

**KARL
MARX
FREDERICK
ENGELS**

**Collected
Works**



**Volume 12
Marx and Engels
1853 - 1854**

Contents

Preface	XIII
---------------	------

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

March 1853-February 1854

1853

March

1. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels.</i> British Politics.—Disraeli.—The Refugees.—Mazzini in London.—Turkey	3
2. <i>F. Engels.</i> The Real Issue in Turkey	13
3. <i>K. Marx.</i> The London Press.—Policy of Napoleon on the Turkish Question	18
4. <i>F. Engels.</i> The Turkish Question	22

April

5. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Berlin Conspiracy	28
6. <i>F. Engels.</i> What Is to Become of Turkey in Europe?	32
7. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Berlin Conspiracy.—London Police.—Mazzini.—Radetzky	37
8. <i>K. Marx.</i> Hirsch's Confessions	40
9. <i>K. Marx.</i> The New Financial Juggle; or Gladstone and the Pennies	44
10. <i>K. Marx.</i> Achievements of the Ministry	50

11. <i>K. Marx.</i> Feargus O'Connor.—Ministerial Defeats.—The Budget	57
12. <i>K. Marx.</i> <i>L. S. D.</i> , or Class Budgets, and Who's Relieved by Them	63
13. <i>K. Marx.</i> Riot at Constantinople.—German Table Moving.—The Budget	67
14. <i>K. Marx.</i> Soap for the People, a Sop for <i>The Times</i> .—The Coalition Budget	75
15. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels.</i> The Rocket Affair.—The Swiss Insurrection	82
16. <i>F. Engels.</i> Political Position of the Swiss Republic	86

May

17. <i>K. Marx.</i> Revolution in China and in Europe	93
18. <i>K. Marx.</i> Affairs in Holland.—Denmark.—Conversion of the British Debt.—India, Turkey and Russia	101
19. <i>K. Marx.</i> Mazzini.—Switzerland and Austria.—The Turkish Question	107
20. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Turkish Question.— <i>The Times</i> .—Russian Aggrandizement	112

June

21. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Russian Humbug.—Gladstone's Failure.—Sir Charles Wood's East Indian Reforms	115
22. <i>K. Marx.</i> The British Rule in India	125
23. <i>K. Marx.</i> English Prosperity.—Strikes.—The Turkish Question.—India	134
24. <i>K. Marx.</i> Turkey and Russia.—Connivance of the Aberdeen Ministry with Russia.—The Budget.—Tax on Newspaper Supplements.—Parliamentary Corruption	142
25. <i>K. Marx.</i> The East India Company—Its History and Results	148
26. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Indian Question.—Irish Tenant Right	157

July

27. <i>K. Marx.</i> Russian Policy Against Turkey.—Chartism	163
28. <i>K. Marx.</i> The Turkish War Question.— <i>The New-York Tribune</i> in the House of Commons.—The Government of India	174

29. <i>K. Marx</i> . Layard's Motion.—Struggle Over the Ten Hours' Bill	185
30. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Russo-Turkish Difficulty.—Ducking and Dodging of the British Cabinet.—Nesselrode's Last Note.—The East India Question	192
31. <i>K. Marx</i> . War in Burma.—The Russian Question.—Curious Diplomatic Correspondence	201
32. <i>K. Marx</i> . The War Question.—Doings of Parliament.—India	209
33. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Future Results of British Rule in India	217
34. <i>K. Marx</i> . Financial Failure of Government.—Cabs.—Ireland.—The Russian Question	223

August

35. <i>K. Marx</i> . In the House of Commons.—The Press on the Eastern Question.—The Czar's Manifesto.—Denmark	233
36. <i>K. Marx</i> . Advertisement Duty.—Russian Movements.—Denmark.—The United States in Europe	239
37. <i>K. Marx</i> . The War Question.—British Population and Trade Returns.—Doings of Parliament	245
38. <i>K. Marx</i> . Urquhart.—Bem.—The Turkish Question in the House of Lords	257
39. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Turkish Question in the Commons	265
40. <i>K. Marx</i> . Affairs Continental and English	277
41. <i>K. Marx</i> . Michael Bakunin	284
42. <i>K. Marx</i> . Rise in the Price of Corn.—Cholera.—Strikes.—Sailors' Movement	287

September

43. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the Editor of <i>The People's Paper</i>	290
44. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Vienna Note.—The United States and Europe.—Letters from Shumla.—Peel's Bank Act	292
45. <i>K. Marx</i> . Political Movements.—Scarcity of Bread in Europe	301
46. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Western Powers and Turkey.—Imminent Economic Crisis.—Railway Construction in India	309
47. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Western Powers and Turkey.—Symptoms of Economic Crisis	318
48. <i>K. Marx</i> . Panic on the London Stock Exchange.—Strikes	329
49. <i>F. Engels</i> . The Russians in Turkey	335

October-beginning of December

50. K. Marx. Lord Palmerston	341
First Article	345
Second Article	352
Third Article	358
Fourth Article	370
Article Fifth	379
Article Sixth	385
Seventh Article	391
Eighth Article	398
51. K. Marx. The War Question.—Financial Matters.—Strikes	407
52. K. Marx. The Turkish Manifesto.—France's Economic Position	416
53. K. Marx. Arrest of Delescluze.—Denmark.—Austria.— <i>The Times</i> on the Prospects of War Against Russia	421
54. F. Engels. Movements of the Armies in Turkey	424
55. F. Engels. The Holy War	430

November

56. K. Marx. War.—Strikes.—Dearth	435
57. K. Marx. Persian Expedition in Afghanistan and Russian Expedition in Central Asia.—Denmark.—The Fighting on the Danube and in Asia.—Wigan Colliers	444
58. F. Engels. The Progress of the Turkish War	450
59. F. Engels. The Russian Defeats	457
60. K. Marx. The Labor Question	460
61. K. Marx. Prosperity.—The Labor Question	464
62. F. Engels. Progress of the Turkish War	471
63. K. Marx. David Urquhart	477
64. K. Marx. The Knight of the Noble Consciousness	479
65. K. Marx. Manteuffel's Speech.—Religious Movement in Prussia.—Mazzini's Address.—London Corporation.—Russell's Reform.—Labor Parliament	509

December

66. F. Engels. The War on the Danube	516
67. K. Marx. The Turkish War.—Industrial Distress	523
68. K. Marx. The Quadruple Convention.—England and the War	527

69. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Russian Victory.—Position of England and France	536
70. <i>K. Marx</i> . Palmerston's Resignation	543
71. <i>F. Engels</i> . Progress of the Turkish War	547

1854

January

72. <i>F. Engels</i> . The European War	553
73. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Western Powers and Turkey	559
74. <i>K. Marx</i> . The War in the East	568
75. <i>F. Engels</i> . The Last Battle in Europe	579
76. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Fighting in the East.—Finances of Austria and France.—Fortification of Constantinople	583
77. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Czar's Views.—Prince Albert	589
78. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . Fortification of Constantinople.—Denmark's Neutrality.—Composition of British Parliament.—Crop Failure in Europe	593

February

79. <i>K. Marx</i> . Count Orlov's Mission.—Russian Finances During the War	601
80. <i>K. Marx</i> . Blue Books.—Parliamentary Debates on February 6.—Count Orlov's Mission.—Operations of the Allied Fleet.—The Irish Brigade.—Concerning the Convocation of the Labor Parliament	606
81. <i>K. Marx</i> . Russian Diplomacy.—The Blue Book on the Eastern Question.—Montenegro	613

APPENDIX

82. <i>K. Marx</i> . Apropos Carey. Cluss' Article "The 'Best Paper in the Union' and Its 'Best Men' and Political Economists" with Extracts from Marx's Letters	623
--	-----

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i>	635
<i>Name Index</i>	699
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i>	733
<i>Index of Periodicals</i>	761
<i>Subject Index</i>	769

ILLUSTRATIONS

Part of a page of the <i>New-York Daily Tribune</i> with Marx's article "The British Rule in India"	129
British conquests in India in mid-19th century	160-161
A page from Marx's notebook with notes on the mailing of articles to the <i>New-York Daily Tribune</i>	319
Part of a page of <i>The People's Paper</i> with the first article of Marx's series <i>Lord Palmerston</i>	343
Title page of the first edition of Marx's pamphlet <i>The Knight of the Noble Consciousness</i>	483

TRANSLATORS

CLEMENS DUTT: Article 64

RODNEY LIVINGSTONE: Article 8

JOAN and TREVOR WALMSLEY: Articles 63, 82

Preface

Volume 12 of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels contains articles and reports written between March 22, 1853, and February 10, 1854. Most of the articles were published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, for which Marx began to work in August 1851.

Writing for the *Tribune* became for Marx and also Engels, whom Marx enlisted to write some of the articles, an important part of their revolutionary activity. In the climate of political reaction which prevailed on the European continent in the 1850s, the opportunity to propagate revolutionary communist ideas in the columns of a popular American newspaper was one not to be missed. Marx had no hesitation about contributing to this bourgeois newspaper in view of the progressive role it was then playing in the social life of the USA. It condemned slavery and supported the abolitionist movement at a time when the conflict between the bourgeois North and the slave-owning South was coming to a head; and since this stand corresponded to the mood of broad sections of the population, it attracted many readers to the paper.

Marx's and Engels' articles aroused great interest in America. Many of them, in addition to appearing in the daily issues of the *Tribune*, were reprinted in special supplements: the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune* and the *New-York Weekly Tribune*. Eventually it became editorial practice to publish these articles and reports in the form of leaders.

The articles by Marx and Engels in the *New-York Daily Tribune* became known in Europe as well. Thus, in a speech in the House of Commons on July 1, 1853, the leader of the Free Traders, John

Bright, mentioned Marx's *New-York Daily Tribune* article on Gladstone's budget (see this volume, p. 176).

At the same time Marx and Engels tried to use for revolutionary propaganda the then very few organs of the proletarian press. Thus, Marx published a number of articles in the Chartist *People's Paper*, which began to appear in May 1852 with Ernest Jones as editor. It also reproduced some articles by him written for the *Tribune*. Marx also supported the New York working-class paper *Die Reform*, which came out from 1853 to 1854 in German and played a considerable part in the dissemination of communist ideas in the USA. Joseph Weydemeyer and Adolph Cluss were among its most active contributors. Marx did all he could to help his German-American friends with the work of editing *Die Reform*. He allowed them to print gratis in the newspaper translations of his articles from the *Tribune*. His letters to Cluss and Weydemeyer often contained ready-made material for articles. Thus, Cluss included in his article "The 'Best Paper in the Union' and Its 'Best Men' and Political Economists" extracts from Marx's letters criticising the economic theory of Carey, then in fashion in the USA and acclaimed by the bourgeois editors of the *Tribune*. The article "David Urquhart" published in *Die Reform* reproduced in its entirety the text of a letter from Marx to Cluss which has not survived.

Marx and Engels used their journalistic activity to expose reactionary regimes in Europe, to reveal the contradictions of capitalist society, to criticise the different trends of bourgeois ideology, and to formulate the position of the working class and revolutionary democracy on major political questions. Although after the disbandment of the Communist League there was no international working-class organisation on which they could lean, they set themselves the task of preserving international links between the representatives of the working-class movement in different countries, uniting them on the platform of scientific communism, and preparing the conditions for the creation of a proletarian party. By their articles in the press and by other means, they sought to show the more politically conscious elements of the proletariat how unstable was the reign of reaction and to strengthen their belief in the advent of a new revolutionary upsurge.

