolution.—30, 36

Butenew, Appollinary Petrovich (1787-1866)—Russian diplomat; envoy to Turkey (1856-58).—545

Cadoudal, Georges (1771-1804)—French politician, royalist; took part in the counter-revolutionary uprising in Vendée (1793); made several attempts to organise a royalist uprising in France; executed in 1804 for an attempted royalist coup in Paris.—494, 495

Caesar (Gaius Julius Caesar) (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman.—146, 164, 356

Cairns, Hugh McCallmont (1819-1885)—British lawyer and statesman, Tory and later a Conservative; Lord Justice of Appeal (from 1858).—586

Calatrava, José María (1781-1847)—Spanish statesman and lawyer; took part in the Spanish revolutions of 1808-14, 1820-23 and 1834-43; deputy to the Cortes; Minister of Justice (1823), Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1836).—628

Calkeoen, Cornelis (1695-1764)—Dutch diplomat, ambassador to Turkey (1725-44).—27

Calonge y Fenollet, Eusebio de (1814-1874)—Spanish general; took part in the Carlist wars on the side of Isabella II; Captain-General of Pamplona (1854).—284, 285

Cameron, Hugh Innes—manager of the Royal British Bank (1849-55), sentenced for machinations.—112, 267-69

Campbell—British general, took part in suppressing the Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59.—508

Campbell, Alexander, Earl of Marchmont (1675-1740)—British politician and diplomat, ambassador extraordinary to Denmark (1715-21).—45, 66

Campbell, Sir Colin, Baron Clyde (from 1858) (1792-1863)—British general, field marshal from 1862; in 1854-55 fought in the Crimean war; commander-in-chief of the British army which suppressed the Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59.—373, 419-20, 423-24, 435-37, 441-42, 447-48, 450-52, 504-09.
527, 529-31, 548, 557-59, 580-83, 607

Campbell, Sir George (1824-1892)—British official in India (1843-74 with intervals); Liberal; author of works on India.—579

Canning, Charles John, Earl (from 1859) (1812-1862)—British statesman, Tory, then Peelite; Governor-General of India (1856-62), organised the suppression of the Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59.—363, 437, 531, 533-34, 547-49, 594

Canning, George (1770-1827)—British statesman and diplomat, Tory, Foreign Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27), Prime Minister (1827).—188, 469

Canrobert, François Certain (1809-1895)—Marshal of France, Bonapartist; an active participant in the coup d'etat of December 2, 1851; commander-in-chief of the French army (September 1854-May 1855) during the Crimean war.—466, 483

Cantemir, Demetrius (Demeter), Prince (1673-1723)—Moldavian encyclopaedist and politician; Hospodar of Moldavia (1710-11); in 1711 concluded an agreement with Peter I placing Moldavia under Russian suzerainty.—89

Cardwell, Eduard Cardwell, Viscount (1813-1886)—British statesman, a leader of the Peelites and then a Liberal; President of the Board of Trade (1852-55), Chief Secretary for Ireland (1859-61).—61, 249

Carl Ludwig Eugène (1826-1872)—Crown Prince of Sweden, Regent (1857-59); King of Sweden and Norway under the name of Charles XV (1859-72); son of Oscar I.—334

Carlos Maria Isidro de Borbón (Don Carlos) (1788-1855)—brother of Ferdinand VII; pretender to the Spanish throne under the name of Charles V; head of the feudal clerical party (Carlists) which fomented a civil war in Spain (1833-40).—104, 106

Carmarthen, Marquis of—see Osborne, Sir Thomas

Carvajal—Spanish general, nominated by Ferdinand VII Captain-General of New Castile in 1820.—626

Casa-Irujo, Carlos Maria Martinez (1765-1824)—Spanish statesman, ambassador to Paris (1821), Minister of Foreign Affairs (1823).—624

Casimir IV Jagiello (1427-1492)—Grand Duke of Lithuania from 1440; King of Poland (1447-92).—85, 86

Cass, Lewis (1782-1866)—American statesman, general and diplomat; member of the Democratic Party; Secretary of State (1857-60).—570-71

Cassagnac—see Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe

Castellane, Esprit Victor Elisabeth Boniface, comte de (1788-1862)—Marshal of France, Bonapartist; commanded the garrison of Lyons from 1850.—466, 475

Castello, Mary Anne—English actress, George Canning's mother.—469

Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Marquis of Londonderry, Viscount (1769-1822)—British statesman, Tory; Secretary for War and for the Colonies (1805-06, 1807-09); Foreign Secretary (1812-22); committed suicide.—114, 222, 471, 491

Catherine I Alexeyevna (1684-1727)—second wife of Peter the Great (from 1712); Empress of Russia (1725-27).—59, 60

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-96).—28-29, 31-32, 34-37, 39-40, 60, 157, 187, 224

Catiline (Lucius Sergius Catilina) (c. 108-62 B.C.)—Roman politician,
organiser of a conspiracy against the aristocratic republic.—36

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-1857)—French general, moderate republican; in May-June 1848 War Minister; directed the suppression of the June 1848 uprising of the Paris workers; head of the executive (June-December 1848); after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, opposed the government of Napoleon III.—302, 353, 465

Cavendish, Lord John (1732-1796)—British politician, Whig, Chancellor of the Exchequer (March-July 1782, April-December 1783), M.P.—34

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.—513

Châlons-Orange, House of— a family of French counts going back to the 14th century.—152

Chamberlain, Sir Neville Bowles (1820-1902)—British general, then field marshal; commanded the irregular forces in the Punjab (1854-58); took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—343, 370, 506, 509

Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de (1820-1883)—last representative of the elder line of the Bourbons; grandson of Charles X; pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V.—466

Changarnier, Nicolas Anne Théodule (1793-1877)—French general and politician, monarchist; took part in the conquest of Algeria in the 1830s and 1840s; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); banished from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—476, 480

Charles II (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—70, 71

Charles (Carlos) III (1716-1788)—King of Spain (1759-88), King of Naples as Charles VII and Sicily as Charles IV (1735-59).—32

Charles V (1500-1558)—Holy Roman Emperor (1519-56) and King of Spain as Charles (Carlos) I (1516-56); Prince of the Netherlands (1516-55); King of Sicily (1516-56).—156, 356

Charles VI (1685-1740)—Holy Roman Emperor (1711-40).—27, 51, 52

Charles X (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30); Count of Artois before he acceded to the throne.—334, 624

Charles X (Gustavus) (1622-1660)—King of Sweden (1654-60).—95

Charles XI (1655-1697)—King of Sweden (1660-97).—70-71

Charles XII (1682-1718)—King of Sweden (1697-1718).—29, 41-42, 44, 48-55, 57, 59, 63, 65-67, 69-72, 92

Charles Albert (Carlo Alberto) (1798-1849)—King of Sardinia and Piedmont (1831-49).—6

Charles Louis (Karl Ludwig) (1771-1847)—Archduke of Austria, field marshal and military author; commander-in-chief during the wars with France (1796, 1799, 1805 and 1809), War Minister (1805-09).—170

Charles the Great (Charlemagne) (742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800), Holy Roman Emperor (800-814).—75

Charles ("the Bold") (1433-1477)—Duke of Burgundy (1467-77).—152

Chatham—sec Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham ("the Senior")

Chateaubriand, François René, vicomte de (1768-1848)—French writer, statesman and diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1822-24).—15

The Chernyshevs (Chernicheffs)—a Russian aristocratic family close to the
Court in the 18th-19th centuries.—31

Chevalier, Michel (1806-1879)—French engineer, economist and journalist, Saint-Simon’s follower; supported Napoleon III’s economic policy, wrote for the Journal des Débats.—15

Ch’ing (The Manchu)—dynasty of Manchu emperors, ruled in China from 1644 to 1911.—225, 282

Christian V (1646-1699)—King of Denmark and Norway (1670-99).—70

Christina—see Maria Cristina

Cicero (Marcus Tullius Cicero) (106-43 B.C.)—Roman orator, statesman and philosopher.—95, 154, 282

Clanricarde, Ulick John de Burgh, Earl and Marquis of (1802-1874)—English diplomat and politician, Whig; ambassador to St. Petersburg (1838-41), Lord Privy Seal (1857-58).—469, 596

Clarendon, George William Frederick Villiers, Earl of, Baron Hyde (1800-1870)—British statesman, Whig, then Liberal; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1847-52), Foreign Secretary (1853-58, 1865-66, 1868-70).—5, 217-18, 232, 250, 324, 547

Clark or Clerk, Sir George (1787-1867)—British statesman, Tory, then Peelite; Secretary to the Treasury (1834-35, 1841-45), Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint (1845-46).—249

Claudius (10 B.C.-A.D. 54)—Roman Emperor (41-51).—164

Clay, Sir William (1791-1869)—British politician and journalist, Whig, M.P. (1832-57).—200

Cobbett, William (1763-1835)—British politician and radical writer; published Cobbett’s Weekly Political Register from 1802.—356, 493

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and politician; a leader of the Free Traders and a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League, M.P.—207, 211, 215, 220, 227-29, 238-40, 249, 469

Cockburn, Sir George (1772-1853)—British admiral (from 1837), First Lord of the Admiralty (1841-46), Admiral of the Fleet (1851).—571

Codrington, Sir William John (1804-1884)—British general, commander-in-chief of the British army in the Crimea (November 1855-July 1856), Governor of Gibraltar (1859-65), M.P.—447

Collado, José Manuel—Spanish politician, banker, member of the Progressista Party, Minister of Finance in the Espartero Ministry (August 1854-January 1855).—288

Colquhoun, Robert Gilmour—British consul in Bucharest in the 1840s and 1850s.—62

Concha, Manuel Gutiérrez de le, marqués del Duero (1808-1874)—Spanish general, belonged to the Moderado Party; conspired against Espartero in 1843; helped organise the suppression of revolution of 1854-56.—98, 105

Constantine XI Palaeologus (1405-1453)—last Byzantine Emperor (1449-53).—80

Contador, Riego—Spanish War Minister (1821).—624

Corberon, Marie Daniel Bourrée, baron de (1748-1810)—French diplomat, chargé d'Affaires in Russia (1777-80).—31

Cornwallis, Charles Cornwallis, Marquis and Earl (1738-1805)—British statesman, Governor-General of India (1786-93, 1805); as the Viceroy of Ireland (1798-1801) suppressed the Irish rebellion of 1798.—547
Courtais, Aimable Gaspard Henri, vicomte de (1790-1877)—French general, began his service in Napoleon I's army; commanded the National Guard of Paris in 1848-49; abandoned politics after the revolution.—481

Cousin, Victor (1792-1867)—French philosopher.—488

Coxe, William (1747-1828)—English historian and traveller, archdeacon in Wiltshire from 1804; collected and published historical documents.—36

Cramaill, Adrien de Montluc, comte de, prince de Chabunais (1588-1642)—French writer.—326

Cranworth, Robert Monsey Rolfe, Baron (1790-1868)—British statesman and lawyer, Whig, Lord Chancellor (1852-58, 1865-66).—207

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the English Revolution, Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland from 1653.—69

Cunibert, Bartélymy Sylvestre—physician of Prince Miloš Obrenović of Serbia (up to 1839); author of a history of Serbia.—62

David d'Angers, Pierre Jean (1788-1856)—French sculptor, republican; banished from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—135

Delangle, Claude Alphonse (1797-1869)—French lawyer and politician; Attorney-General from 1847 till the February revolution of 1848; First President of the Imperial Court (1852-58); Minister of the Interior (1858-59).—473

Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, Earl of (1799-1869)—British statesman, Tory leader; Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68).—204, 207, 210-11, 214, 217, 222, 248, 425-26, 468-70, 511, 516, 548, 585-87, 597

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and writer, a Tory leader; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68); Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).—200-01, 205-06, 214-16, 227, 247, 250, 309-13, 332-33, 469-70, 510-12, 514, 566

D’Israeli, Isaac (1766-1848)—British writer, Benjamin Disraeli’s father.—469

Dodd, George (1808-1881)—English author, wrote a number of articles, mostly on industrial questions, for various reference books.—266

Dolgor(o)uki, Vasily Lukich, Prince (c. 1670-1739)—Russian diplomat, ambassador to Denmark (1707-20), member of the Supreme Privy Council (1728-30); exiled to Solovetsky Monastery in 1730 and executed in 1739.—44

Dost Mohammed Khan (1793-1863)—Afghan Emir (1826-39, 1842-63).—180

Dowbiggin—British army officer, fought in the Crimean war, Lord Panmure’s nephew.—469

Dulce y Garay, Domingo, marqués de Castellflorite (1808-1869)—Spanish
general, close to the Moderado Party; headed an uprising in Madrid in 1854 which sparked off the revolution of 1854-56; in 1856 suppressed revolutionary struggle of the masses.—103, 105

Dundas, Sir James Whitley Deans (1785-1862)—British admiral, commander-in-chief of the British fleet in the Mediterranean from 1852 to January 1855.—34

Dundas, Richard Saunders (1802-1861)—British vice-admiral, commander-in-chief of the British fleet in the Baltic (1855).—94

Dupont, Emile (b. 1821)—French public figure; editor of a number of journals, including La Voix du Pros-crit.—467

Dureau de la Malle, Adolphe Jules César Auguste (1777-1857)—French philologist and archaeologist.—485

E

Elena Ivanovna (1476-1513)—daughter of Ivan III, Grand Duke of Moscow; in 1495 was married to Alexander Jagiello, Grand Duke of Lithuania.—86

Eleonore—daughter of Albert Frederick, Duke of Prussia; wife (from 1603) of Joachim-Friedrich, Elector of Brandenburg.—156

Elgin, James Bruce, Earl of Elgin and Kinkardine (1811-1863)—British statesman and diplomat, plenipotentiary extraordinary to China (1857-58, 1860-61), Viceroy and Governor-General of India (1862-63).—300

Elio, Francisco Javier (1767-1822)—Spanish general, fought in the war of independence (1808-14); helped to establish the absolute power of Ferdinand VII in 1814; was executed during the revolution of 1820-23 for organising a counter-revolutionary coup.—630

Ellenborough, Edward Law, Baron (1750-1818)—British statesman and lawyer, Whig, later Tory; member of the House of Lords; Lord Chief Justice of the King’s Bench (1802-18).—497

Ellenborough, Edward Law, Earl of (1790-1871)—British statesman, Tory, member of the House of Lords; Governor-General of India (1842-44), First Lord of the Admiralty (1846), President of the Board of Control for India (1858); son of Baron Ellenborough.—321, 469, 531, 534, 549, 587, 588

Elliot, William—British politician, M. P. (1802).—491

Ellis, Sir Henry (1777-1855)—British diplomat, envoy (1814-15), then ambassador to Teheran (1835-36).—179

Elphinstone, John, Baron (1807-1860)—English official in India, Governor of Madras (1837-42) and Bombay (1853-59).—376

Émeriau, Maurice Julien, comte (1762-1845)—French vice-admiral, commanded the Mediterranean squadron (1811-14).—147

Enfantin, Barthelemy Prosper (nicknamed Père Enfantin) (1796-1864)—French utopian socialist, a disciple of Saint-Simon, after his death headed the Saint-Simonian school.—15

Eric XIV (1533-1577)—King of Sweden (1560-68).—63

Escosura y Morrogh, Patricio de la (1807-1878)—Spanish writer and statesman, Minister of the Interior in the Espartero Cabinet (1856).—100

Espartero, Baldomero, duque de la Victoria (1793-1879)—Spanish general and politician, leader of the Progressista Party, Regent of Spain (1841-43), head of government (1854-56).—98-104, 108, 284, 285, 287-88, 622
Espiga, Don José—Archbishop of Seville (1820).—623, 628

Espinasse, Charles Marie Esprit (1815-1859)—French general, Bonapartist, took an active part in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; headed an expeditionary force in Dobrudja (1854); participated in the Crimean war in 1855; Minister of the Interior and Public Safety (1858).—464, 476, 480, 482, 488, 500, 550

Espoz y Mina, Francisco (1781-1836)—Spanish general, a guerrilla leader during the war of independence (1808-14); active participant in the revolution of 1820-23, fought against the Carlists in 1833-36.—626

Essiéd-Mohammed Salihdar—Turkish statesman, Grand Vizier in 1736.—27, 39

Este, Maximilian Joseph Johann Ambros Karl (1782-1863)—Archduke of Austria, Master of the Ordnance, inventor of a defence tower named after him.—149

Etheridge (d. 1857)—British admiral, commanded the British fleet in the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57; committed suicide.—294

Eugène, Prince of Savoy (François Eugène de Savoie-Carignan) (1663-1736)—Austrian general and statesman.—167

Eugénie Marie Ignace Augustine de Montijo de Guzmán, comtesse de Teba (1826-1920)—French Empress, wife of Napoleon III.—455, 457

Evans, Sir George de Lacy (1787-1870)—British general, Liberal politician, M.P.; commanded a division in the Crimea in 1854.—327, 331, 332, 483, 590

Falcon, Antonio—Spanish general, took part in the Spanish revolution of 1854-56.—98, 103

Fallmerayer, Jakob Philipp (1790-1861)—German historian and traveller.—75

Fath Ali (Feth Ali; Futtch Ali) (1762-1834)—Shah of Persia (1797-1834).—178

Favre, Jules Gabriel Claude (1809-1880)—French lawyer and politician; a leader of the republican bourgeois opposition from the late 1850s; Orsini's counsel for the defence (1858).—473-74, 477

Fawhener, Sir Everard (1684-1758)—English merchant and diplomat, ambassador to Turkey (1735-42).—27

Feliú, Ramón—Spanish statesman, Minister of the Interior (1821).—627

Ferdinand II (1578-1637)—Holy Roman Emperor (1619-37).—94

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59), nicknamed King Bomba for the bombardment of Messina in 1848.—5

Ferdinand VII (1784-1833)—King of Spain (1808 and 1814-33).—99, 106, 622-24, 626-27

Ferdinand—see Frederick Ferdinand.

Feroukh (Ferrukh) Khan—Persian diplomat who signed the Anglo-Persian treaty of 1857; envoy to Paris (1857).—293, 295, 296, 331

Finnis, Thomas Quested—Lord Mayor of London in 1856-57.—232

Fitzroy, Henry (1807-1859)—British politician, Peelite, Under-Secretary for Home Affairs (1852-55).—600

Floridablanca (Florida Blanca), José Moñino, conde de (1728-1808)—Spanish statesman and diplomat, champion of enlightened absolutism; Prime Minister (1777-92); President of the Central Junta (1808); tried to prevent the development of revolution in Spain in 1808.—32
Fotiades—chargé d'affaires of the Moldavian Government in Constantinople in 1857.—324

Fould, Achille (1800-1867)—French banker and politician, Orleanist, later Bonapartist; several times held the post of Minister of Finance and other governmental posts (1849-67).—272, 457, 466

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—21

Fox, Charles James (1749-1806)—English politician, Whig leader, Foreign Secretary (1782, 1783, 1806).—30, 34, 35

Fox, William Johnson (1786-1864)—British politician, journalist, Free Trader, M.P.—238

Franchini, Viktor Antonovich (1820-1892)—Russian army officer, later general, fought in the Crimean war of 1853-56 and later served in the Caucasus.—542-43

Francis I (1768-1835)—Emperor of Austria (1804-35), last Holy Roman Emperor under the name of Francis II (1792-1806).—75

Francis II—see Francis I

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—182, 323

Franks, Sir Thomas Harte (1808-1862)—British general, took part in the second Anglo-Sikh war (1848-49) and in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—505-07, 509

Frederick I (1657-1713)—Elector of Brandenburg as Frederick III (from 1688), King of Prussia (1701-13).—152, 156

Frederick II (1413-1471)—Elector of Brandenburg (1440-70).—155

Frederick II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—28-29, 31-32, 35, 154, 167

Frederick III (1609-1670)—King of Denmark (1648-70).—70

Frederick IV (1671-1730)—King of Denmark and Norway (1699-1730).—42, 44-45, 48-50, 54, 66, 71

Frederick VII (1808-1863)—King of Denmark (1848-63).—334

Frederick Augustus I—see August(us) II (the Strong)

Frederick Ferdinand (1792-1863)—Prince of Denmark.—334-35

Frederick William I (1688-1740)—King of Prussia (1713-40).—50, 53

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—151, 152, 174, 182, 568

Gabel, Christian Carl (1679-1748)—Danish vice-admiral, took part in the Northern War.—44

Garnett, Jeremiah (1793-1870)—English journalist, one of the founders of The Manchester Guardian and its editor from 1844 to 1861.—240, 589

Garnier-Pagès, Étienne Joseph Louis (1801-1841)—French politician, headed the republican opposition after the 1830 revolution; member of the Chamber of Deputies (1831-34, 1835-41).—310

Garnier-Pagès, Louis Antoine (1803-1878)—French politician, moderate republican, in 1848 member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris; brother of the above.—310

Genghis Khan—see Jenghiz Khan

George I (1660-1727)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27), Elector of Hanover (1698-1727).—41, 45, 53, 95, 187, 188

George II (1683-1760)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1727-60), Elector of Hanover.—27, 39
George III (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820), Elector and from 1815 King of Hanover.—30, 33, 492-94

Georg Ludwig—see George I

George William (Georg Wilhelm) (1595-1640)—Elector of Brandenburg (1619-40).—156

Gibbon, Edward (1737-1794)—British historian.—310

Gibson, Thomas Milner (1806-1884)—British statesman, Free Trader and later Liberal, President of the Board of Trade (1859-65, 1865-66).—229, 238-40, 470

Girardin, Émile de (1806-1881)—French journalist and politician; editor of La Presse in the 1830s-1860s (with intervals); during the 1848-49 revolution moderate republican, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51); later Bonapartist; notorious for his lack of principles in politics.—131