The journalistic activity of Marx and Engels was closely linked with their theoretical research and rested largely on the results obtained by Marx in his studies of political economy and world

history, and by Engels in his research on military science, Oriental studies, philology and history. The extant notebooks contain numerous copied extracts showing that in addition to accumulating a vast amount of material for his economic work, Marx made a special study of a large number of sources for his articles and reports (these sources are given in the notes to the individual articles). Conversely, Marx's continuous interest in current economic questions broadened the base for his work on general economic theory. The materials quoted by Marx in his articles for the *New-York Daily Tribune* were later used by him in the *Economic Manuscripts of 1857-58* (the *Grundrisse*), and also in Volume I of *Capital*.

In this period, 1853-54, Marx's and Engels' attention was centred on three questions: the economic condition of the European countries, in particular of the most developed one, England, and the consequent prospects for a new upsurge of the democratic and working-class movements; the colonial policy of the capitalist powers and the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples; and, finally, international relations.

Analysing the economic position of the European countries, Marx devoted a number of articles—"The War Question.—British Population and Trade Returns.—Doings of Parliament", "Political Movements.—Scarcity of Bread in Europe", "The Western Powers and Turkey.—Symptoms of Economic Crisis", and many others—to the state of industrial production, primarily in England, agriculture, domestic and foreign trade, market prices, foreign exchange rates, etc. He distinguished different phases in the current trade and industrial cycle and gave concrete expression to the thesis he had propounded as early as the 1840s on the cyclical nature of the development of production under capitalism. Marx revealed laws actually operating in a capitalist economy, and so refuted the arguments of bourgeois apologists who represented capitalism as a never-changing, harmonious system which ensures the well-being of all classes of society. The whole secret of bourgeois political economy, he observed, "consists simply in transforming transitory social relations belonging to a determined epoch of history and corresponding with a given state of material production, into eternal, general, never-changing laws, natural laws, as they call them" (see this volume, p. 247). At the same time, Marx called attention to specific features in the different economic schools and doctrines current in the various countries. Thus, Carey's views were influenced by specific features of social-economic development in the USA, and his attacks on

British industrialists and economists, Ricardo in particular, reflected the struggle between the American and British capitalists. What Carey had in common with the French economist Bastiat and a number of British followers of the classical school, however, was his preaching of the harmony of class interests under capitalism and his defence of the foundations of the capitalist system.

Marx's articles include a sharp, critical description of the economic and political liberalism proclaimed by the British Free Traders. The hypocritical phrases of the Free Traders about "freedom" and prosperity concealed a defence of the unlimited exploitation of the workers, and their pacifist propaganda expressed not their love of peace, but the belief of the British industrial bourgeoisie in Britain's ability to retain its monopoly of world industry and trade by peaceful means, without the onerous expenditure of waging war.

The falsity of the Free Traders' argument that free trade would lead to a development of capitalism without crises was strikingly revealed at the end of 1853, when a phase of prosperity gave way to a period of stagnation in industry and trade. Emphasising the growing influence of British industry and its periodic crises on the world market and on the world economy as a whole, Marx concluded that the symptoms of crisis observable in 1853-54 were inevitably bound to develop into a universal economic crisis, which did in fact break out in 1857.

A number of articles in the present volume, e.g. "The Russian Victory.—Position of England and France" and "The Fighting in the East.—Finances of Austria and France.—Fortification of Constantinople", dealt with the position of France. In them Marx called attention to the political consequences in France of economic difficulties, poor harvests, the rising cost of living, financial mismanagement, and so on. The discontent of the masses, particularly a section of the peasantry, with the measures of Louis Bonaparte's government bore witness to the instability of the Second Empire (see this volume, pp. 540-42). The decisive blow against this counter-revolutionary regime, Marx predicted, would be dealt by the French workers. The time would come "when general causes and the universal discontent of all other classes" would enable the workers of France "to resume their revolutionary work anew" (see this volume, p. 541).

Closely related to the economic reviews were Marx's articles on financial questions: "The New Financial Juggle; or Gladstone and the Pennies", "Achievements of the Ministry", "*L.S.D.*, or Class

Budgets and Who's Relieved by Them", and others. Some of these were written for the Chartist *People's Paper*. In this series of articles Marx showed up the class nature of the economic policy of the bourgeois state and of the financial and fiscal measures taken by the British Government, which was always careful, on this as on other questions, not to overstep the limit "beyond which the working man would gain—the aristocrat and middle classes lose" (see this volume, p. 66). The budget of Gladstone, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Coalition Cabinet, is described by Marx as "a middle-class Budget—written by an aristocratic pen" (see this volume, p. 63).

Describing the destitution of the English workers and the aggravation of contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, manifested in large-scale class conflicts, strikes and lock-outs, Marx made a profound analysis of the strike movement. He gave a detailed description of the strikes which were taking place in the industrial areas of Britain in his articles "English Prosperity.—Strikes.—The Turkish Question.—India", "Russian Policy Against Turkey.—Chartism", "Panic on the London Stock Exchange.—Strikes", and others, noting a new and positive phenomenon—the participation of unorganised workers in strikes. An analysis of the results of the mass strikes in 1853 and early 1854 helped Marx to give more concrete expression to conclusions on the different forms of the class struggle of the proletariat which he and Engels had drawn in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and other works. Marx showed that strikes are natural phenomena in capitalist society, that they serve as a means of restraining the arbitrary behaviour of factory owners and ensuring that the vital needs of the workers are satisfied. He stressed the influence of the capitalist economic cycle, the fluctuations in the state of the market and the level of wages, in exacerbating social antagonisms and the growth of the class consciousness of the proletariat. "Without the great alternative phases of dullness, prosperity, over-excitement, crisis and distress, which modern industry traverses in periodically recurring cycles, with the up and down of wages resulting from them, as with the constant warfare between masters and men closely corresponding with those variations in wages and profits, the working classes of Great Britain, and of all Europe, would be a heart-broken, a weak-minded, a worn-out, unresisting mass, whose self-emancipation would prove as impossible as that of the slaves of Ancient Greece and Rome" (see this volume, p. 169—written by Marx in English).

Marx saw the prime importance of strikes in the political and moral influence which they have on workers, increasing their spirit

of resistance and further promoting their class solidarity and organisation.

Describing the working-class movement in Britain, Marx concluded that the workers should not confine themselves to waging an economic struggle, important as it might be, but must combine it with a political struggle as the main means of liberating the working people from wage slavery. He constantly emphasised the need to organise the proletariat on a national scale, form a mass political party of the working class and wage a struggle for the conquest of political power. The trade unions—class organisations often created by the workers in the course of the strikes themselves—would, he said, assume particularly great importance for the working class when “their activity will ... be carried over to the *political field*” (see this volume, p. 334). In Marx’s view, to overcome the idea that trade unions were not concerned with politics and to draw them into political life was one of the ways of achieving a higher form of class organisation of the British proletariat—of creating a proletarian party.

Marx assigned an important role in this to the revolutionary Chartists led by Ernest Jones, then a small but highly active detachment of the British working-class movement. In the articles “The Labor Question”, “Prosperity.—The Labor Question”, “Manteuffel’s Speech.—Religious Movement in Prussia.—Mazzini’s Address.—London Corporation.—Russell’s Reform.—Labor Parliament”, and others, Marx wrote with great sympathy of Jones’ attempts to strengthen the influence of the Chartists among the masses, his tours of industrial areas and his agitation among strikers, trade union members and unorganised workers. In many cases Marx reproduced reports of workers’ meetings and Jones’ speeches at them, in which one can sense the influence of Marx’s own ideas. Marx welcomed the Chartist proposal to convene a representative Labor Parliament as a step towards the founding of a national workers’ organisation capable not only of co-ordinating the sporadic strikes, but also of directing the political actions of the masses.

Marx and Engels did all they could to support the endeavours of Jones and other revolutionary Chartist leaders to revive the Chartist movement on a new basis, combining the struggle for the People’s Charter with the propaganda of revolutionary socialism. They attached great importance to the struggle of the British workers for universal suffrage. At a time when the British proletariat already constituted the majority of the population, and the ruling classes did not yet possess a sufficiently powerful military and bureaucratic machine, universal suffrage could help the proletariat to win politi-

cal power as an essential prerequisite for achieving socialism in Britain.

Marx pointed to symptoms of revolutionary ferment not only in Britain and France, but also in other European countries—Prussia, Austria, and Italy. For him they were signs of the imminent new revolutionary events. Even the Prussian Government, he noted, “smells the breath of Revolution in midst of the apparent apathy” (see this volume, p. 30). The realisation that the situation in Europe was fraught with a new upsurge of the revolutionary movement impelled Marx and Engels to return to tactical problems and to criticise false tactical premises, particularly those of a conspiratorial and adventurist nature. Thus, criticising the tactics of the Italian revolutionary Mazzini, Marx stressed the mistaken and utopian nature of his view that an Italian revolution “is not to be effected by the favorable chances of European complications, but by the private action of Italian conspirators acting by surprise” (see this volume, p. 512).

Marx's pamphlet *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness*, the text of which includes a letter from Engels, was also aimed against adventurism and sectarianism in the revolutionary movement. In this work, as in two earlier ones—*The Great Men of the Exile* and *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*—Marx and Engels exposed the petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionism and phrase-mongering, the demagogic playing at revolutions and conspiracies, in which the leaders of the petty-bourgeois émigrés indulged. The pamphlet unmask August Willich, one of the leaders of the sectarian faction of the Communist League, who used the émigré democratic press to attack working-class revolutionaries. Analysing Willich's “revolutionary” plans, Marx sharply criticised the voluntarism and subjectivism characteristic of the supporters of conspiratorial tactics, their reluctance and inability to make a sober assessment of the situation, and their political vacillation.

A new and important feature in the theoretical and journalistic work of Marx and Engels at this period was their deep interest in the historical fate of the colonial peoples. At this time they began to publish articles systematically in the press about the situation in the colonial countries of the East, exposing the predatory policy of the capitalist states in relation to these countries. Whereas earlier Marx had treated colonial problems on a general theoretical plane, explaining the general laws of capitalist development and the place which colonial exploitation occupied in it, in the 1850s he began to pay far more attention to

the history of the colonies and dependent countries, colonial policy, and the methods and consequences of colonial rule. And he made extensive use of the results of his studies in his journalistic writings. Marx's articles on this subject proclaimed the ideas of proletarian internationalism, and of the solidarity of the working class with the oppressed peoples of the colonies and dependent countries.

This approach to the colonial question enabled Marx to give a new interpretation of the history of the peoples of the oppressed countries, to reveal the interrelation and interdependence of the historical development of the countries where capitalism was well established and the economically backward countries of the East, of the metropolises and the colonies. Marx regarded colonial policy as an expression of the most repulsive and cruel aspects of the capitalist system. "The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked" (see this volume, p. 221).

Marx devoted considerable space in his works to India. The position and history of this great country, which had fallen under the rule of British colonialism, was examined by him in a series of articles, "The British Rule in India", "The East India Company — Its History and Results", "The Future Results of British Rule in India", and others, in which he traced the most important stages and methods of the colonial enslavement of India by Britain.