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite, leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the 19th century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55, 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—61, 200-01, 204-07, 216-17, 227, 249-50, 511, 575, 588

Glyn, George Grenfell, Baron Wolverton (from 1869) (1824-1887)—English banker, Liberal M.P.—512

Goedel Lannoy, Oscar, baron de—Austrian consul in Moldavia.—325-26

Golitsin, Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince (1718-1783)—Russian diplomat, ambassador to London (1755-62), Vice-Chancellor (1762-75).—28

Gorchakov (Gorchakov), Mikhail Dmitrievich, Prince (1793-1861)—Russian general, commanded the Russian troops on the Danube (1853-54), commander-in-chief of the Southern army (September 1854-February 1855) and of the army in the Crimea (February-December 1855); Governor-General of the Kingdom of Poland (1856-61).—263

Göttz, Georg Heinrich, Baron von Schliitz (1668-1719)—Swedish statesman, Minister of Finance and Minister of State Affairs from 1715. —43, 61

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861)—British statesman, Whig, later Peelite; Home Secretary (1841-46), First Lord of the Admiralty (1830-34, 1852-55).—216-17, 227-29, 249

Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe (1806-1880)—French journalist; Orleanist prior to the 1848 revolution, later Bonapartist; deputy to the Corps législatif (1852-70); contributed to Le Constitutionnel.—467, 488

Grant, Sir James Hope (1808-1875)—British general, fought in the First Opium War with China in 1840-42 and in the Anglo-Sikh wars (1845-46, 1848-49); took part in suppressing the Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59.—452, 505, 507-08, 581, 607

Grantham, Thomas Robinson, Baron (1738-1786)—British statesman and diplomat, Whig; Foreign Secretary (1782-83).—31, 34-35, 39

Granville, George Leveson-Gower, Earl of (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig, later Liberal; Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74, 1880-85), President of the Council (1852-54, 1855-58, 1859-65).—217, 308

The Great Mogul—see Bahadur Shah II

Great Moguls—dynasty of Indian rulers (1526-1858).—176, 305, 328, 346, 362, 365

Grenville, William Wyndham, Baron (1759-1834)—British statesman,
Tory, later Whig, Foreign Secretary (1791-1801), Prime Minister (1806-07).—491, 495

Grey, Charles, Earl of, Viscount Howick, Baron Grey (1764-1845)—British statesman, a Whig leader, Prime Minister (1830-34).—468, 566

Grey, Sir Henry George, Viscount Howick, Earl of (1802-1894)—British statesman, Whig; Secretary at War (1835-39) and Secretary of State for the Colonies (1846-52); son of Charles Grey.—211, 217, 566, 571, 573

Gross, Henrich (d. 1765)—Russian diplomat, Minister Plenipotentiary in France (1744-48) and in Prussia (1749-50), envoy to Poland (1752-59) and England (1763-65).—28, 30, 39

Grotius, Hugo (Huig de Groot) (1583-1645)—Dutch scientist, jurist, a founder of the natural law theory.—295

Guise, Duke—see Henry II of Lorraine

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; virtually directed France's foreign and home policy from 1840 to the February 1848 revolution.—15, 467, 478, 488

Gurrea, Ignacio—Spanish general, member of the Progresista Party.—101

Gustavus II Adolphus (1594-1632)—King of Sweden (1611-32) and general.—95, 156

Gyllenborg, Carl, Count (1679-1746)—Swedish statesman and diplomat, envoy to London (1715-17), Secretary of State (from 1718) and Prime Minister (1739-46).—43, 50, 54, 61

Hauff, Wilhelm (1802-1827)—German poet and novelist.—589

Haus(s)mann, Georges Eugène, baron (1809-1891)—French politician, Bonapartist; took part in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Prefect of the Seine (1853-70).—502

Havelock, Sir Henry (1795-1857)—British general; took part in several colonial wars; in 1857 took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising in India.—347, 361-62, 365, 367, 372, 393, 420, 423, 558, 583

Hawkesbury, Robert Banks Jenkinson, Earl of Liverpool (1770-1828)—British statesman, Tory, Foreign Secretary (1801-03, 1809), Home Secretary (1804-06, 1807-09) and Prime Minister (1812-27).—492-93, 495

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—101

Henry II of Lorraine, Duke of Guise (1614-1664)—one of the Fronde leaders.—14
Henry V—see Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de

Herbert, Sidney, Baron of Lea (1810-1861)—British statesman, at first Tory and later Peelite, Secretary at War (1845-46, 1852-55), Secretary for War (1859-60); nephew of Prince Vorontsov.—216, 249

Hervey, Alfred—British politician, Peelite, M.P.—249

Hesiod (c. 8th cent. B.C.)—Greek poet.—209

Hewitt—British general; commanded the garrison in Meerut in 1857, during the national liberation uprising in India.—300, 366

Hien Fung (Hsien Fung) (c. 1831-1861)—Emperor of China (1850-61).—163, 283

Hodges, George Lloyd (1792-1862)—British colonel and diplomat, Consul-General in Serbia (1837-39), then in Egypt (1839-40); Palmerston’s protégé.—62

Hogg, Sir James Weir (1790-1876)—British politician, Peelite, M.P.; President of the Court of Directors of the East India Company (1846-47, 1852-53); member of the Indian Council (1858-72).—232, 249

Hohenzollerns—dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918).—151, 152, 154-57

Holkar, Tukaji (born c. 1836)—Maharatta Duke of the Indore Principality; sided with the English during the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India.—364

Holmes, John (1808-1878)—British colonel, then general, took part in the first Anglo-Afghan war (1838-42) and in the suppression of the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India.—355, 608

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B.C.)—Roman poet.—55

Horner, Leonard (1785-1864)—English geologist and public figure; commissioner to inquire into employment of children in factories and chief inspector under Factories Act (1833-56), took the side of the workers.—253

Hotze, Friedrich, Baron von (1739-1799)—Austrian field marshal.—168

Hudson, George (1800-1871)—British capitalist, big railway owner, Tory M.P. (1845-59).—266

Hughes, Thomas Smart (1786-1847)—English writer and historian, author of works on religion and English history.—33

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; opposed Louis Bonaparte in 1848-51; emigrated after the coup d’état of December 2, 1851.—490

Hung Hsiu-ch’üan (1814-1864)—leader and ideologist of the Taiping rebellion in China (1851-64), head of the Taiping State.—283

Husayn Khan—Persian ambassador to England in 1838-39.—180

Hyenne—French army officer who wounded at a duel a journalist Henri de Pène (1858).—552

Ibrahim Karabatir, Prince—son of the Circassian prince Sepher Pasha, participant in the wars of the Caucasian mountaineers against Tsarist Russia.—542

Igor (Ingvar) (d. 945)—Grand Duke of Kiev (912-45).—75

Infante, Facundo (1786-1873)—Spanish general, member of the
Progresista Party, President of the Cortes (1854-56).—100

Inglis, Sir John Eardley Wilmot (1814-1862).—British general, took part in suppressing the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India.—436-39, 441

Isabella II (1830-1904).—Queen of Spain (1833-68); daughter of Ferdinand VII.—98, 100, 103, 106-07, 286-87, 629

Ismail I (Ismael, Ismail Shah) (1487-1524).—Shah of Persia (1502-24); founder of the Safavid dynasty (1502-1736).—177

Ismail Pasha (1805-1861).—Turkish general; Circassian by birth; fought in Circassia against Russia.—542, 545

Ivan I Danilovich Kalita (Ivan Moneybag) (d. 1340).—Prince of Moscow from 1325; Grand Duke of Vladimir (1328-40).—78-81, 86-87

Ivan III (1440-1505).—Grand Duke of Moscow (1462-1505).—78, 80-87, 92

Jacob, Sir George Le Grand (1805-1881).—British colonel, later general; in 1857 took part in the Anglo-Persian war and in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—331

James I (1566-1625).—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1603-25).—94

James II (1633-1701).—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1685-88).—492

James, Edwin John (1812-1882).—English lawyer, M.P.; counsel for the defence at Simon Bernard's trial in April 1858.—516

Jenghiz Khan (1162-1227).—Mongol Khan and general, founder of the Mongol Empire.—77, 87, 557

Jérôme—see Bonaparte, Jérôme

Jérôme-Napoleon — see Bonaparte, Jérôme

Joachim I Nestor (1484-1535).—Elector of Brandenburg (1499-1535).—154, 155

Joachim II Hector (1505-1571).—Elector of Brandenburg (1535-71).—154, 156

Joachim-Friedrich (1546-1608).—Elector of Brandenburg (1598-1608).—156

Johann ("Hans") Sigismund (1572-1619).—Elector of Brandenburg (1608-19).—156

John I Tzimisces (c. 925-976).—Byzantine Emperor (969-976).—76

John III (1537-1592).—King of Sweden (1568-92).—63

John (Johann) Cicero (1455-1499).—Elector of Brandenburg (1486-99).—154

Jones, Sir John (1811-1878).—British general, took part in suppressing the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India.—581

Joseph II (1741-1790).—co-regent of his mother Maria Theresa (1765-80), ruler of the Austrian monarchy (1780-90), Holy Roman Emperor (1765-90).—34

Jung Bahadur (1816-1877).—ruler of the Nepal from 1846; sided with the English during the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India and took part in its suppression.—307, 362, 506

Kaunitz-Rietburg, Wenzel Anton, Prince von (1711-1794).—Austrian statesman and diplomat, supporter of an "enlightened" form of absolutism; bitter enemy of the French Revolution; Chancellor of State (1753-92).—35
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Kern, Johann Conrad (1808-1888)—Swiss liberal politician, lawyer and diplomat; envoy to Paris (1857-83).—480

King, Peter John Locke (1811-1885)—British politician, Radical, M.P.—567

Kinkel, Johann Gottfried (1815-1882)—German poet and democratic journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; sentenced to life imprisonment by Prussian court; in 1850 he escaped and emigrated to England; a leader of the petty-bourgeois refugees in London; an editor of the Hermann (1859); opposed Marx and Engels.—589

Kiselev (Kisseleff), Pavel Dmitrievich, Count (1788-1872)—Russian statesman and diplomat, general; fought in the patriotic war against Napoleon in 1812; head of Russian administration in Moldavia and Wallachia (1829-34); Minister of the Imperial Domains (1837-56); ambassador to Paris (1856-62).—191

Kmety, György (Ismail Pasha) (1810-1865)—Turkish general of Magyar descent; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; during the Crimean war commander of the Turkish forces on the Danube (1853-54) and in the Caucasus (1854-55).—447

Koch, Christophe Guillaume de (1737-1813)—French politician and lawyer; professor at Strasbourg University; wrote works on the history of Europe.—29

Korsakov—see Rimsky-Korsakov, Alexander Mikhailovich

Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement; head of the revolutionary government (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey, later to England and the USA; sought for support in the Bonapartist circles in the 1850s.—236, 541, 543

Kower (Kooer) Singh (d. 1858)—a leader of the insurgents in Oudh during the 1857-59 national liberation uprising in India.—376

Laboucheere, Henry, Baron Taunton (1798-1869)—British statesman, Whig; President of the Board of Trade (1839-41, 1847-52); Secretary of State for the Colonies (1855-58).—221

Lacy, Evans—see Evans, Sir George de Lacy

Lacy, Francisco Antonio, conde de (1731-1792)—Spanish general and diplomat; envoy to Sweden and Russia (1780s).—31

Lagarde, Augustin Marie Balthazar Charles Pelletier, comte de (b. 1780)—French general and diplomat, ambassador to Madrid (1820-23).—629

La Guéronnière, Louis Étienne Arthur Dubreuil Hélion, vicomte de (1816-1875)—French writer and politician, Bonapartist in the 1850s.—472

Łapiński, Teofil (1827-1886)—Polish colonel; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary, served in the Turkish army under the name of Tewfik Bey; fought against Russia in Circassia (1857-58).—540-41, 543-44

Lawrence, French (1757-1809)—English lawyer, M.P. from 1796.—494

Law, John (1671-1729)—Scottish economist and financier, Minister of Finance in France (1719-20).—15, 20, 24, 358

Lawrence, John Laird Mair, Baron Lawrence (1811-1879)—high official of the British colonial administration, Chief Commissioner of the
Punjab (1853-57); Viceroy of India (1864-69).—354, 370, 372, 506, 609

Lawrence, Sir George Saint Patrick (1804-1884)—British general; took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India; resident in Rajputana (1857-64).—377

Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery (1806-1857)—British general, resident in the Nepal (1843-46); head of the British administration in the Punjab (1849-53); Chief Commissioner of Oudh (1857); commanded British troops in Lucknow during the suppression of the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—299, 316, 347, 367, 437-38

Lecourbe, Claude Joseph, comte (1759-1815)—French general; took part in the wars of the French Republic against European coalitions and in Napoleon I's campaigns.—169

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French writer and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats; editor of La Réforme; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government (February-May 1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (headed the Montagne party); emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849.—17

Leeds—see Osborne, Sir Thomas, Earl of Danby

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; took part in the 1830-31 Polish insurrection; a leader of the democratic wing of Polish emigrants.—486

Leopold I (1640-1705)—Holy Roman Emperor (1658-1705).—157

Lersundi y Ormaechea, Francisco de (1817-1874)—Spanish general and statesman, member of the Moderate Party; War Minister (1851); Minister-President and War Minister (1853).—286

Lewis, Sir George Cornewall (1806-1863)—British statesman, Whig; Secretary to the Treasury (1850-52); editor and publisher of the journal Edinburgh Review (1852-55); Chancellor of the Exchequer (1855-58); Home Secretary (1859-61).—61, 200-01, 203-05, 469, 510-12

Liebig, Justus, Baron von (1803-1873)—German chemist.—281

Lieven, Khristofor Andreyevich, Prince (1774-1839)—Russian diplomat, envoy to Berlin (1810-12), ambassador to London (1812-34).—192, 193

Lister, Samuel Cunliffe, Baron Masham (1815-1906)—English manufacturer and inventor.—260

Locke King—see King, Peter John Locke

Longuevilles—the family of French dukes (1505-1672).—152

Longueville, Charles Paris d’Orléans, duc de (1649-1672)—last representative of the Longuevilles.—152

Longworth—British consul in Anapa in the 1850s.—542

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—116, 488, 492

Louis XV (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-1774).—33, 186

Louis XVIII (Louis de Désiré) (1755-1824)—King of France (1814-15 and 1815-24).—99, 463, 629

Louis Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Louis Napoleon—see Napoleon III


Louisa Ulrica (Lovisa Ulrika) (1720-1782)—wife of Adolphus Frederick, King of Sweden (1751-71);
sister of Frederick II of Prussia.—
29

Lowe, Robert, Viscount Sherbrooke (1811-1892)—British statesman and journalist, contributed to *The Times*, Whig, and later Liberal; Vice-President of the Board of Trade (1855-58).—221, 238-39

Lucan (Marcus Annaeus Lucanus) (A.D. 39-65)—Roman poet.—146

Lucena, Count of—see O'Donnell y Jorris, Leopoldo

Lugard, Sir Edward (1810-1898)—
English general, chief-of-staff during the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57; took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—508, 581-82

Lushington, Charles Manners—British politician, Peelite, M.P. (1854-57).—249, 571

Luxembourgs—dynasty of Holy Roman Emperors (1308-1437, with intervals), also ruled in Bohemia (1310-1437) and Hungary (1387-1437).—154-55

Lyndhurst, John Singleton Copley, Baron of (1772-1863)—British statesman and lawyer, Tory; Lord Chancellor (1827-30, 1834-35, 1841-46).—207, 210-11

Lytton, Edward George Earle Lytton, Bulwer-Lytton (1803-1873)—British writer and politician, Whig; from 1852 Tory, M.P., Secretary for the Colonies (1858-59).—207, 216, 567, 596-600

Lytton, Edward Robert Bulwer, Earl of Lytton (Bulwer-Lytton) (1831-1891)—British diplomat and poet; Viceroy of India (1876-80); ambassador to Paris (1887-91); son of the above.—596-600

Lytton, Rosina Bulwer-Lytton (1802-1882)—English novelist; wife of Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer-Lytton.—596-600, 604.

M

Macartney, George, Earl Macartney (1737-1806)—British colonial official and diplomat, envoy extraordinary to St. Petersburg (1764-67).—28-30, 39

Macdonald, Jacques Étienne Joseph Alexandre, duc de Tarente (1765-1840)—Marshall of France, participant in Napoleon I's campaigns, in 1799 commander-in-chief of the French troops during the Italian and Swiss campaigns; after Napoleon's abdication entered the service of the Bourbons; from 1816 to 1830 held high posts at the Court.—169

MacGregor, John (1797-1857)—British statistician and historian, Free Trader; founder and one of the governors of the Royal British Bank (1849-56); M.P. from 1847.—110-11

Machiavelli, Niccolò (1469-1527)—
Italian politician, philosopher, historian and writer.—62, 80, 84

Mackenzie, George—British diplomat, ambassador in Russia (1710-15).—93, 94

MacMahon, Marie Edme Patrice Maurice, comte de, duc de Magenta (1808-1893)—French military figure and politician, Marshal of France, senator, Bonapartist; fought in the wars of the Second Empire; commanded a division in the Crimea (1855); a butcher of the Paris Commune (1871); President of the Third Republic (1873-79).—476, 483

McNeill, Sir John (1795-1883)—
British diplomat, envoy to Teheran (1836-39, 1841-42).—179, 180

Madoz, Pascual (1806-1870)—Spanish politician and writer, member of the Progresista Party, President of the Cortes (1854), Minister of Finance (1855); took part in the
Spanish revolution of 1854-56.—100

Magnan, Bernard Pierre (1791-1865)—Marshal of France, Bonapartist, an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—465

Magne, Pierre (1806-1879)—French statesman, Bonapartist, Minister of Finance (1855-60, 1867-69, 1870, 1873-74).—119, 122, 500

Mahmud II (1785-1839)—Sultan of Turkey (1808-39).—99

Mahmud (Mir Mahmoud) (1699-1725)—Shah of Persia (1722-25).—177

Mahon, Philip Henry Stanhope, Viscount (1805-1875)—British politician and historian, Peelite, M.P.—36, 57, 60

Malakoff, Duke of—see PéliSSier, Aima-Ble Jean Jacques

Malmesbury, James Harris, Earl of and Viscount Fitzharris (1746-1820)—British diplomat and statesman, Whig; envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia (1777-82) and Holland (1784-89).—31-36, 39

Malmesbury, James Howard Harris, Earl of (1807-1889)—British statesman, Tory, Foreign Secretary (1852, 1858-59).—217, 470, 571-73

María Cristina, senior (1806-1878)—wife of King Ferdinand VII of Spain, regent of Spain (1833-40); after Ferdinand VII's death secretly married Agustín Fernando Muñoz.—98-99, 106-07, 171, 284

Marie Antoinette (1755-1793)—Queen of France (1774-93), wife of Louis XVI; executed during the French Revolution.—186

Marie d'Orléans-Longueville, duchesse de Nemours (1625-1707)—daughter of Henry II of Orléans, Duke of Longueville.—152


Martínez de la Rosa Berdejo Gómez y Arroyo, Francisco de Paula (1787-1862)—Spanish writer and politician, a leader of the Moderados, head of government (1834-35).—625, 629

Martínez Rodríguez—Spanish general, took part in the defence of Badajoz during the war of independence (1808-14).—624

Martínez Sán Martin, Don José—Spanish general.—628

Mason, George Henry Monck (1825-1857)—English army officer, resident in Jodhpore; killed in the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—377

Masséna, André, duc de Rivoli, prince d'Essling (1756-1817)—Marshal of France; fought in the Napoleonic wars, in 1814 went over to the side of the Bourbons.—168, 177

Mathilde (Bonaparte, Mathilde-Laetitia-Wilhelmine), princess of Bonaparte (1820-1904)—daughter of Jérôme Bonaparte and Napoleon III's cousin.—474

Ma(th)ias Corvinus (Matthias I, Hunyadi) (1443-1490)—King of Hungary (1458-90).—85

Maun (Man) Singh—big feudal landowner in the Kingdom of Oudh; an ally of the British during the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—607, 609

Maun (Man) Singh—Indian Rajah, in August 1858 joined the insurgents but at the beginning of 1859 abandoned them by betraying their leader Tantia Tope.—609

Maximilian I (1459-1519)—Holy Roman Emperor (1493-1519).—85

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, leader of the national liberation movement; in 1849 head of the Provisional Gov-
ernment of the Roman Republic; in the early 1850s sought for support among the Bonapartists but later opposed them.—115, 485, 486, 488

Mehemed Bey—see Bangya, János

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848)—British statesman, Whig, Home Secretary (1830-34), Prime Minister (1834, 1835-41).—468, 597

Menchikoff (Menshikov), Alexander Sergeyevich, Prince (1787-1869)—Russian general and statesman; ambassador extraordinary in Constantinople (February-May 1853); commander-in-chief of the Russian army and navy in the Crimea (1853-February 1855).—322, 483

Mengli-Ghirai (Menghi-Ghirei) (d. 1515)—Criman Khan (1468-1515).—82, 85, 86

Mercy, de—French army officer; court-martialled and sentenced to death for the sadistic murder of an officer in his regiment in 1858.—552

Merry, Anthony—British diplomat, envoy to Paris (1802).—491, 492, 495

Miall, Edward (1809-1881)—English writer and politician, radical, M.P. (1852-57, 1869-74).—238

Michelet, Jules (1798-1874)—French historian.—488

Mieczkowski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement; took part in the 1830-31 Polish insurrection and in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; later headed the moderate wing of the Polish democratic émigrés; sought for support among the Bonapartists in the 1850s.—62

Mikhail Borisovich (1453-c. 1505)—Grand Duke of Tver (1461-85).—85

Millaud, Moïse (1813-1871)—French banker, founded a number of newspapers and banks.—502

Milner Gibson—see Gibson, Thomas Milner

Milos (Milosh) Obrenović I (1780-1860)—Prince of Serbia (1815-59, 1858-60), founder of the Obrenović dynasty.—62

Mina—see Espoz y Mina, Francisco

Minié, Claude Étienne (1804-1879)—French officer, inventor of a new type of rifle.—450

Minto, Sir Gilbert Elliot, Earl of (1751-1814)—British statesman, Whig, envoy to Vienna (1799-1801), Governor-General of India (1807-13).—495

Mireș, Jules Isaac (1809-1871)—French banker, owner of a number of newspapers, Le Constitutionnel among them.—467

Moguls—see Great Moguls

Mohammed Ali Shah—King of Oudh (1837-42).—536-38

Mohammed-Amin—Naib in the western part of the North Caucasus (the Abadzeh tribe) (1848-59); led the mountaineers' struggle against Tsarist Russia.—543

Mohammed Shah (1810-1848)—Shah of Persia (1834-48).—178-80

Molière (real name Jean Baptiste Poquelin) (1622-1673)—French playwright.—356

Mon, Alejandro (1801-1882)—Spanish politician, liberal; Minister of Finance (1837, 1844-46, 1849), deputy to the Cortes (1836-75).—286

Moncreiff, James, Baron Moncreiff (from 1874), Baron of Tullibole (from 1883) (1811-1895)—British lawyer, M.P., Lord Advocate for Scotland (1851-52, 1852-58, 1859-66, 1868-69).—216
Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de (1810-1870)—French politician and journalist, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1849-51), Orleanist, Catholic leader; supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, but later joined the opposition.—19, 20

Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondât, baron de La Brède et de (1689-1755)—French sociologist, economist and writer of the Enlightenment.—310, 485

Montijo—see Eugénie Marie Ignace Augustine de Montijo de Guzmán, comtesse de Teba

Montluc—see Cramail, Adrien de Montluçon

Montmorency-Laval, Mathieu Félicité, duc de (1767-1826)—French politician and diplomat.—629

Morillo, Pablo, conde de Cartagena y marqués de la Puerta (1778-1837)—Spanish general, took part in the liberation war against Napoleonic France (1808-14), commanded troops fighting against the national liberation movement of the Spanish colonies in South America (1815-20), opponent of the 1820-23 revolution in Spain.—627

Morny, Charles Auguste Louis Joseph, duc de (1811-1865)—French politician, Bonapartist; an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (December 1851-January 1852); President of the Corps législatif (1854-56, 1857-65); ambassador to Russia (1856-57); step-brother of Napoleon III.—15, 21, 272, 457, 470, 479

Morris, James—governor of the Bank of England (1847).—382

Mourant, Ph.—French émigré on the Jersey, printer.—496

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)—Austrian composer.—356

Mulgrave, Sir George Augustus Constantine Phipps, Marquis of Normanby, Earl of (1819-1890)—British statesman, Whig M.P., Treasurer of the Household (1853-58), later governor of a number of British colonies.—221

Mungul Pandy—soldier of the 34th Sepoy regiment.—298

Muñoz Benavente, José (Pucheta) (1820-1856)—Spanish toreador; took an active part in the revolution of 1854-56, a leader of Madrid revolutionary people; was killed on the barricades.—100, 105

Muñoz, madame—see María Cristina Murat, Joachim (1767-1815)—Marshal of France, took part in Napoleon I's campaigns; commander of the French troops in Spain (1808); King of Naples (1808-15).—106

Murray, Sir Charles Augustus (1806-1895)—British diplomat, consul-general in Egypt (1846-53), envoy to Teheran (1854-59).—296, 331

Musurus Pasha, Kostaki (Constantin) (1807-1891)—Turkish diplomat, envoy and, later, ambassador to London (1851-85); Greek by birth.—324, 325

N

Nadir Shah (Khuli-Khan) (1688-1747)—Shah of Persia (1736-47); invaded India in 1738-39.—177

Nana (Nena) Sahib (born c. 1825)—Indian feudal lord; adopted son of the last peshwa of the Mahrattas, Baji Rao II; a leader of the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—347, 372, 554

Napier, Sir Charles (1786-1860)—British admiral, commanded the British naval forces in the Baltic (1854); M.P.—94

Napier, Sir Charles James (1782-1853)—British general, took part in
the Peninsular war (1808-14), in 1842-43 commanded the British troops in India that captured Sind: governor of Sind (1843-47).—198, 315, 328, 420, 447


Napoleon, Prince—see Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul

Narváez, Ramón Maria, duque de Valencia (1800-1868)—Spanish general and statesman, leader of the Moderado Party; head of government (1844-46, 1847-51, 1856-57, 1864-65, 1866-68).—98-100, 284-88

Nasmyth, James (1808-1890)—British engineer and inventor.—259

Nasr-ed-Din (1831-1896)—Shah of Persia (1848-96).—177, 197, 295, 296, 307

Nazar—envoy of the Novgorod Republic in 1477.—83

Nasir-ed-Din (d. 1837)—King of Oudh (1827-37).—536

Necker, Jacques (1732-1804)—French banker and politician, several times Director-General of Finance in the 1770s and 1780s; attempted to carry out reforms.—186

Neill, James George Smith (1810-1857)—British general, fought in the Crimean war; during the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India acted with great severity in Cawnpore.—372

Nemours, Duchess of—see Marie d'Orléans-Longueville

Nesselrode, Karl Vasilyevich, Count (1780-1862)—Russian statesman and diplomat, Minister for Foreign Affairs (1816-56), State Chancellor (from 1845).—193

Newcastle, Henry Pelham Fiennes Pelham Clinton, Duke of (1811-1864)—British statesman, Peelite, Secretary for War and the Colonies (1852-54), Secretary for War (1854-55) and Secretary for the Colonies (1859-64).—217

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—178, 187, 264, 466, 533

Nicholson, John (1821-1857)—British general, in 1842 took part in the first Anglo-Afghan war, fought in the second Anglo-Sikh war (1848-49); in 1857, during the national liberation uprising in India, commanded an English unit in the attack on Delhi.—365, 370, 374

Nocedal, Cándido (1821-1885)—Spanish politician and journalist; member of the Moderado Party; deputy to the Cortes; Minister of the Interior (1856-57).—284

Nolan, Lewis Edward (c. 1820-1854)—British army officer, served in India, took part in the Crimean war, wrote several books on the cavalry.—279

Norris, Sir John (c. 1660-1749)—British admiral, in 1709-21 commander of the squadron in the Baltic sent to help Sweden against Russia.—45, 50, 54, 66, 70, 93

North, Frederick, Earl of Guilford (1732-1792)—British statesman,
Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1767), Prime Minister (1770-82); Home Secretary (1783).—30, 32-35

Northcote, Sir Stafford Henry, Earl Idesleigh, Viscount St. Cyres (1818-1887)—British statesman, Peelite, later joined the Conservatives, M.P. (1855-57, 1858-85); held a number of ministerial posts.—249

Norton, Caroline Elizabeth Sarah (1808-1877)—English poetess.—597

Norton, George Chappie (c. 1800-1875)—English barrister-at-law, husband of Caroline Norton.—597

O'Donnell, Enrique José, conde de la Bisbal (1769-1834)—Spanish general, took part in the war of independence (1808-14); during the period of reaction (1814-20) maintained contacts with the liberals and betrayed revolutionaries to the government.—99

O'Donnell y Jorris, Leopoldo, conde de Lucena y duque de Tetuán (1809-1867)—Spanish general and politician, a leader of the Moderado Party; Captain-General of Cuba (1843-48); in 1854 used the revolutionary crisis in the country to establish military dictatorship; as War Minister directed the suppression of the 1854-56 revolution; head of government (1856, 1858-63, 1865-66); nephew of the above.—97-102, 104-05, 107-08, 284-88, 573

Oleg (d. 912)—Prince of Kievan Rus.—75, 76

Omer Pasha (Michael Lattas) (1806-1871)—Turkish general; Croat by birth; commander-in-chief of the Turkish troops on the Danube (1853-54), in the Crimea (1855) and in the Caucasus (1855-56).—193

Orléans—royal dynasty in France (1830-48).—479, 531, 533, 551

Orléans, Duke of—see Louis Philippe. I

Orléans, Philip II, duc d' (1674-1723)—Regent of France (1715-23).—24, 359, 488

Orloff (Orlov), Alexei Fyodorovich, Prince (1786-1861)—Russian military figure and statesman, diplomat; headed Russian delegation at the Paris Congress in 1856; President of the State Council and the Committee of Ministers (from 1856); President of the Secret (from 1856) and of the Chief Peasant Question Committee (from 1858); opposed abolition of serfdom.—3

Orsini, Felice (1819-1858)—Italian democrat and republican; a prominent figure in the struggle for Italy's national liberation and unification; executed for his attempt on the life of Napoleon III.—468, 472-75, 477-78, 480

Osborne—see Bernal Osborne, Ralph

Osborne, Sir Thomas, Earl of Danby, Marquis of Carmarthen, Duke of Leeds (1631-1712)—British Tory statesman; Prime Minister (1674-79, 1690-95); in 1695 was accused of bribe-taking by Parliament.—187, 585

Oscar I (1799-1859)—King of Sweden and Norway (1844-59).—334

Osten, Adolph Siegfried, Count (1726-1797)—Danish diplomat, ambassador to St. Petersburg (1757-61, 1763-65).—28

Osterman, Andrei Ivanovich, Count (1686-1747)—Russian diplomat and statesman, Vice-Chancellor (1725-41), from 1731 virtually directed Russia's foreign and home policy; exiled after enthronement of Yelizaveta Petrovna in 1741.—27

Osterman, Ivan Andreyevich, Count (1725-1811)—Russian diplomat, ambassador extraordinary to Sweden (1759-74), Vice-Chancellor (1775-96), Chancellor (1796-97); son of the above.—29
Otto, Louis-Guillaume, comte de Mosloy (1754-1817) — French diplomat, envoy to London (1800-02), ambassador to Vienna (1809-13).— 491-95

Outram, Sir James (1803-1863) — British general, resident at Lucknow (1854-56), in 1857 commanded British troops in the Anglo-Persian war; Chief Commissioner of Oudh (1857-58); took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.— 372, 437, 442, 504, 505, 507, 508, 549

Overstone, Samuel Jones Loyd, Baron (from 1860) (1796-1883) — English banker, Whig, inspirer of Robert Peel’s financial policy and, in particular, of his English Bank Act of 1844.— 379, 407

Owen, W. D. — a director of the Royal British Bank (1849-54, 1855-56); condemned for fraud. — 111

Palmerston, Emily Mary (previously Countess Cowper) (c. 1787-1869) — wife of Henry John Temple Palmerston (from 1839).— 597, 599

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount (1784-1865) — British statesman; at first Tory, from 1830 Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51); Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65).— 3, 6, 34, 39, 62-63, 179, 186-88, 193, 200, 204, 211-23, 226, 238-40, 242, 247-50, 293-94, 309, 323, 325, 328-33, 382, 458, 468-70, 483, 510-11, 513, 517, 531, 536-37, 566, 571-72, 587, 590, 593, 595-97, 599

Panin, Nikita Ivanovich, Count (1718-1783) — Russian diplomat and statesman, envoy to Denmark (1747) and Sweden (1747-59), head of the Department for Foreign Affairs (1763-81).— 28-31, 39

Panmure, Fox Maule, Baron Panmure, Earl of Dalhousie (1801-1874) — British statesman, Whig, Secretary at War (1846-52), Secretary for War (1855-58).— 469

Parandur Singh — Rajah of Hindustan.— 376

Parkes, Sir Harry Smith (1828-1885) — British diplomat; as a consul in Canton provoked an Anglo-Chinese conflict which served as a prologue of the Second Opium War with China (1856-60); one of the three European control commissioners in Canton (1858-59, 1860-61), consul in Shanghai (1864-65), envoy to Japan (1865-83).— 158-60, 208, 222, 233-34

Paton, John Stafford (1821-1889) — British officer, later general; took part in the first and second Anglo-Sikh wars (1845-46 and 1848-49), and in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.— 370
Paul I (1754-1801)—Emperor of Russia (1796-1801).—37, 38

Paul, Sir John Dean (1802-1868)—British banker, bankrupted in June 1855; was sentenced to hard labour for financial machinations.—110

Peel, Sir Robert (1750-1830)—English cotton-spinning manufacturer, M.P., father of Sir Robert Peel.—469

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory, Home Secretary (1822-27, 1828-30), Prime Minister (1834-35, 1841-46); repealed the Corn Laws (1846).—200, 201, 202, 216, 248, 379, 381-83, 389, 468-69, 572

Pélegriñ, Ramon López—Spanish statesman, Minister of the Interior.—627

Pélissier, Aimable Jean Jacques, duc de Malakoff (1794-1864)—Marshal of France, took part in the conquest of Algeria in the 1830s-early 1850s; commander-in-chief of the French army in the Crimea (May 1855-July 1856); for taking Malakhov Mound was awarded the title of duc de Malakoff; ambassador to London (1858-59).—355, 457, 466, 476, 482-84, 515

Peltier, Jean Gabriel (1765-1825)—French royalist writer; after the August 10, 1792 revolution emigrated to London where he published various periodicals; was prosecuted for his sharp criticism of Napoleon I.—492-94, 496

Péne, Henri de (1830-1888)—French journalist, contributor to Le Figaro.—552

Perceval, Spencer (1762-1812)—British statesman, Tory, Attorney General (1802-06), Chancellor of the Exchequer (1807-09), Prime Minister (1809-12).—468, 491

Péreire, Isaac (1806-1880)—French banker, Bonapartist; deputy to the Corps législatif; in 1852, together with his brother Émile Péreire, founded the joint-stock bank Crédit Mobilier.—9, 12, 15-16, 20-23, 118, 270-77, 303, 359-60, 500

Péreire, Jacob Émile (1800-1875)—French banker, Bonapartist, deputy to the Corps législatif, in 1852, together with his brother Isaac Péreire, founded the joint-stock bank Crédit Mobilier.—9, 15, 21, 272, 276, 303, 304, 360, 500

Perovsky, Vasily Alexeyevich, Count (1795-1857)—Russian general, military governor of Orenburg (1833-42), Governor-General of Orenburg and Samara gubernias (1851-57); commanded a military expedition to Khiva (1839-40).—196

Persigny, Jean Gilbert Victor Fialin, comte (1808-1872)—French statesman, Bonapartist; an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (1852-54, 1860-63), ambassador to London (1855-58, 1859-60).—17-18, 457, 482

Peter (second half of the 13th cent.-1326)—Metropolitan of Russia (1308-26).—78

Peter I (the Great) (1672-1725)—Tsar of Russia (from 1682), Emperor of Russia (from 1721).—40-60, 64-65, 68-70, 75, 87-96, 157, 178, 324

Petit—substitute of the Paris Attorney General (1856).—137

Petty, Sir William, Marquis of Lansdowne and Earl of Shelburne (1737-1805)—British politician, Home Secretary and First Lord of the Treasury (1782-83).—33, 36

Philipp I (d. 1473)—Metropolitan of Moscow and Russia (1464-73); helped to create a centralised Russian state.—86

Philipson, Grigory Ivanovich (1809-1883)—Russian general, took part
in conquering the Caucasus.—539, 540, 544

Phillimore, John George (1808-1865)—British lawyer and politician, Liberal M.P. (1852-57).—249

Phillimore, Sir Robert Joseph (1810-1885)—British lawyer, Whig, then Peelite, M.P. (1852-57); brother of the above.—249

Pidal, Pedro José, marqués de (1800-1865) —Spanish politician, member of the Moderado Party, President of the Cortes (1843), Minister of the Interior (1844-48), Minister of Foreign Affairs (1848-51).—286, 288, 573

Pieri, Giuseppe Andrea (1808-1858)—Italian revolutionary, executed as an accomplice of Orsini in an attempt on Napoleon III’s life.—478

Piétri, Pierre Marie (1809-1864)—French politician, Bonapartist, prefect of the Paris police (1852-58).—455, 474

Pilate, Pontius (died c. A.D. 37)—Roman procurator of Judaea (26-36).—115

Pindar (c. 522-c. 442 B.C.)—Greek lyric poet; wrote ceremonial odes.—219

Pitt, L. K.—cousin of William Pitt “the Younger”; priest at the British merchant trading station in St. Petersburg in the 1790s.—36-38

Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham (“the Senior”) (1708-1778)—British statesman, Whig, Foreign Secretary and Secretary for War (1756-61), Prime Minister (1766-68).—29, 35, 188-89

Pitt, William (“the Younger”) (1759-1806)—British statesman, Tory, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1782-83), Prime Minister (1783-1801, 1804-06).—30, 36, 468, 470, 491, 513, 586

Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—3, 5

Place, Henri—French financier, a governor of the joint-stock bank Crédit Mobilier.—15, 358

Place, Victor—French consul in Moldavia in the 1850s.—324, 326

Pompey (Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus) (106-48 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman.—146

Popoff (Popov)—Russian consul in Moldavia in the 1850s.—324

Potemkin, Grigory Alexandrovich, Prince Taurichesky (1739-1791)—Russian statesman, field marshal-general (from 1784); directed the colonisation of the Southern territories incorporated into Russia.—31, 34

Potter, Sir John (d. 1858)—British liberal M.P., was elected Mayor of Manchester three times.—240

Pottinger, Sir Henry (1789-1856)—British diplomat and military figure, envoy to China (1841-42); in 1842 commanded British troops in the First Opium War with China, Governor of Hong Kong (1843-44), of the Cape of Good Hope (1846-47), and Madras (1847-54).—244, 245

Powlett, William John Frederick, Lord—British statesman, Peelite, M.P.—249

Pozzo di Borgo, Karl Osipovich, Count (1764-1842)—Russian diplomat, Corsican by birth; envoy to Paris (1814-21), ambassador to Paris (1821-35) and to London (1835-39).—38

Praslin, Charles Laure Hugues Théobald, duc de Choiseul (1805-1847)—French aristocrat; his trial in 1847 for murdering his wife had political repercussions; committed suicide.—472

Prescott, H. J.—assistant-governor of the Bank of England in 1847.—382
**Price, Richard** (1723-1791) — British radical publicist, economist and moralist philosopher. — 513

**Prince of Prussia** — see **William I**

**Prokesch-Osten, Anton, Count von** (1795-1876) — Austrian general and diplomat, internuncio (1855-67) and ambassador (1867-71) to Constantinople. — 322, 324

**Prost** — French businessman, chief of the Compagnie générale de Caisses d’Escompte (1858). — 501

**Proudhon, Pierre Joseph** (1809-1865) — French writer, economist and sociologist, a forefather of anarchism. — 15, 185

**Pucheta** — see **Muñoz Benavente, José**

**Puffendorf, Samuel, Baron von** (1632-1694) — German historian and lawyer, a theoretician of "natural law." — 60

**Pulszky, Ferenc** (1814-1897) — Hungarian politician, writer and archaeologist; Pole by birth; took part in the Hungarian revolution of 1848-49; émigré; in the 1850s contributed to the *New York Daily Tribune*. — 361

**Q**

**Quiroga, Antonio** (1784-1841) — Spanish army officer, Liberal, participant in the revolutions of 1808-14 and 1820-23. — 625

**R**

**Radetzky, Josef, Count of Radetz** (1766-1858) — Austrian field marshal, in 1848-49 suppressed the revolutionary and national liberation movement in Italy; Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venetia (1850-56). — 6, 107

**Raglan, Lord Fitzroy James Henry Somerset, Baron** (1788-1855) — British field marshal; commander-in-chief of the British army in the Crimea (1854-55). — 447

**Ranbir (Ranbeer) Singh** — Indian Rajah from Cashmere; during the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India fought on the British side. — 374

**Rapp, Jean, comte** (1772-1821) — French general, participant in Napoleon I’s campaigns; from January 1813 to January 1814 commanded the garrison of Danzig besieged by Russian and Prussian troops. — 441

**Rawlinson, Sir Henry Creswicke, Baronet** (1810-1895) — English historian, Orientalist, served as an officer in Persia, member of the Council of India (1858-59, 1868-95), envoy to Teheran (1859-60). — 294

**Redgrave, Alexander** — British factory inspector. — 525

**Reed, Sir Thomas** (1796-1883) — British general, participated in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India. — 343-44, 370-71

**Regnault, Elias Georges Soulange Olivia** (1801-1868) — French historian and writer, Bonapartist. — 62

**Reinhard, Charles Frederic, comte** (1761-1837) — French diplomat, envoy to Lower Saxony (1802); German by birth. — 498

**Renaud** (d. 1857) — British army officer, took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India. — 347

**Renée, Lambert Amédée** (1808-1859) — French journalist, Bonapartist, responsible publisher of *Le Constitutionnel* and *Le Pays* from 1856. — 515