A major role in the subjugation of India, with its colossal natural resources and ancient culture, as Marx shows in his articles, was played by the East India Company—"merchant adventurers, who conquered India to make money out of it" (see this volume, p. 179). Over the decades, the Company robbed the peoples of Hindustan, annexing one region after another, and using the resources it had seized to organise aggressive incursions into neighbouring territories—Afghanistan, Burma and Persia. The Company made wide use of the Ancient Roman principle *divide et impera* (divide and rule), which, as Marx stressed, was one of the main methods of effecting colonial conquests in the capitalist age as well. The colonialists took advantage of India's political fragmentation, its communal heterogeneity, and the strife between the local rulers, and bribed members of the local aristocracy to win their support. Binding the native sovereign princes to them by a system of subsidiary treaties, promissory notes and other bonds of "alliance", they turned them into the Company's puppets. "After having won over their allies in the way of ancient Rome, the East India Company executed them in

the modern manner of Change-Alley," wrote Marx, comparing the methods of the colonialists to the practices of one of the centres of usury in London (see this volume, p. 197). The robbery and usurpation committed by the Company in India served as a source of wealth and strength for the land-owning magnates and money-lords in Britain itself.

While revealing the essence and methods of colonial policy, Marx at the same time showed by his analysis of the internal situation in India and other Eastern countries the reason for their retarded historical development in the periods preceding conquest. He saw the source of their backwardness and weakness, as a result of which they became easy prey for conquerors, in the isolated nature of the small village communities, in the concentration of considerable means of production in the hands of despotic rulers, which impeded the emergence of a capitalist economy, and in other specific features of the social system of the Asian countries, which had at one time attained a high level of civilisation.

Marx gives a vivid portrayal of the British colonialists' predatory rule in India and its appalling consequences for the peoples of that country. Having inherited from the Eastern rulers such branches of administration as the financial and war departments, and using them to rob and oppress the people, the British rulers of India disregarded a third branch, to which even the Eastern despots devoted attention—the department of public works. As a result, irrigated farming in India fell into total decline. The competition of British manufactures was disastrous for local handicraft production, particularly hand-spinning and hand-weaving, and doomed millions of people to poverty and death. A great burden was put upon the population by the land and salt taxes and the whole system of financial extortion practised by the colonialists. While destroying old patriarchal forms of communal land-owning, the British retained in India's social and political system numerous feudal forms which hampered the country's progressive development.

Marx showed that the system of land-tenure and land taxes introduced by the British in India essentially consolidated pre-capitalist relations in the countryside and adapted them to the interests of the colonialists. It strengthened the various forms of shackling tenure in India's agrarian system, and increased the exploitation of the peasants by the landowners, land middlemen and tax collectors to the absolute limit. As a result, Marx remarks, "the Ryots—and they form 11/12ths of the whole Indian population—have been wretchedly pauperized" (see this volume, p. 215).

Pre-capitalist forms of exploitation flourished under colonial rule in other enslaved countries too—in particular, Ireland, which Marx and Engels considered the first British colony. In the article “The Indian Question.—Irish Tenant Right”, for example, Marx vividly compared the extortion practised by landlords on the enslaved Irish tenants—an extortion legalised by the British—with the relations “between the robber who presents his pistol, and the traveler who presents his purse” (see this volume, p. 160).

In the article “Revolution in China and in Europe” Marx also showed the pernicious consequences of the intervention of European capital in the internal life of the Asian countries. He pointed to the destructive influence of the competition of British goods on Chinese local industry, to the drain of silver from the country as a result of the import of opium, which threatened to ruin the Chinese economy, and to the enormous growth of taxes in connection with the payment of the indemnity imposed on China by Britain at the end of the First Opium War.

The colonial administrative, legal and military apparatus was a parasite on the body of the oppressed country. Marx showed that under the extraordinarily confused and cumbersome system of government in India true power was wielded by a clique of officials from the head office of the East India Company in London. “...The real Home Government of India are the permanent and irresponsible *bureaucracy*” (see this volume, p. 183).

Marx used the example of British rule in India to show the contradictoriness and double-faced nature of the bourgeois system as a whole, and revealed the reverse side of progress under the rule of the exploiters. The period of the rule of the bourgeoisie, he pointed out in the article “The Future Results of British Rule in India”, was in general to create the material basis for a new, socialist society. However, these material prerequisites, the powerful productive forces which constitute the foundation of bourgeois civilisation, are created at the cost of incredible sufferings on the part of the masses. Whole peoples are doomed by the bourgeois age to follow the bitter path of blood and filth, poverty and humiliation. Only after the socialist revolution, he wrote, will “human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain” (see this volume, p. 222).

At a time when the colonial system of capitalism was still in the process of formation, Marx saw that it bore the seeds of its own destruction. He noted, for example, that the British colonialists of India, who were motivated solely by the pursuit of profit, would be compelled, against their will, to promote the development of

elements of capitalism in their colony, in particular, to commence railway construction and create related branches of industry. By permitting, albeit in a colonially distorted form, the birth of capitalist economy, the colonialists were bringing to life forces which threatened their rule—a local proletariat and a national bourgeoisie, which were capable of giving a more organised and stable character to the growing resistance of the masses to colonial oppression. These processes had barely begun at that time, but Marx was already fully aware of their significance for the future of the colonial world. He foresaw the growth of the opposition of the masses to the colonialists in India and other oppressed countries. In the article “Revolution in China and in Europe” he noted, in particular, the great successes of the Taiping peasant rebellion. The Taiping movement was ostensibly directed against the oppression of the foreign Manchu nobility. At the same time, like other progressive liberation movements in the East, it was an anti-colonial movement. Its advent was accelerated by “English cannon forcing upon China that soporific drug called opium” (see this volume, p. 93).

Marx saw in the liberation struggle of the enslaved peoples and the victory of the proletariat in the metropolis the two conditions for freeing the oppressed countries from colonial oppression and for their true social rebirth. The population of India, he wrote, would be unable to benefit from the fruits of modern civilisation “till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether” (see this volume, p. 221).

Thus, Marx saw two possible paths for the future liberation of the colonies, which he by no means regarded as mutually exclusive. He considered the struggle of the working class for proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement as two interconnected aspects of the revolutionary process.

His discovery of the profound inner connection between the processes of revolutionary ferment in the colonial world and the maturing of the prerequisites for proletarian revolution in the West was perhaps the most important result of Marx's study of colonial problems. In his articles he showed that the drawing of the colonial and dependent countries into the orbit of capitalist relations would inevitably sharpen the antagonisms of the capitalist world, and that the national liberation movement in these countries, by inflicting blows on the capitalist colonial system, would weaken the position of capitalism in the metropolis. Marx

referred to the revolutionary processes in the East as a spark thrown into the "overloaded mine of the present industrial system" (see this volume, p. 98). Conversely, as all Marx's articles on India, Ireland and China show, the working class of the capitalist countries must in the long term benefit from the destruction of the colonial system, and should render all possible assistance to the liberation of the colonies.

Marx's studies of national and colonial problems in his articles of 1853 and subsequent years were vital contributions to revolutionary theory and provided the foundation for working-class policy on the colonial question. They were the point of departure for Lenin's subsequent analysis of imperialism, and of the liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries as an integral part of the world-wide anti-imperialist revolutionary process.

Marx and Engels examined problems of international relations in the context of prospects for the proletarian and national liberation movement. The articles on these questions constitute a considerable section of the present volume. The experience of the revolution of 1848-49 convinced Marx and Engels of the important role of diplomacy and foreign policy. Diplomatic means were used extensively by the reactionary forces of absolutist states and the ruling bourgeoisie for the achievement of counter-revolutionary ends. Marx and Engels considered, as Marx later formulated it in the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", that one of the most important tasks of proletarian revolutionaries was to understand the secrets of international politics and to expose the machinations of the diplomacy of the ruling classes and their aggressive designs. In the working class they saw a real social force capable of effectively counteracting the aggressive policies of governments. They stressed the need for the working class to pursue its own revolutionary line in international conflicts, aimed at thorough-going bourgeois-democratic transformations in Europe and the preparation of the conditions for a victorious proletarian revolution. It was from this position, the position of the "Sixth Power", as Marx and Engels called the European revolution, contrasting it with the five "Great Powers" of the day (see this volume, p. 557), that they approached all international questions.

In their numerous articles on these subjects Marx and Engels exposed the whole system of international relations which had taken shape since the Congress of Vienna in 1815. They saw this system as an obstacle to the progressive development of Europe, the liberation of the oppressed nations, and the national unifica-

tion of politically disunited countries. Statesmen and diplomats clung to this decrepit system, but not from any belief in the principle of observing international agreements. Marx showed in many of his articles that the treaties of 1815 were constantly violated by the rulers of European states when it suited their purpose. Thus the traditional cunning methods of the diplomacy of the ruling classes continued to flourish on the basis of established international relations. Marx and Engels in their articles condemned its practice of setting nations against one another, of intimidation and blackmail, and blatant interference in the internal affairs of small states. In the article "Political Position of the Swiss Republic", in particular, Engels pointed out that the declared neutrality of the small states had in fact become a pure formality and that the existing "European political system" doomed these states to the role of lackeys of the counter-revolutionary forces and the "scapegoat" in the diplomatic game of the Great Powers (see this volume, p. 86).

At the centre of the attention of Marx and Engels at that time were the contradictions between the European powers in the Middle East, the struggle for the partition of the Turkish Empire, for control of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, and for predominance in the Balkans and the countries of Asia Minor. A long series of articles by Marx and Engels is devoted to "the Eastern question", the aggravation of which led to the outbreak of the Crimean War. Already in the first articles on this subject, which were written by Engels—the section "Turkey" in the article "British Politics.—Disraeli.—The Refugees.—Mazzini in London.—Turkey", the articles "The Real Issue in Turkey", "The Turkish Question", and "What Is to Become of Turkey in Europe?"—Marx's and Engels' position on this question was substantially outlined. Their point of view was further developed in Marx's articles "The Turkish Question.—*The Times*.—Russian Aggrandizement", "The War Question.—Doings of Parliament.—India", "The Western Powers and Turkey", and others.

Analysing the position in the Middle East and the Balkans, Marx and Engels revealed the economic, political and military causes of the rivalry between the European powers in this region. The complexity of the problem, in their opinion, lay in the fact that this competition was linked with international confrontations caused by the liberation movement of the Balkan peoples against the rule of feudal Turkey.

In contrast to West European politicians and diplomats, who concealed their aggressive aims in the Middle East behind the doctrine of maintaining the *status quo* as established by the

Congress of Vienna and the pretence of defending the inviolability of the feudal Ottoman Empire, Marx and Engels saw that Empire as a great obstacle to historical progress and the development of the Balkan peoples who were under the rule of the Ottoman conquerors. The revolutionary-democratic solution to the Eastern question lay, in their opinion, first and foremost, in the granting of independence and the right to choose the form of their future state system to the Southern Slavs and all the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. Marx wrote that the choice would depend on the concrete historical conditions. He did not exclude the possibility of the creation in the Balkans of a Federal Republic of Slavonic States (see this volume, p. 212).

A genuine solution to the Middle East crisis, Marx and Engels stressed, should not be expected from the Western politicians. "The solution of the Turkish problem is reserved, with that of other great problems, to the European Revolution," wrote Engels (see this volume, p. 34). Moreover he foresaw the possibility of the revolution spreading eastwards. Already in 1789 the boundaries of revolution had begun steadily to extend further and further. "The last revolutionary outposts were Warsaw, Debreczin, Bucharest; the advanced posts of the next revolution must be Petersburg and Constantinople" (see this volume, p. 34).

Marx and Engels denounced in particular the policy of Tsarist autocracy, its role of gendarme in Europe, its striving for aggrandisement. Tsarism, they stressed, sought to use for counter-revolutionary and aggressive aims the sincere sympathy which the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula felt for Russia, particularly since its victory in the wars with Turkey had actually facilitated the liberation of those peoples from Turkish oppression. But Tsarist autocracy, the oppressor of the Russian people and the other peoples of the Russian Empire, was the worst enemy of revolution. The strengthening of Tsarism presented a serious threat to the democratic and working-class movement in Europe.