**Reynaud** — French journalist, editor of the *Courrier Français de Londres* (1802). — 493

**Reynaud, Jean** (1806-1863) — French naturalist and philosopher. — 488
Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—British economist.—8
Richard III (1452-1485)—King of England (1483-85).—219
Riego y Núñez, Rafael del (1785-1823)—Spanish army officer, participant in the war of independence (1808-14); prominent figure during the revolution of 1820-23; executed after its defeat.—625, 626, 629
Rimsky-Korsakov, Alexander Mikhailovich (1753-1840)—Russian general, commander of the Russian army in Switzerland (1799); member of the State Council from 1830.—168
Roberts, Sir Henry Gee (1800-1860)—British general, participated in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—608, 609
Robertson—British consul in Shanghai (1856).—127
Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—leader of the Jacobins in the French Revolution, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—186, 488
Robinson, Smith P.—honorary secretary of the Anti-Corn Law League.—241
Rockingham, Charles Watson Wentworth, Marquis of (1730-1782)—British statesman, Whig M.P., Prime Minister (1765-66, 1782).—34, 36
Roebuck, John Arthur (1801-1879)—British politician and journalist, radical M.P.—216, 227
Romanovs—dynasty of Russian tsars and emperors (1613-1917).—5
Romanus II (939-963)—Emperor of Byzantium (959-63).—75
Roncali, Federico, conde d'Alcoy (b. 1809)—Spanish politician, head of government and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1852-53).—286
Rondeau, Claudius (d. 1739)—British diplomat, consul-general (1730-31) and resident-minister (1731-39) in St. Petersburg.—27, 39
Rooke, Sir George (1650-1709)—British admiral; in 1700 commander-in-chief of the Anglo-Dutch squadron sent to help Charles XII during the Danish-Swedish war.—95
Ros de Olano, Antonio (1808-1886)—Spanish general and politician, member of the Moderado Party, participant in the revolution of 1854-56.—99
Rose, Hugh Henry, Baron Strathnairn (1801-1885)—British general, later field-marshall, fought in the Crimean war, took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—506, 508, 558, 582, 583
Rothschild, James, baron de (1792-1868)—head of the Rothschild banking house in Paris.—15
Rothschilds—dynasty of bankers with establishments in various European countries.—123, 291, 417
Roulard, Gustave (1806-1878)—French statesman, Bonapartist, Minister of Public Instruction and Worship (1856-63), President of the State Council (1863-64), general director of the Bank of France (1864-78).—467
Ruriks—dynasty of Russian princes and subsequently tsars (912-1598), founded, according to the chronicle, by Rurik, a semi-legendary Varangian leader.—75-77
Russell, John, Earl of (1792-1878)—British statesman, Whig leader, Prime Minister (1846-52, 1865-66), Foreign Secretary (1852-53, 1859-65), President of the Council (1854-55); Britain's representative at the Vienna Conference (1855).—186, 204, 206-07, 214-15, 217, 227-29, 249-50, 382, 468-70, 587-88
Russell, Sir William Howard (1820-1907)—British journalist, the Times war correspondent during the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—527, 529, 556-57

Rutland, Charles Cecil John Manners, Duke of (1815-1888)—British aristocrat, Tory.—567

Ryos y Rosas (Rios y Rosas), Antonio de los (1812-1873)—Spanish politician, member of the Moderado Party, deputy to the Cortes; Minister of the Interior (1856).—100

S

Sacy, Samuel-Ustazade Silvestre de (1801-1879)—French journalist and writer; worked in the Journal des Débats from 1828.—467

Sadleir, John (1814-1856)—Irish banker and politician, a leader of the Irish Brigade in Parliament; committed suicide when the Tipperary Bank, of which he was director, went bankrupt.—16, 110

Sáez (Sáenz), Victor—Ferdinand VII's favourite, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1823).—626

Said Pasha (1822-1863)—ruler of Egypt (1854-63).—595

Saint-Arnaud, Armand Jacques Achille Leroy de (1801-1854)—Marshal of France, Bonapartist; took part in conquering Algeria (1830s-40s); an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of War (1851-54); commander-in-chief of the French army in the Crimea (1854).—483

Saint-Just, Antoine Louis Léonide Richebourg de (1767-1794)—a Jacobin leader in the French Revolution.—15

Saint-Leonards—see Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—15

Saint-Simon, Louis de Rouvroy, duc de (1675-1755)—French politician, writer, author of the famous memoirs.—20, 38, 110

Salanza—general, War Minister in Espartero's cabinet prior to O'Donnell.—288

San Luis, Luis José Sartorius, conde de (1820-1871)—Spanish statesman and writer, a leader of the Moderado Party, Minister of the Interior (1847-51), head of government (1853-54).—284-87

San Miguel y Valledor, Evaristo, duque de (1785-1862)—Spanish general, writer and politician, fought in the war of independence (1808-14) and the 1820-23 revolution; head of the liberal ministry (1822); War Minister (1840-42, 1854); deputy to the Cortes (1854-57).—287

Sandwich, John Montagu, Earl of (1718-1792)—British statesman, First Lord of the Admiralty (1748-51, 1763-65, 1771-82).—28-30, 35, 39

Sartorius—see San Luis, Luis José Sartorius, conde de

Savoy—a royal dynasty ruling in the Sardinian Kingdom (1720-1861) and in the united Italian Kingdom (1861-1946).—3-7

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—586, 589

Schlözer, August Ludwig von (1735-1809)—German historian and statistician, lived in Russia in 1760-66; a founder of the theory of the Russian state's Norman origin.—75

Schröder, Christian Matthias (1812-1892)—head of a large banking firm in Hamburg; went bankrupt at the end of 1857.—412
Schröder, John Henry (1784-1883)—head of a large banking firm in London; brother of Christian Matthias Schröder.—412

Sébastiani, Horace François Bastien, comte (1772-1851)—Marshal of France, diplomat, Orleanist; Foreign Minister (1830-32), ambassador to London (1835-40).—496

Ségur, Philippe Paul, comte de (1780-1873)—French diplomat, military writer and historian; general, took part in the 1812 campaign.—75, 78, 83, 84, 89, 92

Sen (Xu Guangjin) (1785-1858)—Chinese statesman, Governor-General of Kwangtung and Kwangsi.—162

Sidmouth, Henry Addington, Viscount (1757-1844)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer (1801-04), Home Secretary (1812-21).—222, 494

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English playwright and poet.—211, 219, 269, 457, 492

Shelburne—see Petty, Sir William

Shore, John, Baron Teignmouth (1751-1834)—British Governor-General of India (1793-98).—535

Shuvalovs (Schuwaloffs)—Russian noble family, close to the Court in the 18th-19th centuries.—31

Siddhia, Ali Jah Jaiaji (Bagirat Rao) (born c. 1835)—Maharatta Prince of Gwalior from 1853; sided with the British during the national libera-
tion uprising of 1857-59 in India.—364, 609

Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Sismonde de (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, representative of economic romanticism.—147

Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere) (1414-1484)—Pope (1471-84).—86

Sleeman, Sir William Henry (1788-1856)—British colonial official, officer, then general, resident at Gwalior (1843-49) and at Lucknow (1849-54).—538

Smith, Sir John Mark Frederick (1790-1874)—British general, military engineer, M.P.—333

Smith, Robert Vernon, Baron Lyveden (1800-1873)—British statesman, Whig, M.P.; Secretary at War (1852); President of the Board of Control for India (1855-58).—314, 316, 469

Smythe, John George—British politician, colonel, Peelite, M.P.—249

Solms-Sonnenwalde, Victor Friedrich, Count von (1730-1783)—Prussian diplomat, envoy extraordinary to Sweden (1755-59), envoy to Russia (1762-79).—29

Sophia (Zoë) Palæologus (c. 1448-1503)—Grand Duchess of Moscow, second wife of Ivan III, niece of the last Byzantine emperor, Constantine XI Palæologus.—80, 86

Soult, Nicolas Jean de Dieu, duc de Dalmatie (1769-1851)—Marshall of France and statesman, fought in the wars of Napoleonic France, Prime Minister (1832-34, 1839-40, 1840-47).—39, 290

Souwaroff—see Suvorov, Alexander Vasilyevich

Stalker, Forster (d. 1857)—British general, commanded British land forces in the Anglo-Persian war of 1856-57; committed suicide.—294

Stanhope, James, Earl (1673-1721)—British military and political figure, diplomat, Whig; participant in the War of the Spanish Succession, envoy to (1706-07, 1708-10) and commander of the British troops in Spain (1708-10); Secretary of State (1714-17), Chancellor of the Exchequer (1717-21); supported Sweden in her war against Russia.—56, 60, 93, 187

Stanley, Edward Henry, Earl of Derby (1826-1893)—British statesman, Tory, Conservative in the 1860s-70s, later Liberal; Colonial Secretary (1858, 1882-85), Secretary of State for India (1858-59), Foreign Secretary (1866-68, 1874-78); son of Edward Derby.—469, 470, 590

Stanley, Edward John, Baron Stanley of Alderley and Baron Eddisbury of Winnington (1802-1869)—British statesman, Whig, M.P.; President of the Board of Trade (1855-58), Postmaster-General (1860-66).—425-26, 428

Stead, Jean—French émigré on Jersey, printer.—496

Stein, Maximilian, Baron (1811-1860)—Austrian army officer; during the revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary was chief of the General Staff of the revolutionary army; then émigré in Turkey under the name of Ferhad Pasha; fought against Russia in the Caucasus (1857-58).—541-43, 545

Stephen III the Great (d. 1504)—Hospodar of Moldavia (1457-1504).—85

Stewart, Sir Donald Martin (1824-1900)—British army officer, later field marshal; took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India, and in the second Anglo-Afghan war (1878-80); commander-in-chief of the British troops in India (1881-85); member of the Council of India (1885-1900).—364
Stieglitz—owner of the St. Petersburg banking house Stieglitz & Co.—359
Stock, Franciszek—Polish émigré, officer in the Turkish army.—539, 549
Stocken, von—Danish minister (early 18th cent.).—43, 44
Stormont, David Murray, Viscount Stormont, Earl of Mansfield (1727-1796)—British statesman and diplomat, Tory; envoy to Paris (1772-78); Secretary of State for the Southern Department (1779-82).—32-33, 35
Strabo (63 B.C.-c. A.D. 20)—Greek geographer and historian.—146
Strahan, William (born c. 1808)—British banker, partner of a firm which went bankrupt in June 1855; sentenced to hard labour for financial machinations.—110
Stratford de Redcliffe, Stratford Canning, Viscount (1786-1880)—British diplomat, envoy to Constantinople (1810-12, 1825-28, 1841-58).—293, 322, 595
Stroganov (Stroganoffs)—the family of Russian merchants, later of nobles; known for their efforts to colonise the Urals and Siberia in the 16th-18th centuries; were close to the Court in the 18th-19th centuries.—31
Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus) (c. 70-c. 160)—Roman historian and writer, author of The Twelve Caesars.—164
Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw, Baron St. Leonards (1781-1875)—British lawyer and statesman, Tory; Lord Chancellor (1852).—469
Sugden, Richard—hairdresser, father of the above.—469
Sunderland, Spencer Charles, Earl of (1674-1722)—British diplomat and politician, Whig; Secretary of State for the Northern Department (from 1717), First Lord of the Treasury (1718-21).—34
Sutton, John Henry Manners—British politician, Peelite, M.P. (1847-57).—249
Suvorov, Alexander Vasilyevich, Count Suvorov Rimniksky, Prince Italisky (c. 1729-1800)—Russian general.—168
Svatoslav Igorevich (d. 972 or 973)—Grand Duke of Kiev (c. 945-72).—75, 76
Szémeré, Bertalan (Bartholomäus) (1812-1869)—Hungarian politician and journalist; Minister of the Interior (1848) and head of the revolutionary government (1849); emigrated after the defeat of the revolution.—236

T

Tahlman—Austrian resident in Constantinople in 1736.—27
Tahmasp II (died c. 1736)—Shah of Persia (1730-32).—177
Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice, prince de (1754-1838)—French diplomat, Foreign Minister (1797-99, 1799-1807, 1814-15); represented France at the Vienna Congress (1814-15).—29, 227, 488, 491, 492, 498
Tao Kuang (1782-1850)—Emperor of China (1821-50).—244-45
Tasso, Torquato (1544-1595)—Italian poet.—477
Terence (Publius Terentius Afer) (c. 190-159 B.C.)—Roman author of comedies.—55
Terentianus Maurus (2nd half of the 2nd cent.)—Roman grammarian.—15
Tewfik Bey—see Łapiński, Teofil
Themistocles (c. 525-c. 460 B.C.)—Greek statesman and general of the time of Greco-Persian wars.—55
Thesiger, Frederick, Baron Chelmsford  (1794-1878)—British statesman, Tory, M.P. from 1840; Attorney-General (1845-46, 1852), Lord Chancellor (1858-59, 1866-68).—216

Theys, Willem—Dutch diplomat; at the beginning of the 18th century served at Dutch Embassy in Turkey, carried out diplomatic missions for the Russian Government; in 1711-12 helped to conclude a peace treaty between Russia and Turkey.—65

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836, 1840), deputy to the Constituent (1848) and Legislative (1849-51) Assemblies; head of the Orleanists after 1848; organised the suppression of the Paris Commune (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—488

Thouvenel, Édouard Antoine (1818-1866)—French diplomat, ambassador to Constantinople (1855-60), Foreign Minister (1860-62).—322-23

Thurneyssen, Auguste—a director of the French joint-stock bank Crédit Mobilier.—358, 359

Thurneyssen, Charles—French banker, nephew of the above.—358, 359

Timur (Tamerlane) (1336-1405)—Central Asian general and conqueror, founder of a large state in the East with Samarkand as its capital.—81, 557

Tippoo Saib (Tipu Sahib) (1750-1799)—ruler of Mysore (1782-99); waged wars against British expansion in India in the 1780s and 1790s.—340

Tite, Sir William (1798-1873)—British architect and politician; Liberal, M.P. from 1855.—600

Todtleben (Totleben), Eduard Ivanovich, Count (1818-1884)—Russian military engineer, general, an organiser of the defence of Sevastopol (1854-55).—392, 441

Tolstoi, Alexei Petrovich, Count (d. 1864)—Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod (1856-62), cavalry general, senator.—464

Tooke, Thomas (1774-1858)—British economist, adherent of the classical school of political economy.—382, 402

Toreno, José María Queipo de Llano, conde de (1786-1843)—Spanish politician of liberal leanings and historian, participant in the revolutions of 1808-14 and 1820-23; deputy to the Cadiz Cortes, Minister of Finance (1834) and Prime Minister (1835); lived in emigration from 1814 to 1820, 1823 to 1833 and from 1835.—625

Townshend, Charles, Viscount (1674-1738)—British diplomat and politician, at first Tory, later Whig; ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Holland (1709-11), Secretary of State (1714-17, 1721-30).—56, 60, 65, 93

Tseang (Jiang Li'ang)—prefect in Luichow.—161, 162

Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, baron de l'Aulne (1727-1781)—French economist and statesman; Physiocrat; Controller-General of Finance (1774-76).—185

Turgot, Louis Felix Étienne, marquis de (1796-1866)—French diplomat, Bonapartist, took part in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Foreign Minister (1851-52), ambassador to Spain (1853).—98

Turner, James Aspinall (1797-1867)—British cotton manufacturer and politician, Tory, M.P., President of the Manchester Commercial Association.—240

Türr, István (Achmet Kiamil Bey) (1825-1908)—Hungarian army officer, participant in the 1848-49
revolution in Italy and Germany, émigré in Turkey; fought in the Crimean war on the side of the Allies and in the Caucasian mountaineers’ war against Tsarist Russia.—542-43

U

Ummer Singh—see Amar Singh

Urquhart, David (1805-1877)—British diplomat, writer and politician; Turkophile; carried out diplomatic missions in Turkey in the 1830s; M.P. (1847-52), Tory; opponent of Palmerston’s policy; founder and editor of The Free Press (1855-65).—184

Uzbek Khan (c. 1282-1342)—Khan of the Golden Horde (1312-42).—78

V

Vaillant, Jean Baptiste Philibert, comte (1790-1872)—Marshal of France, senator, Bonapartist, Minister of War (1854-59).—465

Vaisse, Claude Marius (1799-1864)—French statesman, Bonapartist, Minister of the Interior (January-April 1851), prefect of Lyons in the mid-1850s.—466

Valbezen, de—French consul in Calcutta (1854-58).—320

Valdez—Spanish general, participant in the revolution of 1854-56.—100, 101

Valdez (Valdés), Jeronimo (1784-1855)—Spanish general, Governor-General of Cuba (1841-42).—573

Van Cortlandt, Henry Charles (1815-1888)—British general; was in the military service of the Sikhs (1832-39); fought in the first and second Anglo-Sikh wars (1845-46, 1848-49) on the side of the British; participated in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—329, 345, 361, 372

Vaughan, Sir John Luther (1820-1911)—British general, participated in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—307

Velasco y Coello, Manuel (1776-1824)—Spanish general, participant in the first (1808-14) and second (1820-23) revolutions in Spain; Military Governor of Madrid, Captain-General of Extremadura.—626

Veuillot, Louis François (1813-1883)—French journalist, editor-in-chief of clerical newspaper L'Univers (1848-60).—483, 488

Victor Emmanuel (Vittorio Emanuele) II (1820-1878)—King of Piedmont (Sardinia) (1849-61), King of Italy (1861-78).—5, 417

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—186, 465, 525

Vigodet, Caspar—Governor of Montevideo (1810), Captain-General of New Castile (1820); in 1823 emigrated to France after the defeat of the revolution.—626

Villemaur, Abel François (1790-1870)—French politician and writer, Liberal, Minister of Public Education (1839-40, 1840-44).—467, 488

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—Roman poet.—43, 188, 486

Vittoria, Duke of—see Espartero, Baldomero

Vladimir Svyatoslavich (d. 1015)—Grand Duke of Kiev (980-1015).—75, 76, 86

Vogorides, Alexandros, Prince (Aleko-pasha) (c. 1823-1910)—Turkish statesman and diplomat; Bulgarian by birth; counsellor of the Embassy in London (1856-61), ambassador to Vienna (1876-78), Governor of the Eastern Rumelia (1879-84).—324-25
Vogorides, Nikolaos (Konaki-Vogorides) (1821-1863)—Kaimak of Moldavia (1857-59); Bulgarian by birth; brother of Alexandros Vogorides.—323, 324, 326

Vogorides, Stefan (Bogorov, Stojko) (c. 1775-c. 1862)—Turkish politician; Bulgarian by birth; Kaimak of Moldavia (1821-22); father of Alexandros and Nikolaos Vogorides.—324

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—309

Vorontsov, Mikhail Semyonovich, Prince (1782-1856)—Russian statesman, field marshal-general, in 1844-54 commander-in-chief of the troops in Transcaucasia and Governor-General in the Caucasus; after retiring lived in Odessa; Sidney Herbert's maternal uncle.—249

Vsevolod III (1154-1212)—Grand Duke of Vladimir (1176-1212).—77

W

Wajid Ali Shah—King of Oudh (1847-56).—316, 529, 535

Walewski, Alexandre Florian Joseph Collon, comte (1810-1868)—French diplomat and statesman; son of Napoleon I and Polish Countess Marie Walewska; Foreign Minister (1855-60); was chairman at the Paris Congress (1856).—5, 470

Walker, William (1824-1860)—American adventurer; in the 1850s made several expeditions to Central American states with a view to uniting them in an empire under himself; seized power in Nicaragua in 1856 and declared himself President; was taken prisoner and executed in 1860, during his expedition to Honduras.—162

Walpole, Horatio (Horace), Baron Walpole of Wolterton (1678-1757)—British diplomat and politician, Whig; envoy plenipotentiary (1715, 1715-16, 1722, 1734) and ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Holland (1734-37, 1739) and to France (1724-30).—27, 30, 39, 56, 65

Walpole, Sir Robert, Earl of Orford (1676-1745)—British statesman, Whig leader, Prime Minister (1721-42); the first to form cabinets independent of the king and relying on the majority in Parliament; widely resorted to bribery; brother of the above.—56, 57

Walpole, Spencer Horatio (Horace) (1806-1898)—British statesman, Tory, Home Secretary (1852, 1858-59, 1866-67).—600

Wellesley, Richard Colley, Marquis (1760-1842)—British statesman, Governor-General of India (1797-1805), Foreign Secretary (1809-12), Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1821-28, 1833-34).—535

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852)—British general and statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1828-30), Foreign Secretary (December 1834-April 1835).—192, 468

Wheeler, Sir Hugh Massy (1789-1857)—British general; in 1838-39 took part in the first Anglo-Afghan war, and in the Anglo-Sikh wars (1845-46, 1848-49); commander of the Cawnpore garrison (1856-57); took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—346-47, 367, 441, 442

Whiteside, James (1804-1876)—Irish lawyer and politician, Tory M.P.; Attorney-General (1858-59, 1866).—216

Whitlock, George (1798-1868)—British general; in 1818 entered the service of the East India Company; took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—558, 582
Whitworth, Charles, Earl (1752-1825)—British diplomat, ambassador to Paris (1802-May 1803), Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (1813-17).—496-98

William I (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia, Prince Regent (1858-61), King of Prussia (1861-88), Emperor of Germany (1871-88).—568

William III (1650-1702)—Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of the Netherlands (1672-1702), King of England, Scotland and Ireland (1689-1702).—49, 53, 57, 64-66, 72, 95, 152, 187

William IV (1765-1837)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1830-37).—536

William “of Kars”—see Williams, Sir William Fenwick, Baronet “of Kars”

Williams, Sir William Fenwick, Baronet “of Kars” (1800-1883)—British general; headed the defence of Kars in 1855, during the Crimean war; M.P. (1856-59); commanded the garrison in Woolwich (1856-59).—216, 447-48

Wilson, Sir Archdale (1803-1874)—British general; during the national liberation uprising in India commander of the troops which besieged and stormed Delhi (1857), and of the artillery during the siege of Lucknow (1858).—365, 370, 396, 398, 558

Wilson, George (1808-1870)—British manufacturer and politician, Free Trader, President of the Anti-Corn Law League (1841-46).—241

Wilson, James (1805-1860)—Scottish economist and politician, Free Trader, founder and editor of The Economist, M.P. (1847-59), Financial Secretary to the Treasury (1853-58).—206, 517, 518

Wilson, N. (d. 1857)—British colonel, took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—451

Windham, Sir Charles Ash (1810-1870)—British general; in 1854-56 fought in the Crimean war; commanded British troops in Lahore (1857-61); took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising of 1857-59 in India.—442, 447-52, 504