Marx's and Engels' detestation of Tsarism was shared by the progressive representatives of revolutionary democracy, first and foremost, by the Russian revolutionaries themselves. "Half a century ago," Lenin wrote in 1903, "Russia's reputation as an international gendarme was firmly established. In the course of the last century our autocracy rendered no small support to various reactionary causes in Europe even to the point of crushing by downright military force the revolutionary movements in neighbouring countries. One has only to recall the Hungarian campaign of Nicholas I, and the repeated repressions of Poland, to understand why the leaders of the

international socialist proletariat from the forties onward denounced tsarism so often to the European workers and European democrats as the chief mainstay of reaction in the whole civilised world.

“Beginning with the last three decades or so of the nineteenth century, the revolutionary movement in Russia gradually altered this state of affairs. The more tsarism was shaken by the blows of the growing revolutionary movement at home, the weaker it became as the enemy of freedom in Europe” (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 461).

Marx and Engels regarded the exposure of the self-seeking, anti-democratic position of the ruling circles of the Western powers, above all, of Britain and France, as one of the main aims of their articles on the Eastern question.

In their view the essence of the foreign policy of these powers was to strive to weaken Russia as a rival in the struggle for supremacy in the Middle East and the Balkans, while at the same time seeking to preserve Tsarism as a dependable weapon and bulwark of counter-revolutionary regimes in Europe. The desire to prevent the revolutionary consequences of the collapse of Tsarism and to avoid a decisive clash with Tsarism on the assumption that it would continue to perform the services of a gendarme in the future revealed, to quote Marx, “the mean and abject spirit of the European middle classes” (see this volume, p. 590). However, he stressed that all the ambiguous manoeuvres and tricks of Western diplomacy—the provocative incitement of the Sultan to offer resistance to Tsarist Russia, while at the same time conniving with the Tsar, and the attempt to perform a mediatory role as “peace-maker”—could only aggravate the situation and precipitate the impending military conflict. Western diplomats and politicians, Marx stated, “will not get rid of their embarrassment in this sneaking way” (see this volume, p. 561). The hostilities between Russia and Turkey which began in October 1853 were inevitably developing into a European war.

The France of Napoleon III, Marx stressed, played the role of one of the main instigators of the Crimean War. “The Bonapartist usurpation, therefore,” he pointed out, “is the true origin of the present Eastern complication” (see this volume, p. 615). In the article “The London Press.—Policy of Napoleon on the Turkish Question”, and others Marx exposed the adventurism and dynastic aims of Louis Bonaparte and his supporters in the Eastern question. For the ruler of the Second Empire foreign adventures were a means of preserving the counter-revolutionary Bonapartist dictatorship and a way for the usurper of the imperial throne of France to gain

recognition from the European monarchs as one of those who decided the fate of Europe.

Marx's articles "Urquhart.—Bism.—The Turkish Question in the House of Lords", "The Turkish Question in the Commons", "The Quadruple Convention.—England and the War", "The Czar's Views.—Prince Albert", "Russian Diplomacy.—The Blue Book on the Eastern Question.—Montenegro". and many others dealt with the position of the British ruling circles on the Eastern question. They contain a scathing criticism of the foreign policy of the British Government which, as Marx and Engels frequently stressed, was dictated by the interests of the bourgeois-aristocratic oligarchy. The founders of Marxism saw this policy as a manifestation of the counter-revolutionary role which Britain played in Europe during the wars against the French Revolution of 1789-94 and in 1848-49, when the British bourgeoisie in league with Tsarism and other reactionary forces acted as the suppressor of the revolutionary movement. Marx and Engels stressed that British ruling circles were especially apprehensive lest the conflict with Russia on the Eastern question should develop into a general revolutionary conflagration on the continent, which might find a response among the mass of the people in Great Britain. This factor, they noted, left its mark on the whole of British diplomacy.

By their criticism of the British ruling oligarchy, which was acting as a counter-revolutionary force not only in Great Britain itself, but also in the international arena, Marx and Engels sought to promote the democratic struggle for a change in the domestic and foreign policy of Great Britain. This was the aim, in particular, of a series of revealing articles by Marx entitled "Lord Palmerston", which were printed in *The People's Paper* and, in part, in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. Some of the articles in this series were reprinted in Britain in the form of pamphlets.

"Lord Palmerston" is a brilliant *exposé* written on the basis of a detailed study of numerous diplomatic documents, parliamentary debates and the press. In this work Marx draws a remarkably accurate and witty portrait of the eminent statesman of bourgeois-aristocratic Britain. His description of Palmerston actually contains an assessment of the whole British system of government, the whole political course of official Britain, the characteristic features of its diplomacy, its striving to exploit other nations for its own ends, its provocative role in many European conflicts, and its perfidious attitude to its allies. Marx revealed the class roots of this system, showing that British statesmen of the Palmerston type were concerned above all that no clouds should darken "the bright

sky of the landlords and moneylords" (see this volume, p. 351).

Analysing Palmerston's stand on the Irish question and his attitude towards the Italian, Hungarian and Polish national movements, Marx revealed the anti-democratic, anti-revolutionary character of British policy which was demagogically concealed by liberal phrases and hypocritical expressions of sympathy for the victims of despotism. A self-proclaimed supporter of "constitutionalism", Palmerston was in Britain itself the initiator of repressive measures and the opponent of all progressive reforms, while in Europe—in Greece, Spain and Portugal—he supported the reactionary monarchist governments and flirted with Bonapartist circles in France.

Palmerston, Marx emphasises, possessed remarkable political cunning, and an actor's ability to play the role required by this or that situation, in keeping with the British two-party system and the constant polemics between representatives of the government party and the opposition. Marx regarded as one of the main features of Palmerston's political art the ability to represent actions taken in the interest of bourgeois-aristocratic circles as national policy, his feigned concern for the well-being and prestige of the British nation. Palmerston proclaimed himself everywhere as a "truly English minister".

In stressing the similarity between the counter-revolutionary aspirations of Russian Tsarism and of the British oligarchy, however, Marx somewhat exaggerated Palmerston's subservient role in relation to the Tsarist autocracy. The position of Palmerston, as of other leading British statesmen, on the Eastern question was determined not only by fear of revolution and the desire to make use of the Russian autocracy in the struggle against it, but also by the British ruling class's own aggressive aspirations in the Middle East, its expansionist ambitions with respect to the Caucasus, and its plans to build up its own supremacy at the expense of Tsarist Russia. This was, indeed, one of the main causes of the Crimean War.

In writing the pamphlet against Palmerston, and in a number of other works, Marx made use of factual material from the articles and brochures of David Urquhart, then a leading figure in propaganda about "the Russian menace" to Britain. And this caused several newspapers, and also bourgeois historians of a later period, to conclude that Marx and Urquhart shared the same position on the Eastern question. However, in fact, as the works in the present volume show, Marx and Engels disagreed radically with Urquhart and regarded his views as on the whole reactionary. Particularly noteworthy in this respect is the article "David Urquhart", published

in *Die Reform*. In it Marx attacked the emotional attitudinising of David Urquhart, "who is basically conservative", his arbitrary interpretation of revolutionary events as, allegedly, the result of the machinations of Tsarist diplomacy, his Russophobia, and his idealisation of the feudal Ottoman Empire and the reactionary Empire of the Habsburgs. Marx also emphatically refutes Urquhart's conception of history as "more or less exclusively the work of diplomacy" (see this volume, p. 478). Marx regarded Urquhart's denunciation of the foreign policy of Palmerston and the Tsarist government as the only positive aspect of his activity.

When the Crimean War began, Marx and Engels followed its course with the greatest attention. Engels wrote a number of reviews on the fighting on the Danubian and Caucasian fronts, and also on the Black Sea ("The Holy War", "The War on the Danube", "The Last Battle in Europe", and others). These reviews were written immediately after the events in question and some of them inevitably show traces of the influence of the one-sided and sometimes also tendentious information about them in the Western press, which Engels could not immediately check from other sources. As a result of this, his assessment of, in particular, the sea-battle of Sinope on November 30, 1853, in the article "Progress of the Turkish War", was inaccurate. In his reviews (see this volume, pp. 471-73, 520-22) Engels amended some exaggerated statistics about the strength of the Russian troops on the Danube which he had quoted in the articles "The Russians in Turkey" and "Movements of the Armies in Turkey" on the basis of information in the Western press. Nevertheless, Engels' long series of articles on the Crimean War, published in this volume, and also in Volumes 13 and 14 of the present edition, occupies an important place in his writings on military theory. It contains important observations and conclusions on questions of the art of warfare, military strategy and tactics. In analysing the political and military aspects of the Crimean War Marx and Engels worked out a general tactical line for the revolutionary proletariat in this major European military conflict. They arrived at the conclusion that the policy of the ruling classes, whose aggressive aims had plunged the peoples into bloodshed, should be contrasted with the idea of a revolutionary war against Tsarism in the name of the democratic reorganisation of Europe, the liberation of the Poles, Hungarians, Southern Slavs and other oppressed peoples, and the national unification of Germany and also Italy by revolutionary means. Such a war, in their opinion, would inflict a telling blow on Tsarist autocracy, facilitate the liberation of the peoples of Russia, and lead to the collapse of counter-revolutionary regimes in Western

Europe, France and Britain included, and thereby advance the victory of the West European working class.

In this volume four works by Marx are published for the first time in English—"Hirsch's Confessions", "David Urquhart", *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness*, and "Apropos Carey". The articles by Marx and Engels written in English, mainly from the *New-York Daily Tribune*, are published for the first time in the language of the original in collected form (publication in part of a number of them in the collection *The Eastern Question*, London, 1897, is indicated in the notes).

As Marx and Engels repeatedly pointed out in their correspondence, the editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* treated their articles in a somewhat arbitrary fashion, particularly those which were printed, unsigned, in the form of editorials. During the preparation of this volume editorial insertions were discovered in some of these articles. These insertions are reproduced in the present edition in notes to the relevant passages in the given article. Parallel publications in the *New-York Daily Tribune* and *The People's Paper* have been collated. Important divergencies between the two texts are indicated in footnotes. Rare instances of discrepancies in the texts of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and its special issues—the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune* and *New-York Weekly Tribune*—are also indicated in footnotes, with the exception of corrections of misprints made in the main issue. In this case corrections are made in the text without special mention. Obvious misprints in quotations, proper names, geographical names, numbers, dates, etc., discovered in the text of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and other newspapers, have been corrected after checking with the sources used by Marx and Engels. The articles are published under the titles under which they appeared in the newspapers. In cases when an article bore no title in the original, the editorial heading is given in square brackets.

The volume was compiled and the preface, notes, subject index and the index of quoted and mentioned literature written by Tatyana Vasilyeva and edited by Lev Golman (CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism). The indexes of names and of periodicals were prepared by Galina Kostryukova (CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism).

The translations were made by Clemens Dutt, Rodney Livingstone, and Joan and Trevor Walmsley and were edited by Maurice Cornforth and Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence and Wishart) and Victor Schneierson (Progress Publishers).

The volume was prepared for the press by the editors Tatyana Grishina, Victor Schnittke, Lyudgarda Zubrilova and Alla Varavitskaya, and the assistant editors Nadezhda Korneyeva and Alexander Strelnikov for Progress Publishers, and Vladimir Mosolov, scientific editor, for the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU.

KARL MARX
and
FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

March 1853-February 1854

NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE.

VOL. XII.....NO. 3,736.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1853.

PRICE TWO CENTS.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

BRITISH POLITICS.—DISRAELI.—
THE REFUGEES.—MAZZINI IN LONDON.—TURKEY¹

London, Tuesday, March 22, 1853

The most important event in the contemporaneous history of parties is Disraeli's deposition from the leadership of the "great Conservative" minority.² Disraeli, it has transpired, was himself prepared to throw overboard his former allies eight or nine weeks before the dissolution of the Tory Cabinet, and desisted from his resolution only at the urgent instance of Lord Derby. He in his turn, is now dismissed and has been formally replaced by Sir John Pakington, a safe character, cautious, not altogether wanting in administrative ability, but a mournful man otherwise, the very incarnation of the worn-out prejudices and antiquated feelings of the old English squireocracy. This change in leadership amounts to a complete, and perhaps to the final transformation of the Tory party.—Disraeli may congratulate himself on his emancipation from the landed humbugs. Whatever be our opinion of the man, who is said to despise the aristocracy, to hate the *bourgeoisie*, and not to like the people; he is unquestionably the ablest member of the present Parliament, while the flexibility of his character enables him the better to accommodate himself to the changing wants of society.

In reference to the Refugee question I told you in my last,^a that after Lord Palmerston's speech in the House of Commons, the Austrian journals declared it to be useless to ask for redress from a Cabinet corrupted by Palmerstonian influence. But scarcely was Aberdeen's declaration in the House of Lords telegraphed to

^a K. Marx, "Kossuth and Mazzini.—Intrigues of the Prussian Government.—Austro-Prussian Commercial Treaty.—*The Times* and the Refugees" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 535-41).—*Ed.*

Vienna when the aspect of things changed again.³ The same journals now assert that "Austria trusts to the honor of the English Cabinet," and the semi-official *Oesterreichische Correspondenz* publishes the following from its Paris Correspondent:

"Lord Cowley, on his return to Paris, stated to the Emperor of the French,^a that the diplomatic representatives of England at the Northern Courts had been formally instructed to employ all their efforts to deter the Northern Powers from forwarding a collective note to the British Government, and to urge, as the ground for such abstention, that that Government would be the better enabled to *comply with the demand of those powers*, the more it could keep up, in all eyes of England, the appearance of *acting freely and voluntarily in the matter*....

"The British Ambassador, Lord Cowley, urged the Emperor of the French to place implicit confidence on the British Cabinet, the more so as the Emperor would always be at liberty to take any steps he might consider proper in the event of that confidence not having been justified.... The Emperor of the French, while reserving to himself full freedom of action for the future, was induced to *put the sincerity of the British Cabinet to the proof*, and he is now endeavoring to persuade the other powers to follow his example."

You see what is expected from "*ce cher Aberdeen*," as Louis Philippe used to call him, and what promises he must have made. These promises are actually already followed up by deeds. Last week the English Police drew up a list of the Continental refugees residing in London. Several detectives, in plain clothes, walked from square to square, from street to street, and from house to house, making notes on the personale of the refugees, addressing themselves in the majority of cases to the publicans in the neighborhood, but entering in some instances, under the pretense of the pursuit of criminals, the very domiciles and searching the papers of some exiles.

While the Continental Police is vainly hunting after Mazzini, while at Nuremberg the magistrates have ordered the closure of the gates in order to catch him—no man being hanged there before he is caught, according to the old German proverb—while the English press publishes reports after reports as to his supposed sojourn, Mazzini has for the past few days been safe and sound at London.

Prince Menchikoff, after reviewing the Russian forces stationed in the Danubian Principalities, and after an inspection of the army and fleet at Sebastopol, where he caused manoeuvres of embarking and disembarking troops to be executed under his own eyes, entered Constantinople in the most theatrical style on Feb. 28,

^a Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

attended by a suite of 12 persons, including the Admiral of the Russian squadron in the Black Sea,^a a General of Division,^b and several staff officers, with M. de Nesselrode, Jr., as Secretary of the Embassy. He met with such a reception from the Greek and Russian inhabitants as he were the orthodox Czar himself entering *Tsarigrad* to restore it to the true faith. An enormous sensation was created here and at Paris, by the news that Prince Menchikoff, not satisfied with the dismissal of Fuad Effendi, had demanded that the Sultan should abandon to the Emperor of Russia, not only the protection of all the Christians in Turkey, but also the right of nominating the Greek patriarch; that the Sultan had appealed to the protection of England and France; that Colonel Rose, the British Envoy, had dispatched the steamer *Wasp* in haste to Malta to request the immediate presence of the English fleet in the Archipelago, and that Russian vessels had anchored at Kilia, near the Bosphorus.^c The Paris *Moniteur* informs us that the French squadron at Toulon had been ordered to the Grecian waters.^d Admiral Dundas, however, is still at Malta. From all this, it is evident, that the Eastern Question is once more on the European "*ordre du jour*," a fact not astonishing for those who are acquainted with history.

Whenever the revolutionary hurricane has subsided for a moment, one ever-recurring question is sure to turn up: the eternal "*Eastern Question*." Thus, when the storms of the first French revolution had passed, and Napoleon and Alexander of Russia had divided, after the peace of Tilsit, the whole of Continental Europe⁴ betwixt themselves, Alexander profited by the momentary calm to march an army into Turkey, and to "give a lift" to the forces that were breaking up from within that decaying empire. Again, no sooner had the revolutionary movements of Western Europe⁵ been quelled by the Congresses of Laybach and Verona, than Alexander's successor, Nicholas, made another dash at Turkey. When a few years later, the revolution of July, with its concomitant insurrections in Poland, Italy, Belgium, had had its turn, and Europe, as remodeled in 1831, seemed out of the reach of domestic squalls, the Eastern Question, in 1840, appeared on the point of embroiling the "great Powers" in a general war.⁶ And now, when the shortsightedness of the ruling

^a V. A. Kornilov.—*Ed*

^b A. A. Nepokoichitsky.—*Ed*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* erroneously has "Dardanelles".—*Ed*

^d *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 79, March 20, 1853.—*Ed*

pigmies prides itself in having successfully freed Europe from the dangers of anarchy and revolution, up starts again the everlasting topic, the never-failing difficulty: What shall we do with Turkey?

Turkey is the living sore of European legitimacy.⁷ The impotency of legitimate, monarchical government, ever since the first French Revolution, has resumed itself in the one axiom: Keep up the *status quo*. A *testimonium paupertatis*, an acknowledgment of the universal incompetence of the ruling powers, for any purpose of progress or civilization, is seen in this universal agreement to stick to things as by chance or accident they happen to be. Napoleon could dispose of a whole continent at a moment's notice; aye, and dispose of it, too, in a manner that showed both genius and fixedness of purpose; the entire "collective wisdom" of European legitimacy, assembled in Congress at Vienna, took a couple of years to do the same job, got at loggerheads over it, made a very sad mess, indeed, of it, and found it such a dreadful bore that ever since they have had enough of it, and have never tried their hands again at parceling out Europe. Myrmidons of mediocrity, as Béranger calls them,^a without historical knowledge or insight into facts, without ideas, without initiative, they adore the *status quo* they themselves have bungled together, knowing what a bungling and blundering piece of workmanship it is.

But Turkey no more than the rest of the world remains stationary; and just when the reactionary party has succeeded in restoring in civilized Europe what they consider to be the *status quo ante*, it is perceived that in the meantime the *status quo* in Turkey has been very much altered, that new questions, new relations, new interests have sprung up, and that the poor diplomatists have to begin again where they were interrupted by a general earthquake some eight or ten years before. Keep up the *status quo* in Turkey! Why, you might as well try to keep up the precise degree of putridity into which the carcass of a dead horse has passed at a given time, before dissolution is complete. Turkey goes on decaying, and will go on decaying as long as the present system of "balance of power" and maintenance of the "status quo" goes on, and in spite of Congresses, protocols and ultimatums it will produce its yearly quota of diplomatic difficulties and international

^a P. J. Béranger, *Les Mirmidons, ou les funérailles d'Achille*. There is a pun in the title of this allegory: "les mirmidons" meaning a warlike Thessalian race who accompanied Achilles to the Trojan War, and "mirmidon" also denotes "shorty, dwarf, good-for-nothing".—*Ed.*

squabbles quite as every other putrid body will supply the neighborhood with a due allowance of carburetted hydrogen and other well-scented gaseous matter.

Let us look at the question at once. Turkey consists of three entirely distinct portions: the vassal principalities of Africa, viz. Egypt and Tunis; Asiatic Turkey, and European Turkey. The African possessions, of which Egypt alone may be considered as really subject to the Sultan, may be left for the moment out of the question; Egypt belongs more to the English than to anybody else, and will and must necessarily form their share in any future partition of Turkey. Asiatic Turkey is the real seat of whatever strength there is in the Empire; Asia Minor and Armenia, for four hundred years the chief abode of the Turks, form the reserved ground from which the Turkish armies have been drawn, from those that threatened the ramparts of Vienna, to those that dispersed before Diebitsch's not very skillful manoeuvres at Kulevcha.⁸ Turkey in Asia, although thinly populated, yet forms too compact a mass of Mussulman fanaticism and Turkish nationality to invite at present any attempts at conquest; and in fact whenever the "Eastern Question" is mooted, the only portions of this territory taken into consideration, are Palestine and the Christian valleys of the Lebanon.

The real point at issue always is, Turkey in Europe—the great peninsula to the south of the Save and Danube. This splendid territory has the misfortune to be inhabited by a conglomerate of different races⁹ and nationalities, of which it is hard to say which is the least fit for progress and civilization. Slavonians, Greeks, Wallachians, Arnauts,^a twelve millions of men, are all held in submission by one million of Turks, and up to a recent period it appeared doubtful whether, of all these different races, the Turks were not the most competent to hold the supremacy which, in such a mixed population, could not but accrue to one of these nationalities. But when we see how lamentably have failed all the attempts at civilization by Turkish authority—how the fanaticism of Islam, supported principally by the Turkish mob in a few great cities, has availed itself of the assistance of Austria and Russia invariably to regain power and to overturn any progress that might have been made; when we see the central, *i.e.* Turkish authority weakened year after year by insurrections in the Christian provinces, none of which, thanks to the weakness of the Porte and to the intervention of neighboring States, is ever

^a The Turkish name for Albanians.—*Ed.*

completely fruitless; when we see Greece acquire her independence, parts of Armenia conquered by Russia—Moldavia, Wallachia, Serbia, successively placed under the protectorate of the latter power,—we shall be obliged to admit that the presence of the Turks in Europe is a real obstacle to the development of the resources of the Thraco-Illyrian Peninsula.

We can hardly describe the Turks as the *ruling class* of Turkey, because the relations of the different classes of society there are as much mixed up as those of the various races. The Turk is, according to localities and circumstances, workman, farmer, small freeholder, trader, feudal landlord in the lowest and most barbaric stage of feudalism, civil officer, or soldier; but in all these different social positions he belongs to the privileged creed and nation—he alone has the right to carry arms, and the highest Christian has to give up the footpath to the lowest Moslem he meets. In Bosnia and the Herzegovina, the nobility, of Slavonian descent, has passed over to Islam, while the mass of the people remain Rayahs, *i.e.* Christians. In this province, then, the ruling creed and the ruling class are identified, as of course the Moslem Bosnian is upon a level with his co-religionist of Turkish descent.