Windham, William (1750-1810)—British statesman, Whig, subsequently Tory, M.P., Secretary for War (1794-1801).—491, 495

Winslow, Forbes Benignus (1810-1874)—British physician and journalist, editor of The Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology.—599

Withworth, M.—British ambassador at the Court of Peter I.—93

Wodehouse, John, Earl of Kimberley (1826-1902)—British statesman, envoy to St. Petersburg (1856-58), Viceroy of Ireland (1864-66), Lord Privy Seal (1868-70), Secretary for Colonies (1870-74, 1880-82).—572

Wood, Sir Charles, Viscount Halifax (1800-1885)—British statesman, Whig; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1846-52), President of the Board of Control for India (1852-55), First Lord of the Admiralty (1855-58), Secretary of State for India (1859-66).—382

Woodburn—British general, in 1857 took part in suppressing the national liberation uprising in India.—316

Woronzoff, Prince—see Vorontsov, Mikhail Semyonovich, Prince

Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst, Count von (1784-1877)—Prussian general, an active participant in the counter-revolutionary coup d’état in Berlin and in the dispersal of the Prussian National Assembly in November 1848.—107


INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

Achilles (Gr. Myth.)—the bravest of the Greek warriors in the Trojan War, hero of Homer's Iliad.—154, 214, 483

Aeolus (Gr. Myth.)—god of the winds.—188

Agramante—King of Mauritania, a character in Ariosto's poem L'Orlando furioso.—343

Capulets—a noble Veronese family hostile to the Montagues in Shakespeare's tragedy Romeo and Juliet.—469

Christ, Jesus (Bib.)—106, 512

Curtius, Marcus Curtius—a legendary hero of Ancient Rome, who, in order to save Rome, threw himself down into a chasm which had opened in the Forum.—484

Daniel (Bib.)—Old Testament prophet.—296

Don Quixote—the title character in Cervantes' novel.—104

Faust, Sir John—a character in Shakespeare's tragedy King Henry IV and his comedy The Merry Wives of Windsor; a sly fat braggart and jester.—240

Hector (Gr. Myth.)—a son of the Trojan King Priam; defender of Troy and one of the main characters in Homer's Iliad; killed by Achilles.—154

Hercules (Heracles) (Gr. and Rom. Myth.)—son of Zeus; possessed enormous strength and courage.—215, 229

Isaiah (Bib.)—Old Testament prophet.—95

John Bull—the main character in John Arbuthnot's book The History of John Bull (18th cent.); the name is often used to personify England or Englishmen.—205, 228, 242, 301, 316, 327, 332, 356, 443, 445, 458, 476, 482-84, 511, 514, 529, 531, 575

Zamoyski, Ladislas (Wladyslaw), Count (1803-1868)—Polish magnate; took part in the 1830-31 insurrection; after its defeat, a leader of the Polish conservative monarchist refugees in Paris; made attempts to muster a Polish legion to fight against Russia during the Crimean war.—543, 545

Zayas y Chacón, José Pascual de (1772-1827)—Spanish general, took part in the liberation war against Napoleonic France (1808-14) and in the revolution of 1820-23; deputy to the Cortes.—630

Zimiskes—see John I Tzimisces

Zubov, Platon Alexandrovich, Prince (1767-1822)—Russian statesman, favourite of Catherine II.—37
Juggernaut (Hindu Myth.)—Krishna, an incarnation of the Hindu god Vishnu.—356

Macbeth—the title character in Shakespeare's tragedy.—486

Matthew (Bib.)—one of the four evangelists.—115, 191, 216

Nestor (Gr. Myth.)—a character in Homer's Iliad, the oldest and wisest of the Greek heroes who took part in the Trojan War.—154

Odysseus—a hero in the Iliad and the Odyssey who took part in the Trojan War; renowned for his courage and resource.—41

Osmin—a character in Mozart's opera Die Entführung aus dem Serail.—356

Polyphemus (Gr. Myth.)—a man-eating cyclop; blinded by Odysseus.—41

Samson (Bib.)—Old Testament hero known for his supernatural strength and courage.—46

Sindbad the Sailor—a hero in the Arabian Thousand and One Nights.—248

Tartuffe—the title character in Molière's comedy.—356

Timon—a character in Shakespeare's tragedy Timon of Athens.—269
WORKS BY KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

Marx, Karl


British Commerce (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5238, February 3, 1858.—426

The British Revulsion (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5183, November 30, 1857.—401, 411

[The Causes of the Monetary Crisis in Europe] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 4843, October 27, 1856.—124

Crédit Mobilier (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, Nos. 5027 and 5028, May 30 and June 1, 1857.—303, 357, 358


The French Crédit Mobilier (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 4737, June 24, 1856.—132-33

Indian News (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5091, August 14, 1857.—320

[Investigation of Tortures in India] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5120, September 17, 1857.—353

Lord Palmerston (present edition, Vol. 12). In: The People's Paper, Nos. 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 85 and 86; October 22 and 29, November 5, 12 and 19, December 10, 17 and 24, 1853.—193
The Maritime Commerce of Austria (I) (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 4906, January 9, 1857.—144


The Oriental Question (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5102, August 27, 1857.—334


Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century (this volume). In: The Free Press, Vols. III-IV, Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19, 26, 28, 29 and 34; August 16 and 23, September 13 and 20, October 4, November 8 and 29, December 6 and 20, 1856; February 4, 18 and 25, and April 1, 1857.—39-41, 53, 56, 63, 71, 74, 92


[The Revolt in India] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5134, October 3, 1857.—368

[The Revolt in India] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5151, October 23, 1857.—374

[Revolution in Spain] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 4775, August 8, 1856.—105


A Traitor in Circassia (this volume). In: The Free Press, No. 34, April 1, 1857.—539

Engels, Frederick

The Fall of Lucknow (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5312, April 30, 1858.—527

The Relief of Lucknow (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5236, February 1, 1858.—504, 527, 580

[The Revolt in India] (this volume). In: New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5351, June 15, 1858.—580

WORKS BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS

Aberdeen, G. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—571

Addington, H. [Speech in the House of Commons on December 9, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810.—494

Aesop. The Fox and The Crow.—239

[Algarotti, F.] Lettres du comte Algarotti sur la Russie. Londres, 1769.—90


Aristoteles. De Poetica.—310

Auerbach, B. Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten.—589

Baillie, H. J. [Speech in the House of Commons on March 16, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 22943, March 17, 1858.—536


Bauer, B. De la Dictature occidentale. Charlottenburg, 1854.—191
— Die jetzige Stellung Rußlands. Charlottenburg, 1854.—182-85
— La Russie et l'Angleterre. Traduit de l’allemand. Charlottenburg, 1854.—181-93


Bedeau, M. A. [Letter to the Editor of L’Indépendance belge of March 3, 1858.] In: L’Indépendance belge, No. 65, 6 mars 1858.—476

Bible
The Old Testament
Daniel.—296
Isaiah.—95

The New Testament
Luke.—518
Matthew.—115, 191, 216


Bonaparte, L.-N. Histoire du canon dans les armées modernes. Paris, 1848.—482
— Des idées napoléoniennes. The first edition appeared in Paris in 1839.—480


Bright, J. [Speech in the House of Commons on June 24, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 23029, June 25, 1858.—576, 579

Brougham, H. P. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—572

Bulwer-Lytton, E. G. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 26, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22615, February 27, 1857.—215

Bunyan, J. *The Pilgrim's Progress*.—457


Caesar, Gaius Julius. *Commentarii de bello Gallico*.—356

Cairns, H. [Speech in the House of Commons on July 8, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 23041, July 9, 1858.—586

Campbell, G. *Modern India: A Sketch of the System of Civil Government*. To which is prefixed, some account of the natives and native institutions. London, 1852.—579

Canning, G. [Speech in the House of Commons on December 12, 1826.] In: *The Speeches of the Right Honorable George Canning with a Memoir of His Life* by R. Therry in six volumes. Vol. VI, London, 1830.—188

Castlereagh, R. St. [Speech in the House of Commons on November 3, 1801.] In: *Cobbett's Annual Register*. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810.—491

Cervantes Saavedra, M. de. *Novelas ejemplares*.—513

Changarnier, N. A. Th. [Letter to the Editor of *L'Indépendance belge* of March 1, 1858.] In: *L'Indépendance belge*, No. 61, 2 mars 1858.—476

— *Les Martyrs ou le Triomphe de la religion chrétienne*.—15

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Natura Deorum*.—282
— *Pro lege Manilia*.—95

Clarendon, G. W. F. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—574

Cobden, R. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 26, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22615, February 27, 1857.—207, 211, 215, 220

Cunibert, B.-S. *Essai historique sur les révolutions et l'indépendance de la Serbie depuis 1804 jusqu'à 1850*. Tomes premier et second. Leipzig, 1855.—62

Derby, E. [Speeches in the House of Lords]
— March 1, 1858, In: *The Times*, No. 22930, March 2, 1858.—587
Disraeli, B. [Speeches in the House of Commons]
— August 11, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22757, August 12, 1857.—333
— August 20, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22765, August 21, 1857.—333
— April 19, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 22972, April 20, 1858.—510-12
— May 31, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 23008, June 1, 1858.—566

In three volumes. London, 1831.—510

Dupont, [E.] *Chronique de l'Intérieur.* In: *La Voix du Proscrit*, No. 8, 15 décembre 1850.—467


"India and China."—423

Ellenborough, [E. L.] [Speeches in the House of Lords]
— July 31, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22748, August 1, 1857.—321
— May 7, 1858. In *The Times*, No. 22988, May 8, 1858.—531, 534
— [Speech at the trial of J. G. Peltier on February 21, 1803.] In: *Cobbett's Annual Register*. Supplement to Vol. III. "Important Trials."—497

Elliot, W. [Speech in the House of Commons on November 4, 1801.] In: *Cobbett's Annual Register*. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810.—491

Evans, G. de L. [Speeches in the House of Commons]
— August 11, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22757, August 12, 1857.—327
— August 20, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22765, August 21, 1857.—331
— February 4, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 22909, February 5, 1858.—590

Examen critique des révolutions d'Espagne de 1820 à 1823 et de 1836. Tome 1-2, Paris, 1837.—628

Favre, J. [Speech before the Jury on February 26, 1858.] In: *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 58, 27 février 1858.—473, 477

Fourier, Ch. *Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales.*—21


Gladstone, W. E. [Speeches in the House of Commons]
— February 20, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22610, February 21, 1857.—205
— June 7, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 23014, June 8, 1858.—575
— July 6, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 23039, July 7, 1858.—588
Glyn, G. G. [Speech in the House of Commons on April 19, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 22972, April 20, 1858.—512

Graham, J. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 27, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22616, February 28, 1857.—217
— [Speech before the Carlisle constituents on March 16, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22632, March 19, 1857.—228
— [Testimony before the Committee of Roebuck.] In: *The Times*, No. 22054, May 15, 1855.—34

Granier de Cassagnac, A. *La palinodie des honnêtes gens.* In: *Le Constitutionnel*, No. 31, 31 janvier 1858.—467

Granville, G. [Speech in the House of Lords on July 16, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22735, July 17, 1857.—308

Grey, H. G. [Speeches in the House of Lords]
— February 24, 1857. In: *The Times*, No. 22613, February 25, 1857.—211
— June 10, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 25017, June 11, 1858.—567
— June 17, 1858. In: *The Times*, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—570, 573

— *Letters Which passed between Count Gyllenborg, the Barons Gortz, Sparre, and others; Relating to the Design of Raising a Rebellion in His Majesty's Dominions, To be Supported by a Force from Sweden.* London, 1717.—43, 61

Hauff, W. *Die Bettlerin von Pont des Arts.*—589


Heine, H. *Lyrisches Intermezzo.* In: *Buch der Lieder.*—101

Herbert, S. [Speech before the electors of the Southern Division of Wiltshire on April 1, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22644, April 2, 1857. "The Elections."—249

Hesiodus. *Opera et dies.*—209


Hugo, V. *Napoléon le petit.* Londres, 1852.—490

James, E. [Speech at the court hearing of S. Bernard's case on April 16, 1858.] In: *The Times*, No. 22970, April 17, 1858.—516


Labouchere, H. [Speech before the Taunton constituents on March 11, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22627, March 13, 1857.—221

The Last Days of Spain. By an Eye-Witness. London, 1823.—630

Laurence, Fr. [Speech in the House of Commons on December 9, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810.—494


Lewis, G. C. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 13, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22604, February 14, 1857.—200

Lowe, R. [Speech before the Kidderminster constituents on March 10, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22627, March 13, 1857.—221

Lucanus. Pharsalia.—146

Lyndhurst, J. [Speech in the House of Lords on February 24, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22613, February 25, 1857.—210

Lytton, R. B. To the Editor of "The Observer". In: The Times, No. 23049, July 19, 1858. "Lady Bulwer Lytton".—596, 597-600

MacGregor, J. The Resources and Statistics of Nations, exhibiting the Geographical Position and Natural Resources, the Political Statistics, including the Government Revenue, Expenditure, the Civil, Military and Naval Affairs, the Moral Statistics, including Religion and Education; the Medical Statistics, including Comparative Mortality, and etc.; and the Economical Statistics, including Agriculture, Manufactures, Navigation and Trade, and etc., of all Countries. London, 1835.—110

— The Commercial and Financial Legislation of Europe and America, with a Pro-forma Revision of the Taxation and the Customs Tariff of the United Kingdom. London, 1841.—110

[Mackenzie, G.] Truth is but Truth, as it is Timed! Or, our Ministry's Present Measures against the Muscovite vindicated by Plain and Obvious Reasons; Tending to Prove, That it is no less the Interest of Our British Trade, than that of Our State, that the Czar be not suffer'd to retain a Fleet, if needs must that he should a Sea Port, in the Baltic. The Whole Extracted from a Representation made by His Majesty's Order, and given in to the Secretary of State by N. N. on his Return hither from the Court of Muscovy, in August 1715. Humbly Dedicated to the House of Commons. London. MDCCXIX.—56, 74, 92-96

MacMahon, P. M. [Speech in the French Senate on February 25, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 57, 26 février 1858; L'Indépendance belge, No. 59, 28 février 1858.—476


Malmesbury, J. H. H. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—570-74

Marsaud. Banque de France. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 352, 18 décembre 1857.—413

Mazzini, G. To Louis Napoléon. London, 1858.—485-89

Mieczkowski, L. De la nationalité polonaise dans l'équilibre européen. Paris, 1856.—62

Millaud, M. [Report to the Shareholders of the Caisse des Actionnaires of February
10, 1858.] In: The Economist, No. 756, February 20, 1858. "Foreign correspondence"; Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 45, 14. Februar 1858 (Beilage).—502

Molière, J. B. Le bourgeois gentilhomme.—230

Montalembert, Ch. [Speech at the meeting of the Corps législatif on May 31, 1856.] In: The Times, No. 22386, June 5, 1856. "Count Montalembert and the Press in France."—19

[Montesquieu, Ch.-L. de.] Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence. The first edition was published anonymously in Amsterdam in 1734.—310, 486

Montluc. La Comédie des Proverbes. The first edition appeared in Paris in 1618.—326

Mulgrave, G. [Speech before the Scarborough constituents in March 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22627, March 13, 1857.—221


Orsini, F. À Napoléon III, Empereur des Français, 11 février 1858. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 58, 27 février 1858.—473
— [Testimony at the court session on February 25, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 57, 26 février 1858.—473


Overstone, S. J. L. [Speech in the House of Lords on December 3, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22855, December 4, 1857.—407


Palmerston, H. J. T. [Speech before the electors of Tiverton on June 28, 1841.] In: The Times, No. 1773, July 3, 1841.—483
— [Speech at the Ministerial banquet at the Mansion House on March 20, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22634, March 21, 1857.—232
— [Speech before the electors at the meeting in Tiverton on March 27, 1857.] In: The Morning Post, No. 25972, March 28, 1857. "Tiverton. Return of Lord Palmerston and Mr. Heathcoat. From our own reporter."—240
— [Speeches in the House of Commons]
— May 18, 1857. In: The Times, No. 22684, May 19, 1857.—293
— August 11, 1857. In: The Times, No. 22757, August 12, 1857.—330, 332
— August 20, 1857. In: The Times, No. 22765, August 21, 1857.—331, 332


Pindar. The First Olympian Ode.—219

Pitt, W. [Speech in the House of Commons on November 3, 1801.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810.—491

Price, R. An Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the National Debt. 2 ed. London, 1772.—513
— Observations on Reversionary Payments; on Schemes for providing Annuities for Widows, and for Persons in Old Age; on the Method of Calculating the Values of Assurances on Lives; and on the National Debt. 2 ed. London, 1772.—513


Rawlinson, H. C. [Speech at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, held on May 11, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22679, May 13, 1857. “Persia.”—294

Reasons for the present conduct of Sweden in relation to the trade in the Baltic set forth in a letter from a gentleman at Dantzick, to his friend at Amsterdam. Translated from the French original, published in Holland: and now submitted to the Consideration of all just and impartial Britons. London, 1715.—64

Régnauld, E. Histoire politique et sociale des Principautés Danubiennes. Paris, 1855.—62

Renée, Am. L’acquittement de Bernard a causé... In: Le Constitutionnel, No. 111, 21 avril 1858.—515, 516

Revolution d’Espagne. Examen critique. 1820-1836. Paris, 1836.—627, 628


Russell, J. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 26, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22615, February 27, 1857.—215
— [Speech before the electors assembled at the London Tavern on March 19, 1857.] In: The Times, No. 22633, March 20, 1857.—228
— [Speech in the House of Commons on April 12, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 22966, April 13, 1858.—588


Rutland, Ch. C. J. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 10, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23017, June 11, 1858.—567

Schiller, J. Chr. Fr. von. Don Karlos, Infant von Spanien.—589
— Die Räuber. Ein Schauspiel.—586

Segur, Ph. History of Russia and of Peter the Great. London, 1829.—75, 78, 83, 84, 89, 92

Shakespeare, W. King Henry IV.—457
— King John.—219
— King Richard III.—219
— Measure for Measure.—211
— The Merchant of Venice.—492
— Romeo and Juliet.—469
— Timon of Athens.—269

Silius Halcucus. De secundo bello punico, Liber II.—65


28—844
Smith, V. [Speeches in the House of Commons].
— June 29, 1857. In: The Times, No. 22720, June 30, 1857.—314

Sophocles. Antigone.—453

Spada, A. Ephémérides russes politiques, littéraires, historiques, et necrologiques.—
Présentant, dans l'ordre des jours de l'année, un tableau des événements remarquables, qui datent de chacun de ces jours dans l'histoire de la Russie, jusqu'en 1816. Tomes 1-3, St. Pétersbourgs, 1816. (See this volume, Note 222.)—181

Strabo. Strabonis rerum geographicarum libri 17. Ad optimorum, librorum fidem accurate editi. T. 1. Lipstae, 1829.—146

Suetonius G. Tranquillus, Vitae XII Caesarum.—164

Tailleynrand, Ch. M. [Conversation with Lord Whitworth.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—498
— [Conversation with A. Merry, dated June 3, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—491, 492

Tasso, Torquato. Gerusalemme liberata.—477

Tausend und Eine Nacht. Arabische Erzählungen. Bd. 2. Pforzheim, 1839.—248

Terence (Publius Terentius Afer). Andria.—55
— Phormio.—544

Terentianus Maurus. De litteris, syllabis et metris. (Carmen heroicum.)—15

Theyls, W. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Charles XII, roi de Suède. Contenant ce qui s'est passé pendant le sejour de ce Prince dans l'Empire ottoman, et un recit fidèle des troubles survenus de temps en temps entre sa Maj. et la Porte etc. Leyde, 1722.—65

Tite, W. [Speech in the House of Commons on July 22, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23053, July 23, 1858.—600-01

Tooke, Th. A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, from 1793 to 1837; Preceded by a Brief Sketch of the State of the Corn Trade in the Last Two Centuries. In two volumes. London, 1838.—402

Virgil (Publius Virgilius Maro). Aeneid.—43, 189, 486

Voltaire. L'enfant prodigue. Préface.—309
Walpole, S. H. [Speech in the House of Commons on July 22, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23053, July 23, 1858.—601

Walton, W. The Revolutions of Spain, from 1808 to the end of 1836. 2 vols. London, 1837.—626

Winslow, F. To Edwin James, Esq., Q. C. In: The Times, No. 23049, July 19, 1858. “Lady Bulwer Lytton.”—599

Wodehouse, J. [Speech in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] In: The Times, No. 23023, June 18, 1858.—572

DOCUMENTS

An Account of the Declared Value of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures Exported from the United Kingdom to each Foreign Country and British Possession in the Half-year ended June 30, 1857. In: The Economist, No. 732, September 5, 1857.—383

An Account of the Declared Value of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures Exported from the United Kingdom to each Foreign Country and British Possession in the Three Months ended 31st March, 1858, compared with the corresponding period of the Year 1857. In: The Economist, No. 770 (supplement), May 29, 1858. “Exports of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures.”—560-64

An Account of the Number and Tonnage of Vessels, distinguishing the Countries to which they belonged. Entered Inwards with Cargoes (including their repeated Voyages) in the Four Months ended 30th April, 1858, compared with the corresponding Period of the Years 1856 and 1857. In: The Economist, No. 770 (supplement), May 29, 1858. “Vessels employed in the foreign and coasting trade of the United Kingdom.”—560, 565