The principal power of the Turkish population in Europe, independently of the reserve always ready to be drawn from Asia, lies in the mob of Constantinople and a few other large towns. It is essentially Turkish, and though it finds its principal livelihood by doing jobs for Christian capitalists, it maintains with great jealousy the imaginary superiority and real impunity for excesses which the privileges of Islam confer upon it as compared with Christians. It is well known that this mob in every important *coup d'état* has to be won over by bribes and flattery. It is this mob alone, with the exception of a few colonized districts, which offers a compact and imposing mass of Turkish population in Europe. And certainly there will be, sooner or later, an absolute necessity of freeing one of the finest parts of this continent from the rule of a mob, compared to which the mob of Imperial Rome was an assemblage of sages and heroes.

Among the other nationalities, we may dispose in a very few words of the Arnauts, a hardy aboriginal mountain people, inhabiting the country sloping toward the Adriatic, speaking a language of their own, which, however, appears to belong to the great Indo-European stock. They are partly Greek Christians, partly Moslems, and, according to all we know of them, as yet very unprepared for civilization. Their predatory habits will force any

neighboring government to hold them in close military subjection, until industrial progress in the surrounding districts shall find them employment as hewers of wood and drawers of water, the same as has been the case with the Gallegas^a in Spain, and the inhabitants of mountainous districts generally.

The Wallachians or Daco-Romans, the chief inhabitants of the district between the Lower Danube and the Dniester, are a greatly mixed population, belonging to the Greek Church and speaking a language derived from the Latin, and in many respects not unlike the Italian. Those of Transylvania and the Bukovina belong to the Austrian, those of Bessarabia to the Russian Empire; those of Moldavia and Wallachia, the two only principalities where the Daco-Roman race has acquired a political existence, have Princes of their own, under the nominal *suzeraineté* of the Porte and the real dominion of Russia. Of the Transylvanian Wallachians we heard much during the Hungarian War¹⁰; hitherto oppressed by the feudalism of Hungarian landlords who were, according to the Austrian system, made at the same time the instruments of all Government exactions, this brutalized mass was in like manner as the Ruthenian serfs of Galicia in 1846,¹¹ won over by Austrian promises and bribes, and began that war of devastation which has made a desert of Transylvania. The Daco-Romans of the Turkish Principalities have at least a native nobility and political institutions; and in spite of all the efforts of Russia, the revolutionary spirit has penetrated among them, as the insurrection of 1848 well proved.¹² There can hardly be a doubt that the exactions and hardships inflicted upon them during the Russian occupation since 1848 must have raised this spirit still higher, in spite of the bond of common religion and Czaro-Popish superstition which has hitherto led them to look upon the imperial chief of the Greek Church as upon their natural protector. And if this is the case, the Wallachian nationality may yet play an important part in the ultimate disposal of the territories in question.

The Greeks of Turkey are mostly of Slavonic descent, but have adopted the modern Hellenic language; in fact, with the exception of a few noble families of Constantinople and Trebizond, it is now generally admitted that very little pure Hellenic blood is to be found even in Greece. The Greeks, along with the Jews, are the principal traders in the seaports and many inland towns. They are also tillers of the soil in some districts. In all cases, neither their numbers, compactness, nor spirit of nationality, give them any

^a An ancient mountain people of Galicia.—*Ed.*

political weight as a nation, except in Thessaly and perhaps Epirus. The influence held by a few noble Greek families as dragomans (interpreters) in Constantinople, is fast declining, since Turks have been educated in Europe and European legations have been provided with attachés who speak Turkish.

We now come to the race that forms the great mass of the population and whose blood is preponderant wherever a mixture of races has occurred. In fact it may be said to form the principal stock of the Christian population from the Morea to the Danube, and from the Black Sea to the Arnaut Mountains. This race is the Slavonic race, and more particularly that branch of it which is resumed under the name of Illyrian (Ilirski), or South Slavonian (Jugoslavenski). After the Western Slavonian (Polish and Bohemian), and Eastern Slavonian (Russian), it forms the third branch of that numerous Slavonic family which for the last twelve hundred years has occupied the East of Europe. These southern Slavonians occupy not only the greater part of Turkey, but also Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia and the south of Hungary. They all speak the same language, which is much akin to the Russian, and by far to western ears, the most musical of all Slavonic tongues. The Croats and part of the Dalmatians are Roman Catholics, all the remainder belong to the Greek Church. The Roman Catholics use the Latin alphabet, but the followers of the Greek Church write their language in the Cyrillian character,¹³ which is also used in the Russian and old Slavonic or Church language. This circumstance connected with the difference of religion, has contributed to retard any national development embracing the whole south Slavonic territory. A man in Belgrade may not be able to read a book printed in his own language at Agram^a or Betch,^b he may object even to take it up, on account of the "heterodox" alphabet and orthography used therein; while he will have little difficulty in reading and understanding a book printed at Moscow, in the Russian language, because the two idioms, particularly in the old Slavonic etymological system of orthography, look very much alike, and because the book is printed in the "orthodox" (pravoslavni) alphabet. The mass of the Greek Slavonians will not even have their bibles, liturgies and prayer books printed in their own country, because they are convinced that there is a peculiar correctness and orthodoxy and odor of sanctity about anything printed in holy Moscow or in the imperial printing establishment

^a Zagreb.—*Ed.*

^b The Serbian name for Vienna.—*Ed.*

of St. Petersburg. In spite of all the panslavistic efforts of Agram and Prague enthusiasts,¹⁴ the Serbian, the Bulgarian, the Bosnian Rayah, the Slavonian peasant of Macedonia and Thrace, has more national sympathy, more points of contact, more means of intellectual intercourse with the Russian than with the Roman Catholic south Slavonian who speaks the same language. Whatever may happen, he looks to St. Petersburg for the advent of the Messiah who is to deliver him from all evil; and if he calls Constantinople his *Tsarigrad* or Imperial City, it is as much in anticipation of the orthodox Tsar coming from the north and entering it to restore the true faith, as in recollection of the orthodox Tsar who held it before the Turks overrun the country.

Subjected in the greater part of Turkey to the direct rule of the Turk, but under local authorities of their own choice, partly (in Bosnia) converted to the faith of the conqueror, the Slavonian race has, in that country, maintained or conquered political existence in two localities. The one is Serbia, the valley of the Morava, a province with well defined natural lines of frontier, which played an important part in the history of these regions six hundred years ago. Subdued for a while by the Turks, the Russian war of 1806¹⁵ gave it a chance of obtaining a separate existence, though under the Turkish supremacy. It has remained ever since under the immediate protection of Russia. But, as in Moldavia and Wallachia, political existence has brought on new wants, and forced upon Serbia an increased intercourse with Western Europe. Civilization began to take root, trade extended, new ideas sprang up; and thus we find in the very heart and stronghold of Russian influence, in Slavonic, orthodox Serbia, an anti-Russian, progressive party (of course, very modest in its demands of reform), headed by the ex-Minister of Finances Garašanin.¹⁶

There is no doubt that, should the Greco-Slavonian population ever obtain the mastery in the land which it inhabits and where it forms three-fourths of the whole population (seven millions), the same necessities would by and by give birth to an anti-Russian, progressive party, the existence of which has been hitherto the inevitable consequence of any portion of it having become semi-detached from Turkey.

In Montenegro, we have not a fertile valley with comparatively large cities, but a barren mountain country of difficult access. Here a set of robbers have fixed themselves, scouring the plains and storing the plunder in their mountain fastnesses. These romantic but rather uncouth gentlemen have long been a nuisance

in Europe, and it is but in keeping with the policy of Russia and Austria that they should stick up for the rights of the Black Mountain people (Tsernogorci) to burn down villages, murder the inhabitants and carry off the cattle.

Written between March 12 and 22, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3736, and the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 821, April 7, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 604, April 9, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Frederick Engels

THE REAL ISSUE IN TURKEY¹⁷

We are astonished that in the current discussion of the Oriental Question the English journals have not more boldly demonstrated the vital interests which should render Great Britain the earnest and unyielding opponent of the Russian projects of annexation and aggrandizement. England cannot afford to allow Russia to become the possessor of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus. Both commercially and politically such an event would be a deep if not a deadly blow at British power. This will appear from a simple statement of facts as to her trade with Turkey.

Before the discovery of the direct route to India, Constantinople was the mart of an extensive commerce. And now, though the products of India find their way into Europe by the overland route through Persia, Turan^a and Turkey, yet the Turkish ports carry on a very important and rapidly increasing traffic both with Europe and the interior of Asia. To understand this, it is only necessary to look at the map. From the Black Forest to the sandy heights of Novgorod Veliki, the whole inland country is drained by rivers flowing into the Black or Caspian Sea. The Danube and the Volga, the two giant-rivers of Europe, the Dniester, Dnieper and Don, all form so many natural channels for the carriage of inland produce to the Black Sea—for the Caspian itself is only accessible through the Black Sea. Two-thirds of Europe—that is, a part of Germany and Poland, all Hungary, and the most fertile parts of Russia, besides Turkey in Europe, are thus naturally referred to the Euxine^b for the export and exchange of their produce; and

^a The old name of the Turkestan Lowland.—*Ed.*

^b Pontus Euxinus—ancient name of the Black Sea.—*Ed.*

the more so, as all these countries are essentially agricultural, and the great bulk of their products must always make water-carriage the predominant means of transport. The corn of Hungary, Poland, Southern Russia, the wool and the hides of the same countries appear in yearly increasing quantities in our Western^a markets, and they all are shipped at Galatz, Odessa, Taganrog, and other Euxine ports. Then there is another important branch of trade carried on in the Black Sea. Constantinople, and particularly Trebizond, in Asiatic Turkey, are the chief marts of the caravan trade to the interior of Asia, to the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, to Persia, and Turkestan. This trade, too, is rapidly increasing. The Greek and Armenian merchants of the two towns just named import large quantities of English manufactured goods, the low price of which is rapidly superseding the domestic industry of the Asiatic harem. Trebizond is better situated for such a trade than any other point. It has in its rear the hills of Armenia, which are far less impassable than the Syrian desert, and it lies at a convenient proximity to Bagdad, Shiraz, and Teheran, which latter place serves as an intermediate mart for the caravans from Khiva and Bokhara. How important this trade, and the Black Sea trade generally is becoming, may be seen at the Manchester Exchange, where dark-complexioned Greek buyers are increasing in numbers and importance, and where Greek and South-Slavonian dialects are heard along with German and English.

The trade of Trebizond is also becoming a matter of most serious political consideration, as it has been the means of bringing the interests of Russia and England anew into conflict in Inner Asia. The Russians had, up to 1840, an almost exclusive monopoly of the trade in foreign manufactured goods to that region. Russian goods were found to have made their way, and in some instances even to be preferred to English goods, as far down as the Indus. Up to the time of the Afghan war, the conquest of Scinde and the Punjab,¹⁸ it may be safely asserted that the trade of England with Inner Asia was nearly null. The fact is now different. The supreme necessity of a never-ceasing expansion of trade—this *fatum* which, specter-like, haunts modern England, and, if not appeased at once, brings on those terrible revulsions which vibrate from New-York to Canton, and from St. Petersburg to Sidney—this inflexible necessity has caused the interior of Asia to be attacked from two sides by English trade: from the Indus

^a The *New-York Weekly Tribune* has "English".—*Ed.*

and from the Black Sea; and although we know very little of the exports of Russia to that part of the world, we may safely conclude from the increase of English exports to that quarter, that the Russian trade in that direction must have sensibly fallen off. The commercial battle-field between England and Russia has been removed from the Indus to Trebizond, and the Russian trade, formerly venturing out as far as the limits of England's Eastern Empire, is now reduced to the defensive on the very verge of its own line of custom-houses. The importance of this fact with regard to any future solution of the Eastern Question, and to the part which both England and Russia may take in it, is evident. They are, and always must be, antagonists in the East.

But let us come to a more definite estimate of this Black Sea trade. According to the London *Economist*,^a the British exports to the Turkish dominions, including Egypt and the Danubian Principalities, were:

In 1840	£ 1,440,592	In 1846	£ 2,707,571
In 1842	2,068,842	In 1848	3,626,241
In 1844	3,271,333	In 1850	3,762,480
In 1851	£ 3,548,959		

Of these amounts, at least two-thirds must have gone to ports in the Black Sea, including Constantinople. And all this rapidly increasing trade depends upon the confidence that may be placed in the power which rules the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, the key to the Black Sea. Whoever holds these can open and shut at his pleasure the passage into this last recess of the Mediterranean. Let Russia once come into possession of Constantinople, who will expect her to keep open the door by which England has invaded her commercial domain?

So much for the commercial importance of Turkey, and especially the Dardanelles. It is evident that not only a very large trade, but the principal intercourse of Europe with Central Asia, and consequently the principal means of re-civilizing that vast region, depends upon the uninterrupted liberty of trading through these gates to the Black Sea.

Now for the military considerations. The commercial importance of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus at once makes them

^a "Turkey and Its Value", *The Economist*, No. 498, March 12, 1853.—*Ed.*

first-rate military positions, that is, positions of decisive influence in any war. Such a point is Gibraltar, and such is Helsingör^a in the Sound. But the Dardanelles are, from the nature of their locality, even more important. The cannon of Gibraltar or Helsingör cannot command the whole of the strait on which they are situated, and they require the assistance of a fleet in order to close it; while the narrowness of the strait at the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus is such that a few properly-erected and well-armed fortifications, such as Russia, once in possession, would not tarry an hour to erect, might defy the combined fleets of the world if they attempted a passage. In that case, the Black Sea would be more properly a Russian lake than even the Lake of Ladoga, situated in its very heart. The resistance of the Caucasians would be starved out at once; Trebizond would be a Russian port; the Danube a Russian river. Besides, when Constantinople is taken, the Turkish Empire is cut in two; Asiatic and European Turkey have no means of communicating with or supporting each other, and while the strength of the Turkish army, repulsed into Asia, is utterly harmless, Macedonia, Thessaly, Albania, outflanked and cut off from the main body, will not put the conqueror to the trouble of subduing them; they will have nothing left but to beg for mercy and for an army to maintain internal order.

But having come thus far on the way to universal empire, is it probable that this gigantic and swollen power will pause in the career? Circumstances, if not her own will, forbid it. With the annexation of Turkey and Greece she has excellent seaports, while the Greeks furnish skillful sailors for her navy. With Constantinople, she stands on the threshold of the Mediterranean; with Durazzo and the Albanian coast from Antivari to Arta, she is in the very center of the Adriatic, within sight of the British Ionian islands, and within 36 hours' steaming of Malta. Flanking the Austrian dominions on the North, East and South, Russia will already count the Hapsburgs among her vassals. And then, another question is possible, is even probable. The broken and undulating western frontier of the Empire, ill-defined in respect of natural boundaries, would call for rectification, and it would appear that the natural frontier of Russia runs from Dantzic or perhaps Stettin to Trieste. And as sure as conquest follows conquest, and annexation follows annexation, so sure would the conquest of Turkey by Russia be only the prelude for the annexation of Hungary, Prussia, Galicia, and for the ultimate

^a The *New-York Weekly Tribune* gives the English name "Elsinore".—*Ed.*

realization of the Slavonic Empire which certain fanatical Pan-slavistic philosophers have dreamed of.

Russia is decidedly a conquering nation, and was so for a century, until the great movement of 1789 called into potent activity an antagonist of formidable nature. We mean the European Revolution, the explosive force of democratic ideas and man's native thirst for freedom. Since that epoch there have been in reality but two powers on the continent of Europe—Russia and Absolutism, the Revolution and Democracy. For the moment the Revolution seems to be suppressed, but it lives and is feared as deeply as ever. Witness the terror of the reaction at the news of the late rising at Milan.¹⁹ But let Russia get possession of Turkey, and her strength is increased nearly half, and she becomes superior to all the rest of Europe put together. Such an event would be an unspeakable calamity to the revolutionary cause. The maintenance of Turkish independence, or in case of a possible dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, the arrest of the Russian scheme of annexation is a matter of the highest moment. In this instance the interests of the revolutionary Democracy and of England go hand in hand. Neither can permit the Czar to make Constantinople one of his Capitals, and we shall find that when driven to the wall, the one will resist him as determinedly as the other.

Written between March 23 and 28, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3740, April 12, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 605, April 16, 1853

Karl Marx

THE LONDON PRESS.—POLICY OF NAPOLEON
ON THE TURKISH QUESTION²⁰

London, March 25th, 1853

Until this morning no further authentic news has been received from Turkey. The Paris Correspondent of *The Morning Herald*, of to-day, asserts that he has been informed by responsible authority that the Russians have entered Bucharest. In the *Courrier de Marseille* of the 20th inst. we read:

“We are in a position to convey to the knowledge of our readers the substance of the note which has already been presented to the Sublime Porte by M. d’Ozeroff immediately after the departure of Count Leiningen, and before the brutal ‘sortie’ of the Prince Menchikoff in the midst of the Divan. The following are the principal points referred to in this diplomatic note. The Count de Nesselrode complained in the most lively terms that the Porte, in spite of its formal promise not to attack the Montenegrins, had carried on a sanguinary war against that people, which had given the greatest dissatisfaction to the Cabinet of St. Petersburg. In order, now, to secure a sufficient protection to the Montenegrins, and for their preservation from new disasters, Russia would invite the Porte to recognize the *independence of Montenegro*. The note contained also a protest against the blockade of the Albanian Coast, and in conclusion it pressed the demand upon the Sultan^a to dismiss those ministers whose doings had always occasioned misunderstandings between the two governments. On the receipt of this note Turkey is said to have shown a disposition to yield, although with regret, to that one point relating to the dismissal of ministers, particularly of Fuad Effendi, the Sultan’s brother-in-law, who has actually been replaced by Rifaat Pasha, a partisan of Russia. The Porte, however, refused to acknowledge the independence of Montenegro. It was then that Prince Menchikoff, without previously paying the usual compliments to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, presented himself in the Divan, to the neglect of all diplomatic forms, and intimated in a bullying manner to that body to subscribe to his demands. In consequence of this demand the Porte invoked the protection of England and France.”

^a Abdul Mejjid.—*Ed.*

In ancient Greece, an orator who was paid to remain silent, was said to have an *ox on his tongue*. The *ox*, be it remarked, was a silver coin imported from Egypt.²¹ With regard to *The Times*, we may say that, during the whole period of the revived Eastern Question, it had also an ox on its tongue, if not for remaining silent, at least for speaking. At first, this ingenious paper defended the Austrian intervention in Montenegro, on the plea of Christianity. But afterwards, when Russia interfered, it dropped this argument, stating that the whole question was a quarrel between the Greek and Roman Churches, utterly indifferent to the "subjects" of the Established Church of England. Then, it dwelt on the importance of the Turkish commerce for Great Britain, inferring from that very importance, that Great Britain could but gain by exchanging Turkish Free-Trade for Russian prohibition and Austrian protection. It next labored to prove that England was dependent for her food upon Russia, and must therefore bow in silence to the geographical ideas of the Czar.^a A gracious compliment this to the commercial system exalted by *The Times*, and a very pleasant argumentation, that to mitigate England's dependence on Russia, the Black Sea had to become a Russian lake, and the Danube a Russian river. Then, driven from these untenable positions, it fell back on the general statement that the Turkish Empire was hopelessly falling to pieces,—a conclusive proof this, in the opinion of *The Times*, that Russia presently must become the executor and heir of that Empire. Anon, *The Times* wanted to subject the inhabitants of Turkey to the "pure sway" and civilizing influence of Russia and Austria, remembering the old story that wisdom comes from the East, and forgetting its recent statement that "the state maintained by Austria in the provinces and kingdoms of her own Empire, was one of arbitrary authority and of executive, tyranny, regulated by no laws at all." In conclusion, and this is the strongest bit of impudence, *The Times* congratulates itself on the "brilliancy" of its Eastern leaders^b!

The whole London Press, Morning Press and Evening Press, Daily Press and Weekly Press rose as one man against the "leading journal." *The Morning Post* mocks at the intelligence of its brethren of *The Times*, whom it accuses of spreading deliberately false and absurd news. *The Morning Herald* calls it "our Hebraeo-Austro-Russian contemporary," *The Daily News* more shortly the "Brun-

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b See the leader in *The Times*, No. 21383, March 23, 1853.—*Ed.*

now organ.”^a Its twin-brother, *The Morning Chronicle* heaves at it the following blow:

“The journalists who have proposed to surrender the Turkish Empire to Russia, on the score of the commercial eminence of a dozen large [Anglo-]Greek firms, are quite right in claiming for themselves the monopoly of brilliancy!”^b

The Morning Advertiser says:

“*The Times* is right in stating that it is isolated in its advocacy of Russian interests.... It is printed in the English language. But that is the only thing English about it. It is, where Russia is concerned, Russian all over.”^c

There is no doubt that the Russian bear will not draw in his paws, unless he be assured of a momentary “entente cordiale” between England and France.²² Now mark the following wonderful coincidence. On the very day when *The Times* was trying to persuade my lords Aberdeen and Clarendon, that the Turkish affair was a mere squabble between France and Russia, the “roi des drôles”^d as Guizot used to call him, M. Granier de Cassagnac, happened to discover in the *Constitutionnel*, that it was all nothing but a quarrel between Lord Palmerston and the Czar.^e Truly, when we read these papers, we understand the Greek orators with Macedonian oxen on their tongues, at the times when Demosthenes fulminated his Philippics.

As for the British aristocracy represented by the Coalition Ministry, they would, if need be, sacrifice the national English interests to their particular class interests, and permit the consolidation of a juvenile despotism in the East in the hopes of finding a support for their valetudinarian oligarchy in the West. As to Louis Napoleon he is hesitating. All his predilections are on the side of the Autocrat, whose system of governing he has introduced into France, and all his antipathies are against England, whose parliamentary system he has destroyed there. Besides, if he permits the Czar’s plundering in the East, the Czar will perhaps permit him to plunder in the West. On the other hand he is as quite sure of the feelings of the Holy Alliance with regard to the “parvenu Khan.” Accordingly he observes an

^a *The Morning Post*, No. 24726, March 22, 1853; *The Morning Herald*, No. 22115, March 25, 1853, and *The Daily News*, No. 2133, March 23, 1853.—Ed.

^b *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 26910, March 24, 1853.—Ed.

^c *The Morning Advertiser*, March 24, 1853.—Ed.

^d King of the buffoons.—Ed.

^e A. Granier de Cassagnac, “Des Affaires d’Orient”, *Le Constitutionnel*, No. 83, March 24, 1853.—Ed.

ambiguous policy, striving to dupe the great powers of Europe as he duped the parliamentary parties of the French National Assembly. While fraternizing ostentatiously with the English ambassador for Turkey, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, he simultaneously cajoles the Russian Princess de Lieven with the most flattering promises, and sends to the court of the Sultan M. De la Cour, a warm advocate of an Austro-French alliance, in contradistinction to an Anglo-French one. He orders the Toulon fleet to sail to the Grecian waters, and then announces the day afterward, in the *Moniteur*, that this had been done without any previous communication with England. While he orders one of his organs, the *Pays*, to treat the Eastern Question as most important to France, he allows the statement of his other organ, the *Constitutionnel*, that Russian, Austrian and English interests are at stake in this question, but that France has only a very remote interest in it, and is therefore in a wholly independent position. Which will outbid the other, Russia or England? that is the question with him.