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Four Months ended April, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Four Months ending April, 1857, compared with the corresponding Period of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 718, May 30, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Five Months ended May, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Five Months ending May, 1857, compared with the corresponding Period of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 722, June 27, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Six Months ended June, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Six Months ending June, 1857, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 727, August 1, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Seven Months ended July, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Seven Months ending July, 1857, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 731, August 29, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Eight Months ended August, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce
and Manufactures in the Eight Months ending August, 1857, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 736, October 3, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Nine Months ended September, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Nine Months ending September, 1857, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 740, October 31, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. For the Ten Months ended October, 1857. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Ten Months ended October, 1857, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1856. In: The Economist, No. 744, November 28, 1857.—403

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation for the Three Months ended March 31, 1858. III.—Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Three Months ended 31st March, 1858, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1857. In: The Economist, No. 765 (supplement), April 24, 1858.—521-23

Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation for the Four Months ended April 30. In: The Economist, No. 770 (supplement), May 29, 1858.—560

An Act for continuing in the East India Company, for a further Term, the Possession of the British Territories in India, together with certain exclusive Privileges; for establishing further Regulations for the Government of the said Territories, and the better Administration of Justice within the same; and for regulating the Trade to and from the Places within the Limits of the said Company's Charter. [21st July 1813.] In: The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. 53 & 54 George III. (1814). London, 1814.—586

An Act for effecting an Arrangement with the East India Company, and for the better Government of His Majesty's Indian Territories, till the Thirtieth Day of April One thousand eight hundred and fifty-four [28th August 1833.] In: The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. 3 & 4 Will. IV. London, 1835.—444, 586


An Act for the better regulation and management of the affairs of the East India Company, and of the British possessions in India; and for establishing a Court of Judicature for the more speedy and effectual trial of persons accused of offences committed in the East Indies. [August, 1784.]—586

An Act for the Further Amendment of the Laws relating to Labour in Factories.—251


Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature 751


[The Address of the President and Council of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association to the Middle, Commercial, Manufacturing and Industrial Classes of the United Kingdom.] In: The Times, No. 22561, December 26, 1856. “Liverpool Revision of Taxation.”—203

Adresses présentées à l'Empereur. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 17, 17 janvier 1858.—455

[Addresses of the French army men.] In: Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 26, 27; 26, 27 janvier 1858.—475

Andréossi (Andréossy), A. Fr. [Note to Lord Hawkesbury, dated 29 March 1803]. In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.]—496

Annex (B.) To the Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia for the Suppression of the African Slave Trade, signed at London, the Twentieth Day of December in the Year One thousand eight hundred and forty-one. Instructions to Cruisers.—571

Articles convenus entre la Grande-Bretagne et la Perse relatifs à l'indépendance de la Ville de Hérat; signés à Téhéran, le 25 janvier 1853.—295


[The bill submitted to the Turin Chamber of Deputies on February 17, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 54, 23 février 1858. “Partie non officielle. Nouvelles étrangères. Italie.”—480


The Board of Trade Returns. In: The Economist, No. 765, April 24, 1858.—521, 523

Bourse du mardi 30 septembre 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 275, 1 octobre 1856.—130, 131

Bourse du vendredi 31 octobre 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 306, 1 novembre 1856.—130, 131

Bourse du vendredi 23 octobre 1857. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 297, 24 octobre 1857.—417

Bourse du mardi 22 décembre 1857. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 357, 23 décembre 1857.—417


Campbell, C. From his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to the Right Hon. the Governor-General. In: The Times, No. 22889, January 13, 1858. “The Relief and Evacuation of Lucknow.”—435, 436

Carolus. Espèce de Manifeste du Roi de Suede contre le Roi Auguste. In: Lamberty de. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du XVIII siècle, contenant les négociations, traités, résolutions et autres documents authentiques concernant les affaires d'état. Tome sixième. La Haye, 1728.—41

The Case of the Merchants Trading to Russia. [s.l. s.a.].—61

Cavour C. Note adressée au comte Walewski et à lord Clarendon le 16 avril 1856.—6

Charles V. Constitution criminalis Carolina.—356

Constitution. 1848. [Paris, 1848.].—465


Correspondence, respecting Insults in China. Presented to the House of Commons by Command of Her Majesty, 1857. [London.] 1857.—221


Décret portant autorisation de la société anonyme formée à Paris sous la denomination de Société générale de Crédit Mobilier. 18 novembre-11 décembre 1852. In: Collection complète des lois, décrets, règlements et avis du conseil d’État. T. 52, Paris, 1852.—11, 12, 21

The Defensive Treaty concluded in the year 1770, betwixt His Late Majesty King William of ever Glorious Memory, and His Present Swedish Majesty King Charles the XII. Published at the earnest desire of several members of both Houses of Parliament [s.l. s.a.].—41, 56, 57, 63, 65-73, 92


Direction générale des douanes et des contributions indirectes. Tableau comparatif des principales marchandises importées pendant le mois de septembre des années 1856, 1855 et 1854. In: Le Moniteur universel. No. 302, 28 octobre 1856.—133

Direction générale des douanes et des contributions indirectes. In: Le Moniteur universel. No. 80, 21 mars 1858.—501

East India (Torture), London, 1855-57.—336

Eighth Annual Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor. 1854.—602

Eleventh Annual Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor. 1857.—602


Extraits de lettres confidentielles adressées au caïmacam de Moldavie par différents personnages politiques. In: L'Etoile du Danube, No. 50, 8 août 1857.—324-26


Ferdinand VII [Speech at the opening of the first session of the Cortes on July 9, 1820.] In: Davis, H. The War of Ormuzd and Ahriman in the Nineteenth Century. Baltimore, 1852.—623
— [Speech at the opening of the second session of the Cortes on March 1, 1821.] In: Martiiani, M. de. Historia política de la España moderna. Barcelona, 1849.—627
— [Message to the Cortes dated November 25, 1821.] Quoted from Revolution d'Espagne. Examen critique. 1820-1836. Paris, 1836.—628
— [Decree of September 30, 1823.]—624


Hausmann, G.-E. [Report to the Municipal Council of the Seine.] In: The Economist, No. 763, April 10, 1858. "Foreign Intelligence."—502-03

Hawkesbury, R. [Dispatch to A. Merry, dated June 10, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register, Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—491-92
— [Dispatch to A. Merry, dated August 28, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register, Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—495

Hendriks. [Report before the British Statistical Society on the Finances of India. 1858.] In: The Economist, No. 772, June 12, 1858. "The Indian Debt and Revenue."—577

[Horner, L.] "Report of Leonard Horner, Esq., Inspector of Factories, for the half year ended the 31st of October 1856." In: Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department for the half year ending 31st October 1856. London, 1857.—253

[Inglis, J. E. W.] From Brigadier Inglis, Commanding Garrison of Lucknow, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Calcutta. In: The Times, No. 22889, January 13, 1858. "The Siege of Lucknow."—437-41


Lettre adressée le 18 mai 1841, par le département des affaires étrangères, aux lords de l'amirauté, au sujet de la poursuite des bâtiments américains soupçonnés de se livrer à la traite.—572

Louis XVIII. [Speech in the Chamber of Deputies on November 30, 1821.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 335, 1 décembre 1821.—463

— Rapport à l’Empereur. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 281, 7 octobre 1856.—119, 122

Merry. A. [Dispatch to R. Hawkesbury, dated Paris, June 17, 1802.] In: Cobbett’s Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—492

Monthly Comparative Return of Paupers relieved in each month in each year [1857, 1858]. London.—521, 523

Napoléon I. [Conversation with Lord Whitworth, dated February 20, 1803.] In: Cobbett’s Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—497
— Correspondance de Napoléon Ier. In: Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 66, 70, 71, 73, 78; 7, 11, 12, 14, 19 mars 1858. “Variétés.”—472

Napoléon III. [Decree of September 22, 1857 for the prohibition of the export of corn, flour and other products.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 268, 25 septembre 1857. “Partie officielle.”—390
— [Decree of November 10, 1857, repealing the laws of September 8, 1856 and September 22, 1857.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 315, 11 novembre 1857.—391, 407
— [Decree on the appointment of Prince Jérôme President of the State Council, February 1, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 34, 3 février 1858.—457
— [Decree on the nomination of five Marshals, February 13, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 45, 14 février 1858.—466
— Loi relative à la création d’une dotation de l’armée, au reengagement, au remplacement et aux pensions militaires. 26-28 avril 1855.—569
— [Speech at the opening session of the Council-General of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry on April 7, 1850.] In: Discours et Messages de Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, Depuis son retour en France jusqu’à 2 décembre 1852. Paris, 1853.—304
— [Speech at the opening of the Corps législatif on January 18, 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 19, 19 janvier 1858. “Ouverture de la session législative de 1858”.—456


O’Donnell. [Proclamation of July 7, 1854, Manzanares.] In: Journal des Débats, 17 juillet 1854.—107

[Official Customs Returns of the movement of gold and silver in France during the year 1855.] In: The Economist, No. 683, September 27, 1856. “Foreign Correspondence”.—121
Otto, L. - G. [Note to R. Hawkesbury, dated August 17, 1802.] In: Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.].—495

Palmerston, H. J. T. [Dispatch to the British plenipotentiary at Hong-Kong, August 18, 1849.] In: The Times, No. 22616, February 28, 1857. Quoted from J. Graham's speech in the House of Commons, February 27, 1857.—217
— [Correspondence with McNeill in May-July 1838.] In: Correspondence Relating to Persia and Afghanistan. London [1839].—179


Péreire, I. Rapport présenté au nom du Conseil d'administration [29 avril 1858.] In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 120, 30 avril 1858.—551
— Rapport présenté par le conseil d'administration dans l'assemblée générale ordinaire et extraordinaire des actionnaires du 29 avril 1854. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 121, 1 mai 1854.—16, 357, 360
— Rapport présenté par le conseil d'administration dans l'assemblée générale ordinaire des actionnaires du 23 avril 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 117, 26 avril 1856.—9, 22, 23
— Rapport présenté par le conseil d'administration [de la Société générale du Crédit mobilier] dans l'assemblée générale ordinaire des actionnaires du 28 avril 1857. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 120, 30 avril 1857.—270, 272, 275

Persigny, F. Rapport à l'Empereur. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 172, 21 juin 1854.—18

[Petition from the Parish St. Mary in Jamaica.] In: The Times, No. 23023, June 18, 1858. “Parliamentary Intelligence.”—570


Projet de loi sur les sociétés en commandite par actions. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 153, 1 juin 1856.—15


— Le régiment de zouaves de la garde impériale. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 26, 26 janvier 1858. “Partie non officielle.”—457, 475


Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department for the Half Year ending 30th April 1856. London, 1857.—255

Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department for the Half Year ending 31st October 1856. London, 1857.—251, 252, 255

Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the Half Year ending 31st October 1857. London, 1857.—521
Return of Lunatic Asylums in England and Wales...; number of patients, etc. London, 1857-58.—604


Sebastiani, H. Rapport fait an Premier Consul. In: Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, No. 130, 10 pluviôse an 11 de la République (30 janvier 1803). "Interieur."—496

Several Grievances of the English Merchants in their trade into the Dominions of the King of Sweden, whereby it doth appear how dangerous it may be for the English Nation to depend (as now they do) on Sweden only, for the Supply of the Naval Stores; where they are subjected to so many and great grievances: when they might be amply furnished with the like stores, from the Dominions of the Emperor of Russia, if the English Trade thither was enlarged [s.l. s.a.].—61

Seymour M. [A letter to Yeh, Governor-General of two Kwangs Provinces, October 30, 1856]. In: The Times, No. 22567, January 2, 1857. "The Bombardment of Canton."—161

— [A letter to Yeh, Governor-General of the two Kwangs Provinces, November 2, 1856]. The Times, No. 22567, January 2, 1857. "The Bombardment of Canton."—159, 161, 162

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales au jeudi 11 septembre 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 256, 12 septembre 1856.—119

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales au jeudi 9 octobre 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 284, 10 octobre 1856.—119, 123

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales au jeudi 13 novembre 1856. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 319, 14 novembre 1856.—137

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales. In: Le Moniteur universel, Nos. 282, 317, 345, 9 octobre, 13 novembre, 11 décembre 1857.—415, 417

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 15, 15 janvier 1858.—459

Situation de la Banque de France et de ses succursales. In: Le Moniteur universel, No. 43, 12 février 1858.—459

Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor. 1852.—602

Traité conclu entre l'Angleterre et l'Espagne relativement à la traité des nègres, signé à Madrid le 23 Sept. 1817.—572

Traité de garantie entre l'Autriche, la France et la Grande-Bretagne, signé à Paris, le 15 avril 1856.—5

Traité de paix, signé à Paris, entre la France et chacune des puissances alliées, le 30 mai 1814; suivi d'articles additionnels distincts et speciaux avec l'Autriche, la Russie, la Grande-Bretagne et la Prusse, et d'articles secrets.—3
Traité signé à Londres, le 8 mai 1852, entre le Danemark d'une part, et l'Autriche, la France, la Grande-Bretagne, la Russie et la Suède de l'autre part, relatif à l'ordre de succession dans la monarchie danoise.—335

Traité supplémentaire entre S. M. la reine du Royaume-Uni de la Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande et l'empereur de Chine, signé à Houmon-Schai, le 8 octobre 1843.—158

Treaty between His Majesty and the Queen Regent of Spain, during the Minority of her Daughter, Donna Isabella the Second, Queen of Spain, for the Abolition of the Slave Trade.—Signed at Madrid, June 28, 1835.—572

Treaty between the Honorable East India Company and His Excellency the Nabob Vizier-ul-Momalik, Yemeen-Oo-Dowla, Nazim-ul-Moolk, Saadet Ali Khan Behauder, Mobauriz Jung, for ceding to the Company, in perpetual sovereignty, certain portions of His Excellency's territorial possessions, in commutation of the subsidy now payable to the Company by the Vizier.—10th November 1801.—535

Treaty between the Honorable East India Company and His Majesty Abdool Futteh Moeen-ood-Deen Nowshore-Wani-Audil Sultanee Zaman Mahammud Ali Shah, King of Oude,—11th September 1837.—536

Treaty of friendship and alliance between His Britannic Majesty and His Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII, Signed at Madrid the 5th day of July 1814. In the name of the most Holy Trinity.—572.


Treaty with the Nabob Vizier Saadet Ali Khan Behauder,—21st February 1798.—535

Walewski, A. [Despatch to the French Ambassador in London of January 20, 1858.] In: Le Constitutionnel, No. 41, 10 février 1858.—470


ANONYMOUS ARTICLES AND REPORTS
PUBLISHED IN PERIODIC EDITIONS

Cobbett's Annual Register. Vol. II. From July to December, 1802. London, 1810: Summary of Politics.—494

— Vol. III. From January to June, 1803. London [s.a.], No. 8, February 26, 1803: Trial of Mr. Peltier.—497; No. 9, March 5, 1803: Summary of Politics.—496
Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature

Le Constitutionnel, No. 108, 18 avril 1858: Affaire Simon Bernard.—Complicité dans l'attentat du 14 janvier.—516
— No. 158, 7 juin 1858: Bulletin hebdomadaire de la bourse de Paris.—568

The Economist, No. 683, September 27, 1856: “Foreign Correspondence”, “Exports from China”.—127
— No. 685, October 11, 1856: The Trade of India and China and the Drain of Silver.—127
— No. 690, November 15, 1856: Tea and Sugar Duties.—204
— No. 722, June 27, 1857: The trade of May and of five months.—403
— No. 727, August 1, 1857: Trade of the sixth month.—403
— No. 731, August 29, 1857: Trade and navigation returns.—403
— No. 741, November 7, 1857: Dates and Duration of Bank of England Minimum Rates of Discount from 1844.—386; Markets of the manufacturing districts. Manchester, Thursday Evening, Nov. 5.—389-90; The supply and consumption of wool.—427
— No. 744, November 28, 1857: Board of Trade returns.—403
— No. 749, January 2, 1858: The financial obligations of the East India Company.—444
— No. 750, January 9, 1858: Indian loans.—445
— No. 754, February 6, 1858: Paris, Thursday. “Foreign Correspondence.”.—461, 462
— No. 755, February 13, 1858: Paris, Thursday. “Foreign Correspondence.”.—462
— No. 756, February 20, 1858: Paris Thursday. “Foreign Correspondence.”.—500
— No. 760, March 20, 1858: Paris, Thursday. “Foreign Correspondence.”.—500-01
— No. 763, April 10, 1858: The French Alliance: its Character, its Value, and its Price.—517, 518; Paris, Thursday. “Foreign Correspondence”.—502
— No. 764, April 17, 1858: The Value and the Price of the French Alliance.—518-20
— No. 770, May 29, 1858: The Board of Trade tables.—560, 564

The Free Press, No. 20, November 11, 1857: Macclesfield, November 5th, 1857.—389, 390
— No. 26, December 23, 1857.—430-34
— No. 6, May 12, 1858: Extract from the Minutes of the Council of War, held at Aderbi; Confession of Bangya.—540-44

Gazette nationale, ou Le Moniteur universel, No. 173, 23 ventôse an 10 de la République française: Paris, le 22 ventôse. “Interieur.”.—490
— No. 320, 20 thermidor an 10 de la République française: Paris, le 19 thermidor. “Interieur.”.—494
— No. 162, 12 ventôse an 11 de la République: Paris, le 11 ventôse. “Interieur.”.—498

L'Indépendance belge, No. 65, 6 mars 1858: (Correspondance particulière de L'Indépendance belge.) Paris, 4 mars.—475
— No. 71, 12 mars 1858: La Patrie donne les détails suivants sur la tentative...— 475
— No. 86, 27 mars 1858: Le journal la Patrie publie... “Nouvelles de France.”— 483


The Leader, No. 333, August 9, 1856. “Continental Notes. Spain.”— 103

Le Moniteur universel, No. 69, 9 mars 1856. (“Paris, le 8 mars”).— 272
— No. 203, 21 juillet 1856. “Partie non officielle.”— 97
— No. 206, 24 juillet 1856. “Partie non officielle.”— 97
— No. 280, 6 octobre 1856. “Banque de France.”— 118
— No. 15, 15 janvier 1858: Paris, le 14 janvier. “Partie non officielle.”— 454, 455
— No. 68, 9 mars 1858: À Chalon-sur-Saône, dans la soirée...— 475, 478
— No. 71, 12 mars 1858: Paris, le 11 mars. “Partie non officielle.”— 500
— No. 86, 27 mars 1858: Voici en quels termes les principaux organes... “Nouvelles étrangères. Angleterre.”— 483
— No. 95-96, 5-6 avril 1858: Paris, le 5 avril. “Partie non officielle”.— 503
— No. 101, 11 avril 1858: Paris, le 10 avril. “Partie non officielle”.— 499

The Morning Advertiser, No. 20686, October 5, 1857: Our present position in India.— 372

The Morning Post, No. 25971, March 27, 1857: The circumstances which have marked the canvas of candidates throughout the country...— 238
— No. 26090, August 13, 1857: The incoming Indian mail...— 328
— No. 26168, November 12, 1857: The market for the English funds has fluctuated... “Money Market and City News.”— 388
— No. 26369, July 5, 1858. — 596

New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5343, June 5, 1858: The Oude Proclamation. The Correspondence between the Governor-General and the Commissioner of Oude.— 546

Punch, or the London Charivari, March 13, 1858: A Bad Look Out.— 472

The Times, No. 21021, January 26, 1852: If Louis Napoleon had proceeded to exercise with judgment...— 534
— No. 22381, May 30, 1856: We have had lately no lack of comparisons between England and France.— 8
— No. 22567, January 2, 1857: We are now in possession of the full accounts from China...— 163
— No. 22615, February 27, 1857: The Chinese controversy now raging in both Houses...— 211
— No. 22616, February 28, 1857: [Speeches in the House of Commons, February 27, 1857.]— 215
— No. 22620, March 5, 1857: Had it been possible to make an immediate appeal...— 217
— No. 22648, April 7, 1857: On what has the General Election turned?:— 247
— No. 22668, April 30, 1857: In Re Royal British Bank.— 268
— No. 22681, May 15, 1857: It has been remarked that in war a victory is...— 294
— No. 22719, June 29, 1857: The details of the Indian mutiny, as given by our correspondent...— 298
— No. 22728, July 9, 1857: The English people—a problem, as all philosophers call them.—301; “Money-Market and City Intelligence.”—301
— No. 22740, July 23, 1857: Such an event as this Indian Mutiny makes us understand...—315
— No. 22746, July 30, 1857: [Despatch from the British Vice-Consul at Trieste.] Alexandria, July 22. “India and China.”—316
— No. 22748, August 1, 1857: (From the Bombay Times of July 1.) “The Indian Mutinies.”—318, 319
— No. 22758, August 13, 1857: Indian intelligence is still...—343; “Latest Intelligence. (By submarine and British telegraph.) India and China.”—327
— No. 22763, August 19, 1857: [The letter from Tirhoot, dated June 26.] “The Indian Mutinies.”—355
— No. 22765, August 21, 1857: It is a very natural but...—333
— No. 22766, August 22, 1857: [From a letter of an Artillery officer, dated Peshawur, June 26.] “The Indian Mutinies.”—354
— No. 22777, September 4, 1857: [The letter from an officer employed on the Staff at Delhi.] “The Mutinies in India. Delhi.”—361
— No. 22789, September 18, 1857. Alexandria, Sept. 11. “India, China, and Australia.”—361
— No. 22798, September 29, 1857: Rear-Admiral at Malta to the Secretary of the Admiralty, London, Sept. 25, 6 p.m. “India.”—365
— No. 22800, October 1, 1857: [A letter of the Times special correspondent at Bombay of August 31, 1857.] “India.”—370
— No. 22803, October 5, 1857: [A letter from an officer of the Bengal Artillery of August 13, 1857.] “Delhi.”—370-71
— No. 22823, October 28, 1857: “India”; “India and China.”—376, 377
— No. 22824, October 29, 1857: “The Fall of Delhi.”—376, 377
— No. 22831, November 6, 1857: The Bank of England have today raised their charge... “Money-Market and City Intelligence.”—381
— No. 22839, November 16, 1857: “India.”—394
— No. 22848, November 26, 1857: The English funds opened this morning... “Money-Market and City Intelligence.”—400
— No. 22869, December 21, 1857: The favourable character of the Bank return caused the funds... “Money-Market and City Intelligence.”—426
— No. 22876, December 29, 1857: The Relief of Lucknow. "India."—423-24
— No. 22883, January 6, 1858: The quotation of gold at Paris is about 1½ per mille discount... “Money-Market and City Intelligence.”—445
— No. 22889, January 13, 1858: England has already been informed of how Lucknow was relieved...—437
— No. 2296, January 21, 1858: [Resolution proposed to a special general court of the East India Company. January 20.] “East India-House.”—586
— No. 22902, January 28, 1858: Cawnpore, Dec. 7; Calcutta, Dec. 24. “India.”—450
— No. 22906, February 2, 1858: Vienna, Jan. 29. “Austria.”—456
— No. 22954, March 30, 1858: [Telegram from the India-House.] “India”.—505-09
— No. 22959, April 5, 1858: Camp, Cawnpore, Feb. 27, 8 a.m. “The War in India”.—505-09
— No. 22963, April 9, 1858: [Telegram received at the India-House from Malta.] “India.”—505-09
— No. 22966, April 13, 1858: The Siege of Lucknow. “India and China.”—509
— No. 22971, April 19, 1858: Trial and acquittal of Simon Bernard. Sixth day. Central Criminal Court, April 17.—515
— No. 22973, April 21, 1858: Paris, Monday, April 19, 6 p.m. “France.”—515
— No. 22975, April 23, 1858: Paris, Wednesday, April 21, 6 p.m. “France.”—516
— No. 22988, May 8, 1858: On Monday it will be exactly a twelvemonth since...—531
— No. 23000, May 22, 1858: The Correspondence between the Governor-General and the Commissioner of Oude.—548, The late duel at Paris.—552
— No. 23008, June 1, 1858: [Telegram from our Malta Correspondent.] “India.”—554
— No. 23014, June 8, 1858: Paris, Sunday, June 6, 6 p.m. “Foreign Intelligence.”—569
— No. 23015, June 9, 1858: Paris, Monday, June 7, 6 p.m. “Foreign Intelligence.”—569
— No. 23016, June 10, 1858: In those sad days of Ireland’s history...—567
— No. 23017, June 11, 1858: There was a time within the memory...—567
— No. 23023, June 18, 1858: [Speech of Bishop of Oxford in the House of Lords on June 17, 1858.] “Parliamentary Intelligence.”—570
— No. 23032, June 29, 1858: Alexandria, June 23; From the India-House. “India”.—581
— No. 23036, July 3, 1858: Government of India (No. 3) Bill. “Parliamentary Intelligence.”—585
— No. 23037, July 5, 1858: Bombay, June 4. “India.”—582
— No. 23038, July 6, 1858: [Reprint from The Morning Post.]—596
INDEX OF PERIODICALS

Advertiser—see The Morning Advertiser

Allgemeine Zeitung—a conservative daily founded in 1798; from 1810 to 1882 it was published in Augsburg.—502

L'Ambigu, variétés atroces et amusantes, journal dans le genre égyptien—a French-language newspaper published in London three times a month from 1803 to 1818.—493

L'Assemblée nationale—a Legitimist daily published in Paris from 1848 to 1857.—116

The Bengal Gazette—see The Calcutta Gazette

The Bombay Courier—an English-language newspaper, organ of the East India Company, founded in 1790; under this title it was published till 1861.—376

The Bombay Gazette—an English-language daily published under this title from 1791 to 1914.—394

The Bombay Times—an English-language daily published under this title from 1838 to 1861.—318, 319

The Calcutta Gazette—an English-language newspaper published from 1784, official organ of the British Government.—362

Chronicle—see The Morning Chronicle

Le Constitutionnel—a daily published in Paris from 1815 to 1817 and from 1819 to 1870; the mouthpiece of the monarchist bourgeoisie (Thiers party) during the 1848 revolution; a Bonapartist newspaper after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—115, 467, 470, 478, 515, 516, 568

The Continental Review—a weekly published in London in 1858 and 1859.—480

Courrier Français de Londres.—493

Daily Courant—a newspaper published in London from 1702 to 1735.—49

The Daily News—a liberal newspaper of the British industrial bourgeoisie; published under this title in London from 1846 to 1930.—163, 343, 345, 373, 388, 516
Débats—see Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires


The Edinburgh Review, or Critical Journal—a liberal literary and political journal published in Edinburgh and London from 1802 to 1929; quarterly in the 1850s.—469

L’Etoile du Danube—a French-language liberal newspaper, published by Romanians in Brussels in 1856-57.—324-26

The Examiner—a liberal weekly published in London from 1808 to 1881.—247

Le Figaro—a conservative daily published in Paris since 1854 as a continuation of Figaro, Journal nonpolitique that appeared in 1826-33; in the 1850s it took a Bonapartist stand.—552

The Free Press. Journal of the Foreign Affairs Committees—a journal on questions of foreign policy, opposed to the Palmerston government; it was published by David Urquhart and his supporters in London from 1855 to 1865 (weekly till April 1858 and then monthly); it was renamed Diplomatic Review in 1866; it printed several works by Marx.—71, 389, 390, 425, 430, 540, 541

The Friend of China—see The Overland Friend of China

The Friend of India—an English newspaper founded in Serampore (Bengal) in 1818; in the 1850s it appeared once weekly and was liberal in policy.—374, 376

Gaceta de Madrid—a Spanish newspaper founded in 1661, official organ of the government.—100, 286

Gazette nationale ou Moniteur universel—see Le Moniteur universel

The Globe and Traveller—a daily published in London from 1803 to 1921; mouthpiece of the Whigs until 1866, and later of the Conservatives.—388, 443

Hamburger Correspondent—see Staats- und Gelehrten-Zeitung des Hamburgischen unpartheyischen Correspondenten

L’Indépendance belge. Journal mondial d’informations politiques et littéraires—a liberal daily founded in Brussels in 1831.—137, 475, 476, 483

Journal de Madrid—a newspaper published in Madrid in 1855 and 1856.—103

Journal des Chemins de Fer, des Mines et des Travaux Publics—a bourgeois daily published in Paris from 1842.—132

Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires—a daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1944; organ of the moderate Orleanist opposition after the coup d’état of December 2, 1851.—15, 99, 101, 107, 456, 467

The Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology—a quarterly published by doctor Forbes Winslow in London from 1848 to 1864; after some interval it appeared till 1883.—599

The Leader—a liberal weekly published in London from March 1850 to June 1860.—103
The Manchester Guardian—a daily founded in 1821, a newspaper of the Free Traders, and from the mid-nineteenth century of the Liberal Party.—240, 589

Military Spectator—a weekly published in London in 1857 and 1858.—374

The Mofussilite—an English-language weekly published in India; under this name it appeared from 1845 to the mid-1870s first in Meerut, then in Agra and Ambala.—346

Le Moniteur universel—a daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1901 (under this name from 1811); from 1799 to 1869 it was an official government newspaper.—15-16, 18, 22, 23, 97, 118, 119, 122, 123, 130, 131, 133, 272, 273, 275, 276, 391, 413-15, 417, 454-57, 459, 463, 466, 472-75, 477, 478, 480, 482, 483, 490, 491, 493-501, 503, 516, 550, 551

The Morning Advertiser—a daily published in London from 1794 to 1934; in the 1850s it was a newspaper of the radical bourgeoisie.—249-50, 372, 596

The Morning Chronicle—a daily published in London from 1770 to 1862; organ of the Whigs in the 1840s, of the Peelites in the early 1850s, and later of the Conservatives.—388

The Morning Herald—a conservative daily published in London from 1780 to 1869.—104, 388

The Morning Post—a conservative daily published in London from 1772 to 1937; in the mid-nineteenth century it was the mouthpiece of the Right wing of the Whig Party grouped round Palmerston.—238, 247, 317, 328, 388, 596

Die Neue Zeit. Organ der Demokratie—a newspaper of German émigré workers published in London from June 1858 to April 1859.—589

New-York Daily Tribune—a newspaper founded by Horace Greeley in 1841 and published until 1924; till the mid-1850s it was the mouthpiece of the Left wing of the American Whigs, then of the Republican Party; in the 1840s and 1850s it voiced progressive views and opposed slavery. Marx and Engels contributed to it from August 1851 to March 1862.—3-7, 10-12, 106, 107, 122, 151-55, 168, 207, 324, 360, 384, 541, 546

The New-York Herald—a daily newspaper of the Republican Party published from 1835 to 1924.—517

The North British Daily Mail—a Scottish newspaper founded in Glasgow in 1847, organ of the liberal bourgeoisie.—401

L'Opinione—an Italian daily founded in Turin in 1848; organ of Cavour's liberal monarchist party.—416

The Overland Friend of China—an English official newspaper published in Victoria (Hong Kong) from 1842 to 1859.—209

La Patrie—a daily published in Paris from 1841 to 1866; in 1850 it voiced the views of the Party of Order; after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851 it took a Bonapartist stand.—475, 516, 517, 520, 568

Le Pays. Journal de l'Empire—a daily founded in Paris in 1849, semi-official newspaper of Napoleon III's government from 1852 to 1870.—320
Pester Lloyd—a German-language liberal newspaper, semi-official organ of the Hungarian Government; it was published in Budapest twice a day from 1853 to 1944.—236

Le Phare de la Loire—a French daily published in Nantes from 1815.—456

The Phoenix—an English-language newspaper published in Calcutta from 1856 to 1861.—446

Le Pouvoir—a Bonapartist daily founded in Paris in 1849; it was published under this title in 1850 and 1851.—516

The Press—a Tory weekly published in London from 1853 to 1866.—247, 320

La Presse—a daily published in Paris in 1836-66; in the 1850s opposed the Second Empire, later organ of the Bonapartists.—102, 131

Punch, or the London Charivari—a comic weekly, liberal in policy; founded in London in 1841.—220, 472

Le Siècle—a daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1939; in the 1840s it voiced the views of that section of the petty bourgeoisie that demanded moderate constitutional reforms; in the 1850s it was a moderate republican newspaper.—551

The Somerset County Gazette—a weekly founded in Taunton (Somerset, England) in 1836.—596

Somerset Gazette—see The Somerset County Gazette

Le Spectateur—the title under which the newspaper L'Assemblée nationale was published from September 1857 to January 1858.—456

Staats- und Gelehrten-Zeitung des Hamburgischen unpartheyischen Correspondenten—a monarchist daily published in Hamburg from 1814 to 1869.—498

The Standard—a conservative daily founded in London in 1827.—388

The Sun—a liberal daily published in London from 1798 to 1876.—249


The True Briton—a daily founded in London in 1792; in the early nineteenth century it was close to the government circles.—494

L'Union—a monarchist-clerical newspaper published under this title in Paris from 1848 to 1869.—568

L'Univers religieux, philosophique, politique, scientifique et littéraire—a clerical newspaper published in Paris from 1833 to 1860; in the 1850s it supported Napoleon III.—483, 515, 516, 551, 568

La Voix du Proscrit—a weekly of the Central Committee of European Democracy published under this title in Saint-Amand (France) from October 1850 to September 1851.—467
SUBJECT INDEX

Afghanistan, Afghans—177-80, 194-96, 278, 293, 295
Albania, Albanians (Arnauts)—144, 279
Algeria—170, 355, 583
America—120, 121, 124-26, 135, 561, 615
See also California; Canada; United States of America
Analogy—186-87
Ancient Rome—138, 155, 356, 485
—its wars—142, 148
Anglo-Afghan war, 1838-42—180, 364, 505, 588
Anglo-Persian war, 1856-57—177, 180, 194, 198-99, 212, 278-80, 293, 296, 298, 331, 588
Anglo-Sikh war, 1845-46—532
Annexation—311-12, 536, 538, 587, 588
Anti-colonial struggle—281, 298, 341, 441
Anti-Corn Law League—186, 230, 239-41, 250, 469
Arabs—121
Armenia—197, 615
—Austrian—107
—Persian—278-80
—Russian—172, 197-98, 262-65, 450
—Spanish—101-02, 104, 107, 108, 171
—Turkish—278, 280
See also Cavalry; Infantry; Navy
Asia—124-26, 129, 283, 295-96, 298, 546, 579, 587, 615
See also Afghanistan; Asia Minor; China; India; Manchuria; Persia (Iran); Turkey
Asia Minor—141
Astrakhan—197-98
Australia—120, 124, 128, 387, 402, 408, 444, 523, 561
Austria—142-43, 150
—in Middle Ages—153, 155-56
—and Napoleonic wars—169-70, 616
—foreign trade—139-50, 615-16
—finances—120, 121, 137
—and Italian states—3-7, 139, 148, 474-75, 480, 533, 616
—and Galicia, suppression by—568
—foreign policy and diplomacy—192, 296, 322-24, 569, 616
Subject Index

--- and France---116, 139, 146, 474-75, 480, 568, 569, 615-16
--- and Russia---6, 323-24, 568
--- and Switzerland---173
--- and Turkey---141, 147, 322-23
See also Army---Austrian; Austro-Italian war, 1848-49; Austro-Swiss wars, 14th cent. 
Austro-Italian war, 1848-49---5, 533
Austro-Swiss wars, 14th cent.---167

B

Balance of trade---124-29, 415

Banks
--- reserve fund---110, 118, 120, 123-24, 132, 185, 379-82, 402, 460-61
--- and money circulation---379-83, 415, 460
--- and rate of discount---117, 123, 130, 186, 379, 381, 401, 446
--- and railways---21, 23, 120, 132, 135, 274-76, 360, 417-18, 461, 502
--- and the state---16, 454, 461, 551
--- and economic crises---110-38, 379-80, 400-18, 459-63
--- commercial---20-21
See also Bank legislation; Bank of England; Bank of France; Crédit Mobilier; Royal British Bank

Bank legislation---379-83, 385, 389


Belgium---4, 120, 184, 415, 441, 480, 561

Beloochistan---197

Bengal---298, 305-06, 308, 312, 316, 329, 355, 420, 547, 555

Bill of exchange---119, 123

Bimetallism---119-22, 459-60

Bonapartism---5, 14, 453-58, 464-67, 480, 482, 517, 519, 550-52, 568-69, 574
See also France. Second Empire

Bourgeoisie---102, 241, 567
--- Dutch---418
--- English---188-89, 202, 203, 229-30, 241-42, 252, 253, 513, 567
--- French---289, 291, 454, 456, 465, 481
--- German---116, 418
--- Italian---7
--- Spanish---102, 105, 107, 625, 629
--- Swiss---418

Bourse, Stock Exchange---302
--- as centre of speculation and corruption---15, 109, 276, 454, 501
--- and interests of stockjobbers---511-12
--- and the state---502

Brandenburg---153-57

Bulgaria---76

Burgundy, Burgundian lands---152, 167

Burma---529

Byzantium---75, 76, 80, 356, 615

C

California---120, 124

Canada---444

Carbonari---468, 474

Carinthia---149, 616

Caucasus, Caucasians---171, 178, 196-97, 237, 539-40, 544-45

Causality---107, 116, 117, 141, 453-54, 486

Cavalry---168, 264-65, 583

Child labour---252, 254, 261, 524-26

China---278, 282-83
--- foreign trade---122, 126-28, 163, 204, 223-25, 234-35, 444, 561
--- social and political system---225, 278, 282-83
--- as object of colonial expansion by capitalist states---126, 163, 223, 234-35, 280-81
--- opium trade---126-27, 219-220, 224, 234-35, 243
— emigration—234-35, 280-82
See also Opium wars; Taiping uprising in China, 1850-64

Church
— Greek—81, 86
Civilisation—454, 530, 621
“Civil society”—185, 190, 534
Class(es), class struggle—8, 15, 102, 114-15, 134, 202, 231, 254, 302, 454, 465, 486
See also Bourgeoisie; Revolution; Society; Working class

Community
— Indian—547-48
— Greco-Slav tribes—191

Constantinople—76, 141

Constitution, constitutional government—181-84

Content and form—190, 485

Corn Laws (England)—201-03, 222, 248, 387-88, 408-09, 469
See also Anti-Corn Law League


Crimean war, 1853-56—114, 121, 130, 134, 182-84, 185, 190, 213
— battle of Oltenitz, November 4, 1853—279
— military operations in the Caucasus—279-80
— capture of Kars by Russian troops, 1855—214, 279
— military operations in the Crimea, 1854-56—294, 447
— battle on the Alma, September 20, 1854—424, 447, 483
— battle of Balaklava, October 25, 1854—393, 424, 447, 451
— battle of Inkermann, November 5, 1854—198, 392, 393, 424, 483
— defence of Sevastopol, 1854-55—214, 392, 393, 441, 447-49, 483
— its results, Paris Peace Treaty of 1856—3-6, 114, 214, 322
— and Austria—6-7
— and Germany—116
— and Italian states—6-7
— and Piedmont—3
See also Eastern question

Croatia—616
Cuba—235, 573
Customs—156, 621
Customs Union (Germany, 1834-71)—390, 415, 416

D

Dalmatia—144, 147-49, 615-16
Danzig—406, 407, 441

Danubian principalities—62, 191, 322-24

Deism—109


Denmark—41, 42, 56, 94-95, 334, 405-06, 412, 565
See also Schleswig-Holstein question

Despotism—4, 14, 102, 482

Development—19, 102, 115, 125, 141, 259

Discount of Bills—119-21

E

East India Company (British)—61, 126, 128, 194, 297, 311, 349-51, 443-46, 534-37, 579, 585-88

Eastern question, the—182, 183, 190-91, 322-24
See also Danubian principalities

Economic crises
— and condition of the working people—132-35
— and prospects for development of socialist movement and of revolution—113-15, 383-84
— prediction of—113-14, 383, 385-91, 411, 414-16
— periodic nature of—401
— depression—416-17
— and trade—124, 400-03, 411, 414-18
— and market situation—117-22, 130-31
— crises of world market—113, 390
— industrial—113, 390, 401, 411
— commercial—20, 109, 113, 124, 400-03
— crisis of 1825—109, 113, 126
— crisis of 1837—109, 113, 126
— crisis of 1846-47—109, 113, 117, 125, 126, 302, 383, 386, 390
— crisis of 1857-58 in Germany—113-18, 404-07
Economic laws—256
Economy and politics—135, 185-86, 188-89, 202-05, 303-04, 463, 485-86
Egypt—140-42, 296, 561, 615
Emigration—234-35, 490, 493, 495, 539-40, 545
England (Great Britain)—186, 250, 251
— in 17th cent.—63
— in 18th cent.—68
— in the first half of 19th cent. (before 1848)—186, 220, 222, 248, 386-87, 389, 468
— in the 1850s (from 1849)—204, 211-14, 221-22, 226, 238-42, 247-50, 255, 468, 566, 567
— Coalition Cabinet of All the Talents (1853-55)—203, 213, 248
— Bonapartist methods in Palmerston’s policy—204, 213-14, 221, 222, 226-28, 238-40, 248, 250, 468, 517, 519, 567, 587
— industry—255-61, 430
— foreign trade—58-64, 221, 383, 425-33, 521-24, 560-65
— trade with Asia (Turkey, India, China)—125, 126, 142, 220, 383, 407-08
— and slave trade—219, 570-74
— finances—201-06, 211, 469, 510-13, 575-79
— aristocracy—188, 202, 203, 469, 548, 567
— social and political system—8, 61-62, 184, 188-89, 203, 239-40, 248, 266-67, 269, 302, 468, 516, 523, 566-67
— bourgeois society, its morals—214-16, 235, 516, 548, 597-602, 604
— pauperism—205-06, 523-24, 602, 604
— Peelites—204, 214, 247-50
— Liberals—470
— disintegration of the ruling parties (the 1850s-60s)—213-14, 240, 248-50, 302, 567
— Radicals—567
— electoral system, reform of 1832—186, 188, 212, 214, 226, 229, 238-42, 247-49, 469, 567
— law on the emancipation of Catholics (1829)—468-69
— colonial policy—178-80, 196-99, 217-18, 221, 281-82, 293-97, 311, 351, 352, 536, 538, 579, 587, 588; see also Anglo-Afghan war, 1838-42; Anglo-Persian war, 1856-57; Anglo-Sikh war, 1845-46; East India Company (British); Indian national uprising of 1857-59; Opium wars;
— foreign policy before 19th cent.—30, 32-35, 38-41, 56-57, 92
— and Denmark—94
— and France—32-33
— and the Netherlands—64-65
— and Russia—30, 32-35, 56-69, 92-96, 187
— and Sweden—38-40, 56-61, 92-96
— foreign policy in 19th cent.—6, 178-80, 188, 204-05, 214, 254, 302, 333, 351-52, 510, 533, 570-74
— and Austria—198
— and Russia—178-80, 187, 190-93, 281-82, 610
— and Spain—57
— and the USA—141, 214, 570-72
See also Anti-Corn Law League;
Army—British; Bank of England; Bourgeoisie—English; Corn Laws (England); Economic crises—crisis of 1857-58 in England; Factory legislation; Free Trade; “Glorious revolution” in England, 1688; Habeas Corpus Act; Joint-stock companies—in England; Peace Society (England, from 1816); “Poor Laws”; Royal British Bank; Tories (England); Whigs (England); Working class—in England; Workhouses
Epoch—21, 125-26, 488
Essence and phenomenon—257, 401
Europe
— origin and development of European peoples—75, 76
— in 15-16th cent.—80
— economic and political characteristics of 19th-century Europe—4, 10, 120, 125-26, 135, 226
— prospects of revolution in the 1850s—567-68
See also Economic crises; Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe; Slavs

F
Factory, factory system—251-61
Factory legislation—251-54
Female labour—254
Foreign policy—5
Foreign trade—122-29, 139-50, 425
Fortification—392-98, 435-36, 441, 527-29
Fourierism—21
France—75, 143, 152, 185, 190, 202, 453, 464-65
— economy—122, 130-35, 413
— during absolutism (17th-18th cent.)—14, 109, 116, 492
— constitutional monarchy, 1789-92—621-22
— during Consulate and First Empire—145-47, 464-65
— during the Restoration—463, 465, 629-30
— July 1830 Revolution and July monarchy—114, 184, 187, 289-92, 302, 464-65, 472-73, 482, 533-34, 621-22
— peasantry—133-34, 463, 465, 482
— and Austria—116, 190, 474-75, 480, 568
— and Belgium—4-5, 480
— and Denmark—498
— and England—187, 190, 457-58, 468, 470-71, 482-84, 490-98, 515-20, 573-74
— and Germany—152, 498
— and Italy—4-6, 480
— and Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (Naples)—190
— and Prussia—190
— and Romania—323
— and Russia—187, 190, 323, 484
— and Spain—98-99, 190, 353
— and Switzerland—479-80
See also Bank of France; Bourgeoisie—French; Crédit Mobilier; Economic crises—crisis of 1857-58 in France; French Revolution, end of 18th cent.; Joint-stock companies—in France; Napoleonic wars; Revolution of 1848 in France. Second Republic; Society of December 10; Wars of First French Republic (late 18th-early 19th cent.)

— coup d'état of December 2, 1851—110, 222, 226-27, 290, 453-57, 465, 488
— industry, railways, agriculture—20-21, 23, 120, 122, 124, 132-34, 136-37, 460-61, 463, 502, 551
— corruption of ruling circles—14-15, 501
— character of political power—4, 464-65, 482, 499, 517
— army as bulwark of Bonapartist regime—457, 464-66, 482-84, 568, 569
— the press—135, 137, 455-56, 467, 499, 515, 516, 552, 568-69
— Corps Légitimist—16, 213, 291
— bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie—454, 456, 480
— growth of opposition in society and army—134-35, 472, 475, 478, 552
Free Trade, Free Traders—185, 201-03, 228-30, 228-41, 248, 250, 387-88
See also Anti-Corn Law League; Corn Laws (England); England (Great Britain)—Radicals
French Revolution, end of 18th cent.—167-68, 185, 186, 188, 353, 465, 531, 574, 621-22, 626

G

Galicia—568
Genoa, Genoese—3, 64, 95, 141, 148, 430, 615
Germany—75
— in 18th cent.—42
— and July 1830 Revolution in France—116
— fragmentation of country—116
— economy—113-18, 136, 404-08
— foreign policy—3, 153
See also Bourgeoisie—German; Brandenburg; Customs Union (Germany, 1834-71); Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (962-1806); Prussia; Joint-stock companies—in Germany; Reformation in Germany; Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany; Westphalia
Gibraltar—142, 564

“Glorious revolution” in England, 1688—61, 189-90

Gold and silver
— as money—406
— history of their circulation—119-29
— importance of discovery of gold in Australia and America—120, 124-25, 128-29
— as reserve fund—120-21
— as articles of luxury—120-21
— and foreign trade—119-29, 379, 383-91, 400-18
— and crises—117-25, 130, 379-91, 400-18, 459-63

Golden Horde, 13th-15th cent.—78-82, 85, 92
See also Tartar-Mongol yoke

Greece—142, 144, 191

H

Habeas Corpus Act—222
Hamburg—404-07
Hanse towns—63, 414, 415
Heracl—177, 179, 180, 194-99
Historians, historiography—40, 57, 58, 80, 91-92, 485-86
History—40, 75-76, 115, 468
Holland—see Netherlands, the Holy Alliance—3
Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (962-1806)—152-53
Hong-Kong—158, 208, 217-18, 221, 281, 283, 564
Humanism—209, 211, 531, 548
Hungary—75, 77
Hussite movement—155

I

Illyria—146, 148, 616
India—125, 297, 312, 575
— population, nationalities, castes—297, 306, 420, 423, 532, 582-83
— before English conquest—179
— British colonial occupation of Indian territory—300, 311-13, 423, 549, 587-88
— Punjab, occupation of, by the British—297, 299, 306, 313
— annexation of Oude—297, 299, 311, 331, 531, 534-38, 549, 588, 608-10
— religion, religious discord—297-98, 356, 363, 587, 610
— colonial subjugation by Britain, conversion into market—311-12, 349-56, 407-08
— peasants, exploitation of—353, 546-49, 575
— trade, money system, finances—122, 126, 128-29, 352, 444-46, 575-79
— British administration (methods, character)—232, 296-300, 311-13, 336-41, 354, 585-88
— British armed forces in India, use of the Sepoy army—198-99, 297-98, 315-16, 420-21, 532, 583, 610

See also Anglo-Sikh war, 1845-46; Annexation; Bengal; Community—Indian; Delhi; East India Company (British); Indian national uprising of 1857-59

Indian national uprising of 1857-59
— its liberation and anti-colonial character—298, 316, 328-29, 341, 354-56, 366, 441, 549, 553-55, 607-11
— its causes—296, 298, 311-13, 336-41, 356, 538, 548
— and native population of India—307, 329, 423, 445, 504, 532, 534, 549
— and Sikhs—315, 420, 532, 609-10
— siege and capture of, Delhi by the British; see Delhi
— plunder and atrocities by English soldiers—354-55, 437, 529-31, 556-58, 608-10
— causes of defeat—305, 375, 392-94, 399, 422, 423, 438-40, 527-29
— and economic and political situation of England—301, 443-46
— and English people—308, 349, 587
— results of—331-32, 356

Industry
— textile—255-61

Infantry—167, 450-51

Inquisition—106

Ireland—5, 257, 469, 512

"Irony of History"—15, 209, 250, 552

Islam—153, 179, 363, 610

Italy
— history (before 19th cent.)—3, 5, 83, 153, 566, 615-16
— insurrection of 1831—474, 488
— economy—121, 404, 415, 416, 561, 615-16
— national movement in the 1850s—6-7, 304, 474-75; 568
See also Austro-Italian war, 1848-49; Bourgeoisie—Italian; Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont); Mazzinism; Mazzinists; Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states; Working class—in Italy

J

Joint-stock companies
— activity of—10-13, 15-16, 22-23, 110-13
— management of—110-11, 267-69
— and railways—124, 136-37
— and the state—11, 20
— and competition among them—131-32
— in England—110-12, 267
— in France—132, 501, 502
— in Germany—136
See also Banks; Crédit Mobilier; East India Company (British)

Journalism, journalists—552, 596
K

Kabul—177, 195-96
Kamchatka—225
Kazan, Khanate of Kazan (1438—1552)—85, 82
Khanate of Crimea—81, 82
Kiev, Kievan Rus, empire of the Ruriks—76-77, 86
Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont)—3-7
Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (Naples)—122, 190, 561
Knights—80, 153, 167
Kurds—278
Kurile Islands—225

L

Lancashire—253, 254, 256, 257
Law—533, 536, 538, 546-48
Lithuania, Lithuanians—76-77, 79-80, 84-86, 88
Livonia—75, 77, 80
Loans (state)—124, 134
Lombardy—3, 7, 533

M

Machiavellism—62, 80, 84
Malta—564
Manchester School—see Free Trade
Manchuria—283
Market price—120
Mazzinism, Mazzinists—115, 129, 485-89
Merchant fleet and navigation—141-42, 144-46, 560, 565
See also Fortification
Moldavia—322-24
Money
— as means of circulation—406
— metallic—124-29, 406
See also Bill of exchange; Gold and silver: Money circulation; Money market
Money circulation—117-29, 379-83, 406, 415, 459-60
Money market—117-22, 130-31, 133, 136-37, 429
Morals—115
Moscow, principality of Moscow—77-87, 89-93, 198

N

Napoleonic wars—107, 114, 139, 145-47, 148, 169, 171, 353, 424, 441, 490, 615, 616
Nationality, nation—152, 209, 621
Navigation—61, 62, 146, 147
See also Merchant fleet and navigation
Navy—145-50
Netherlands, the—63-65, 120, 128, 141, 415-16, 418, 430, 522
See also Bourgeoisie—Dutch
New Orleans—197
New York—460
Nijni Novgorod—225
Nogay Tartars' Horde—81, 82
Normans, Norman conquests—75-77
Northern war, 1700-21—41-43, 57, 65, 89, 91-92
Norway—334, 405-06, 565
Novgorod, feudal republic of Novgorod, 12th-15th cent.—82-84

O

Odessa—140, 616
Opium wars
— colonial, predatory character of—126, 163, 219-20, 223, 243, 245, 353-54, 587, 588
— Anglo-Chinese war, 1840-42—126, 163, 220, 234-35, 243-46, 278, 280-81, 353-54
— Nanking treaties, 1842 and 1843—158, 162, 163, 208, 220, 245
Opposites, antagonism—8, 178, 254, 302, 464, 465
Papacy—5
Paris—114, 503
Parliament (in bourgeois state)—239, 310
— English—209, 213-14, 222, 239, 247, 309, 468, 566, 567, 587
Peace Society (England, from 1816)—209
Persia (Iran)—177-78, 278-81
— as object of British colonial expansion—178-80, 194-99, 278-80, 293-96
— and Afghanistan—177-80, 194-98, 294, 295
— and France—278, 296
— and Russia—178, 180, 195-97, 278, 296
See also Anglo-Persian war, 1856-57; Army—Persian; Islam; Kurds
Peru—126, 235, 561
Petersburg—88-91
Poland
— before 19th cent.—35, 41, 76-77, 80, 84, 153, 154, 156, 157, 187
— in 19th cent.—90, 193, 486, 533
See also Pomerania; Poznan; Russia (Russian Empire)—Tsarist policy in Poland, 18th-19th cent.; Silesia
Politics—114-15, 189-91, 485
Pomerania—153, 154
“Poor Laws”—61
Poznan (Poznan)—154
Prerequisites—150, 160, 205, 313, 577, 581
Press, the—185, 220-21, 230, 234, 240, 249-50, 328, 356, 493, 596-97, 623
Prevision—113-14, 182, 184, 383-91, 411, 416-17, 518
Private property—114, 531, 550-51
Productive forces—102, 141, 408
Prussia—41, 96, 151-57, 187, 190, 322-23, 568
See also Warsaw Conference of Austria, Prussia and Russia, 1850

R
Race—297, 621
Railways—20, 23, 120, 124, 137, 274-76, 360, 417-18
Rate of interest—117-18, 123, 379, 381, 382
See also Banks—and rate of discount
Reformation in Germany—155-56
Reserve capital (bank)—110, 118, 123, 132, 379-82, 402, 459-60
See also Banks—reserve fund
Revolution (general)—114-15, 185, 302
Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany—114
Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states—4-7, 193, 485, 533
Revolutions of 1848-49 in Europe—4, 62, 102, 113-15, 181-84, 193, 301-02, 420, 625
Rhine Province—154
Romania, Romanians—192, 323-24
Royal British Bank—109-12, 266-69
Russia (Russian Empire)—74, 88, 91-92, 183-84, 224-25
— history—74-96, 169-70
— economy—57-61, 63, 121, 223-25, 415, 565, 616
— foreign and colonial policy of Tsarism, its diplomacy—6, 28-29, 32-35, 38-42, 64, 75, 85-89, 157, 186-87, 190-91, 199, 223, 323
— Patriotic war of 1812—424
— and Far East—223-25, 282-83
— and Central Asia—195-99
— Tsarist policy in Poland, 18th-19th cent.—84, 90, 157, 187, 486, 533
— and Austria—6, 144, 323, 568
— and England—38-41, 56-58, 92-96, 190, 193, 402, 610
— and France—187, 190
— and the Netherlands—64
— and Persia—91, 179, 196-97, 296
— and Sweden—42, 57, 61, 63, 89, 91-92, 94-96
— and Turkey—89, 91, 96, 190-91
— foreign policy and diplomacy in the 1850s-60s—6, 323
See also Army—Russian; Crimean war, 1853-56; Golden Horde; Kazan.
Khanate of Kazan; Khanate of Crimea; Kiev, Kievan Rus, empire of the Ruriks; Moscow, principality of Moscow; Northern war, 1700-21; Novgorod, feudal republic of Novgorod, 12th-15th cent.; Russo-Persian war, 1826-28; Russo-Turkish wars; Tartar-Mongol yoke; Tver, principality of Tver, 13th-15th cent.

Russo-Persian war, 1826-28—178, 196
Russo-Turkish wars, 1686-99, 1710-13, 1735-39, 1776-84—21, 33-34, 89, 91
Russo-Turkish wars, 1806-12 and 1828-29—192, 278-80

Scandinavia—304, 334
Schleswig-Holstein question—114, 334-35
Scotland—78
Secret societies—114, 129, 623, 629-30
Serbia, Serbs—191
Silesia—154
Slave trade—219, 235, 570-74
Slaves—76-77, 153, 191-92
Society—465, 485, 566
— bourgeois—8, 102, 302, 602
— feudal—621
Society of December 10—14, 353, 457
Sophistry—227
Spain—99, 102, 104, 106-08, 132, 172, 404, 561, 572-73
— during the Arab domination and Reconquest (8th-15th cent.)—81, 104
— first Spanish revolution of 1808-14 and struggle against Napoleonic rule—106, 171, 353, 441, 622-24
— Second Spanish revolution, 1820-23—99, 106, 621-30
— first Carlist war, 1833-40—104, 106, 107, 172
— third Spanish revolution, 1834-43—98-100, 106, 284, 629
— fourth Spanish revolution, 1854-56—97-108, 284-88, 304, 622
— Spanish colonial empire, colonial policy—572-74
— and England—561, 572-73
— and France—98-99, 132, 190, 441
See also Army—Spanish; Bourgeoisie—Spanish; War of Spanish Succession, 1701-14
State, the—152, 465, 482, 485, 546, 566
See also Despotism
State property of land
— precapitalist forms of—546-47
"State socialism", Bonapartist (imperial)
"socialism"—8, 11, 15, 24, 110, 405
St. Simonism, St. Simonists—15, 20, 110
Suez Canal—63, 142, 144
Sweden
— in 17th-18th cent.—41-43, 56-61, 63-65, 157
— and movement for the Scandinavian union, 19th cent.—334
— economy—405-06, 412
— and Denmark—41-42
— and England—41-42, 56-59, 61, 63-65, 92-93
— and the Netherlands—63-65
— and Prussia—41, 157
— and Russia—41-43, 56-60, 77, 91
See also Northern war, 1700-21
Switzerland
— natural conditions—164-69, 173-76
— in Middle Ages—152, 164-67
— and French Revolution (end of 18th cent.)—167-69, 172
— war against Sonderbund, 1847—117
— economy—415
— conflict with Prussia over Neuchâtel—151-52, 157
— and France—415-16, 418, 479-80

Taiping uprising in China, 1850-64—126, 129, 163, 224, 246, 282-83
Tartars—88, 89
Tartars, Crimean—see Khanate of Crimea
Tartars, Nogay.—see Nogay Tartars' Horde

Tartar-Mongol yoke, liberation from — 77-87, 91, 92
See also Golden Horde

Taxes, taxation — 201-06, 546-47

Teutonic Order, the — 155

Theocracy — 5, 482

Thirty Years' War, 1618-48 — 156

Tories (England) — 213-14, 239-41, 247-49, 302, 468-71, 548, 567

Trade — 57-62, 102, 123-29, 140-42, 144, 413-18, 560-65, 615-16

Traditions — 150, 178, 241, 366

Tribe(s) — 178, 297

Trieste — 139-43, 144, 149, 615-18

Turkey — 76, 89, 91, 140, 141, 144, 147, 190-91, 279-80, 322-26, 615
See also Eastern question, the; Russo-Turkish wars

Tver, principality of Tver, 13th-15th cent. — 79, 85

Tyrol — 171

U

United States of America — 140
— war of independence, 1775-83 — 30, 35
— economy — 125, 387, 401, 408, 414, 415, 521-23, 560, 563-65

V

Varangians — see Normans, Norman conquests

Vienna Congress of 1814-15 and Vienna treaties of 1815 — 139, 151, 152, 157

Venice — 3, 64, 139-41, 144-46, 148, 149, 430, 615-18

W

War of Austrian Succession, 1740-48 — 3

War of Spanish Succession, 1701-14 — 3, 41, 157, 187

War(s) — 441
— in feudal society — 152-53
— mountain warfare — 166-76
— national, popular — 281-82, 353
— guerrilla — 580, 583, 607-10
See also Ancient Rome — its wars; Anglo-Afghan war, 1838-42; Anglo-Persian war, 1856-57; Anglo-Sikh war, 1845-46; Army; Austro-Italian war, 1848-49; Austro-Swiss wars, 14th cent.; Military science; Napoleonic wars; Northern war, 1700-21; Opium wars; Thirty Years' War, 1618-48; War of Austrian Succession, 1740-48; War of Spanish Succession, 1701-14; Wars of First French Republic (late 18th-early 19th cent.)

Warsaw Conference of Austria, Prussia and Russia, 1850 — 323

Wars of First French Republic (late 18th-early 19th cent.) — 139, 146-47, 167-69, 190, 490, 616

Westphalia — 154

Whigs (England) — 186-88, 229, 240, 247-49, 469, 470

Workers' labour conditions — 251-54
See also Child labour

Workhouses — 206, 524, 604-08

Working class — 102, 404
— in England — 202, 251-54, 260-61, 408-09
— in France — 102, 105, 132
— in Italy — 6-7
— in Spain — 114, 133-34, 454, 461

Working day — 252-53

Y

Yorkshire — 256, 257
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>Correlation of Name</th>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>Correlation of Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoy</td>
<td>Szeming</td>
<td>Coleroon</td>
<td>Cauvery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolia</td>
<td>Asia Minor</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araxes</td>
<td>Aras</td>
<td>Cracow</td>
<td>Kraków</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrabad</td>
<td>Gurgan</td>
<td>Dantzig</td>
<td>Gdañsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurungabad</td>
<td>Aurangabad</td>
<td>Erivan</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austerlitz</td>
<td>Slavkov</td>
<td>Erzoum</td>
<td>Erzurum or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia</td>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrios</td>
<td>Los Barrios</td>
<td>Fiume</td>
<td>Rijeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassora</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Friuli</td>
<td>Udine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulogne</td>
<td>Boulogne-sur-Mer</td>
<td>Galatz</td>
<td>Galañi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braila</td>
<td>Brâila</td>
<td>Grisons</td>
<td>Graubünden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Guiana</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Gujerat</td>
<td>Gujarât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelcund</td>
<td>Bundelkhand</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hsiang-Kiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabool, Caboul</td>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>Illosalva</td>
<td>Illésalva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Kwangchow</td>
<td>Inkermann</td>
<td>Inkerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton River</td>
<td>Chu-Kiang</td>
<td>Ivangoord</td>
<td>Dębîn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jassy</td>
<td>İşçi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jaxartes</td>
<td>Syr Darya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Er Riha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kabardinsk</td>
<td>Kabardinka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamchatka</td>
<td>Kamchatka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karrachee</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lambessa</td>
<td>Lambèse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libau</td>
<td>Liepaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luy-chow-foo</td>
<td>Luichow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macao</td>
<td>Aomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malghera</td>
<td>Marghera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This glossary includes geographical names occurring in Marx's and Engels' articles in the form customary in the press of the time but differing from the national names or from those given on modern maps. The left column gives geographical names as used in the original; the right column gives corresponding names as used on modern maps and in modern literature.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Word</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
<th>Original Word</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memel</td>
<td>Klaipeda</td>
<td>Mohammerah</td>
<td>Khorramshahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Crna Gora</td>
<td>Morea</td>
<td>Peloponnesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Neuenburg</td>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizhni Novgorod</td>
<td>Gorky</td>
<td>Nusserabad</td>
<td>Nasirabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oltenitzka</td>
<td>Oltenija</td>
<td>Oude</td>
<td>Oudh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxus</td>
<td>Amu Darya</td>
<td>Palangen</td>
<td>Palanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekin</td>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>Pernambuco</td>
<td>Recife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pernau</td>
<td>Parnu</td>
<td>Peterhoff</td>
<td>Petrovdrets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Pirano</td>
<td>Piran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plombières</td>
<td>Plombières-les-Bains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pola</td>
<td>Pula</td>
<td>Pomerania</td>
<td>Pomorze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posen</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>Pressburg</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pultawa</td>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajpootana</td>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>Revel</td>
<td>Tallinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohilcund</td>
<td>Rohilkhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovigno</td>
<td>Rovinj</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonica</td>
<td>Thessaloniki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Domingo</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schonen</td>
<td>Skåne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scutari</td>
<td>Üsküdar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebenico</td>
<td>Śibenik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shehustan</td>
<td>Kohistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuster</td>
<td>Shushtar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>Ślask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalato</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stettin</td>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbalpore</td>
<td>Jubbulpore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)und</td>
<td>Øresund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabreez</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnau</td>
<td>Tarnów</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theiss</td>
<td>Tisza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiflis</td>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todhpore</td>
<td>Jodhpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornea</td>
<td>Torno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transoxiana</td>
<td>Bukhara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebizond</td>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsang-Ming</td>
<td>Tsungming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuabs</td>
<td>Tuapse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turan</td>
<td>Turkestan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tver</td>
<td>Kalinin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valengin</td>
<td>Valangin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendish Sea</td>
<td>Baltic Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whampoa</td>
<td>Huang-pu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zara</td>
<td>Zadar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>