Written on March 25, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3739, April 11, 1853; reprinted in the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 822, April 12, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Frederick Engels
THE TURKISH QUESTION²³

It is only of late that people in the West of Europe and in America have been enabled to form anything like a correct judgment of Turkish affairs. Up to the Greek insurrection²⁴ Turkey was, to all intents and purposes a *terra incognita*, and the common notions floating about among the public were based more upon the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* than upon any historical facts. Official diplomatic functionaries having been on the spot, boasted a more accurate knowledge, but this, too, amounted to nothing, as none of these officials ever troubled himself to learn Turkish, South Slavonian, or modern Greek, and they were one and all dependent upon the interested accounts of Greek interpreters and Frank^a merchants. Besides, intrigues of every sort were always on hand to occupy the time of these lounging diplomatists, among whom Joseph von Hammer, the German historian of Turkey,^b forms the only honorable exception. The business of these gentlemen was not with the people, the institutions, the social state of the country; it was exclusively with the Court, and especially with the Fanariote Greeks,²⁵ wily mediators between two parties either of which was equally ignorant of the real condition, power and resources of the other. The traditional notions and opinions, founded upon such paltry information, formed for a long while, and strange to say, form to a great extent even now, the ground-work for all the action of Western diplomacy with regard to Turkey.

^a Franks is the name commonly used in the Middle East for West-Europeans.—
Ed.

^b Jos. Hammer, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*.—Ed.

But while England, France, and for a long time even Austria, were groping in the dark for a defined Eastern policy, another power outwitted them all. Russia herself semi-Asiatic in her condition, manners, traditions and institutions, found men enough who could comprehend the real state and character of Turkey. Her religion was the same as that of nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Turkey in Europe; her language almost identical with that of seven millions of Turkish subjects; and the well-known facility with which a Russian learns to converse in, if not fully to appropriate a foreign tongue, made it an easy matter for her agents, well paid for the task, to acquaint themselves completely with Turkish affairs. Thus at a very early period the Russian Government availed itself of its exceedingly favorable position in the South-east of Europe. Hundreds of Russian agents perambulated Turkey, pointing out to the Greek Christians, the Orthodox Emperor as the head, the natural protector, and the ultimate liberator of the oppressed Eastern Church, and to the South Slavonians especially, pointing out that same Emperor as the almighty Czar who was sooner or later to unite all the branches of the great Slavic race under one sceptre, and to make them the ruling race of Europe. The clergy of the Greek Church very soon formed themselves into a vast conspiracy for the spread of these ideas. The Servian insurrection of 1804,²⁶ the Greek rising in 1821 were more or less directly urged on by Russian gold and Russian influence; and wherever among the Turkish pashas the standard of revolt was raised against the Central Government, Russian intrigues and Russian funds were never wanting; and when thus, internal Turkish questions had entirely perplexed the understanding of Western diplomatists who knew no more about the real subject than about the man in the moon, then war was declared, Russian armies marched toward the Balkan, and portion by portion the Ottoman Empire was dismembered.

It is true that during the last thirty years much has been done toward general enlightenment concerning the state of Turkey. German philologists and critics have made us acquainted with the history and literature, English residents and English trade have collected a great deal of information as to the social condition of the Empire. But the diplomatic wiseacres seem to scorn all this, and to cling as obstinately as possible to the traditions engendered by the study of Eastern fairy-tales, improved upon by the no less wonderful accounts given by the most corrupt set of Greek mercenaries that ever existed.

And what has been the natural result? That in all essential

points Russia has steadily, one after another, gained her ends, thanks to the ignorance, dullness, and consequent inconsistency and cowardice of Western governments. From the battle of Navarino²⁷ to the present Eastern crisis, the action of the Western powers has either been annihilated by squabbles among themselves, mostly arising from their common ignorance of Eastern matters, and from petty jealousies which must have been entirely incomprehensible to any Eastern understanding—or that action has been in the direct interest of Russia alone. And not only do the Greeks, both of Greece and Turkey, and the Slavonians, look to Russia as their natural protector; nay, even the Government at Constantinople, despairing, time after time, to make its actual wants and real position understood by these Western ambassadors, who pride themselves upon their own utter incompetency to judge by their own eyes of Turkish matters, the very Turkish Government has in every instance been obliged to throw itself upon the mercy of Russia, and to seek protection from that power which openly avows its firm intention to drive every Turk across the Bosphorus and plant the cross of St. Andrew upon the minarets of the Aya-Sofiyah.

In spite of diplomatic tradition, these constant and successful encroachments of Russia have at last roused in the Western Cabinets in Europe a very dim and distant apprehension of the approaching danger. This apprehension has resulted in the great diplomatic nostrum, that the maintenance of the *status quo* in Turkey is a necessary condition of the peace of the world. The magniloquent incapacity of certain modern statesmen could not have confessed its ignorance and helplessness more plainly than in this axiom which, from having always remained a dead letter, has, during the short period of twenty years, been hallowed by tradition, and become as hoary and indisputable as King John's Magna Charta.²⁸ Maintain the *status quo*! Why, it was precisely to maintain the *status quo* that Russia stirred up Servia to revolt, made Greece independent, appropriated to herself the protectorate of Moldavia and Wallachia, and retained part of Armenia! England and France never stirred an inch when all this was done, and the only time they did move was to protect, in 1849, not Turkey, but the Hungarian refugees.²⁹ In the eyes of European diplomacy, and even of the European press, the whole Eastern question resolves itself into this dilemma, either the Russians at Constantinople, or the maintenance of the *status quo*—anything beside this alternative never enters their thoughts.

Look at the London press for illustration. We find *The Times*

advocating the dismemberment of Turkey, and proclaiming the unfitness of the Turkish race to govern any longer in that beautiful corner of Europe. Skilful as usual, *The Times* boldly attacks the old diplomatic tradition of the *status quo*, and declares its continuance impossible. The whole of the talent at the disposal of that paper is exerted to show this impossibility under different aspects, and to enlist British sympathies for a new crusade against the remnant of the Saracens. The merit of such an unscrupulous attack upon a time-hallowed and unmeaning phrase which, two months ago, was as yet sacred to *The Times*, is undeniable. But whoever knows that paper, knows also that this unwonted boldness is applied directly in the interest of Russia and Austria. The correct premises put forth in its columns as to the utter impossibility of maintaining Turkey in its present state, serve no other purpose than to prepare the British public and the world for the moment when the principal paragraph of the will of Peter the Great,³⁰ the conquest of the Bosphorus, will have become an accomplished fact.

The opposite opinion is represented by *The Daily News*, the organ of the Liberals. *The Times* at least seizes a new and correct feature of the question, in order afterwards to pervert it to an interested purpose. In the columns of the Liberal journal, on the other hand, reigns the plainest sense, but merely a sort of *household sense*. Indeed, it does not see farther than the very threshold of its own house. It clearly perceives that a dismemberment of Turkey *under present circumstances* must bring the Russians to Constantinople, and that this would be a great misfortune for England; that it would threaten the peace of the world, ruin the Black Sea trade, and necessitate new armaments in the British stations and fleets of the Mediterranean. And in consequence, *The Daily News* exerts itself to arouse the indignation and fear of the British public. Is not the partition of Turkey a crime equal to the partition of Poland³¹? Have not the Christians more religious liberty in Turkey than in Austria and Russia? Is not the Turkish Government a mild, paternal government, which allows the different nations and creeds and local corporations to regulate their own affairs? Is not Turkey a paradise compared to Austria and Russia? Is not life and property safe there? And is not British trade with Turkey larger than that with Austria and Russia put together, and does it not increase every year? And then goes on in dithyrambic strain, so far as *The Daily News* can be dithyrambic, an apotheosis of Turkey, the Turks and everything Turkish, which must appear quite incomprehensible to most of its readers.

The key to this strange enthusiasm for the Turks is to be found in the works of David Urquhart,^a Esq., M.P. This gentleman, of Scotch birth, with medieval and patriarchal recollections of home, and with a modern British civilized education, after having fought three years in Greece against the Turks, passed into their country and was the first thus to enamour himself of them. The romantic Highlander found himself at home again in the mountain ravines of the Pindus and Balkan, and his works on Turkey, although full of valuable information, may be summed up in the following three paradoxes, which are laid down almost literally thus: If Mr. Urquhart were not a British subject, he would decidedly prefer being a Turk; if he were not a Presbyterian Calvinist, he would not belong to any other religion than Islamism; and thirdly, Britain and Turkey are the only two countries in the world which enjoy self-government and civil and religious liberty. This same Urquhart has since become the great Eastern authority for all English Liberals who object to Palmerston, and it is he who supplies *The Daily News* with the materials for these panegyrics upon Turkey.

The only argument which deserves a moment's notice, upon this side of the question is this: "It is said that Turkey is decaying; but where is the decay? Is not civilization rapidly spreading in Turkey and trade extending? Where you see nothing but decay, our statistics prove nothing but progress." Now it would be a great fallacy to put down the increasing Black Sea trade to the credit of Turkey alone, and yet this is done here, exactly as if the industrial and commercial capabilities of Holland, the high road to the greater part of Germany, were to be measured by her gross exports and imports, nine-tenths of which represent a mere transit. And yet, what every statistician would immediately, in the case of Holland, treat as a clumsy concoction, the whole of the liberal press of England, including the learned *Economist*, tries, in the case of Turkey, to impose upon public credulity. And then, who are the traders in Turkey? Certainly not the Turks. Their way of promoting trade, when they were yet in their original nomadic state, consisted in robbing caravans, and now that they are a little more civilized it consists in all sorts of arbitrary and oppressive exactions. The Greeks, the Armenians, the Slavonians and the Franks established in the large seaports, carry on the whole of the trade, and certainly they have no reason to thank

^a This evidently refers to David Urquhart's books published in the 1830s: *Turkey and Its Resources* and *The Spirit of the East*.—Ed.

Turkish Beys and Pashas for being able to do so. Remove all the Turks out of Europe, and trade will have no reason to suffer. And as to progress in general civilization, who are they that carry out that progress in all parts of European Turkey? Not the Turks, for they are few and far between, and can hardly be said to be settled anywhere except in Constantinople and two or three small country districts. It is the Greek and Slavonic middle class in all the towns and trading posts who are the real support of whatever civilization is effectually imported into the country. That part of the population are constantly rising in wealth and influence, and the Turks are more and more driven into the background. Were it not for their monopoly of civil and military power, they would soon disappear. But that monopoly has become impossible for the future, and their power is turned into impotence, except for obstructions in the way of progress. The fact is, they must be got rid of. To say that they cannot be got rid of except by putting Russians and Austrians in their place, means as much as to say, that the present political constitution of Europe will last forever. Who will make such an assertion?

Written at the end of March 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3746, April 19, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 606, April 23, 1853

Karl Marx

THE BERLIN CONSPIRACY

London, Friday, April 1, 1853

At length, the fifth of the "Great Powers," Prussia, enjoys the good fortune of having added of her own to the great discoveries made by the Austrian Police,³² with respect to the "demagogical machinations" of the revolutionists.

"The Government," we are assured by its official organs, "having obtained proof that the chiefs of the Democratic party held continued relations with the revolutionary *propaganda*, ordered domiciliary visits to be made, on the 29th of March, at Berlin, and succeeded in arresting 40 individuals, among whom were Streckfuss, and the ex-members of the Prussian N. Assembly, Berends, Waldeck, etc. Domiciliary visits were made in the houses of eighty persons suspected of participation in a conspiracy. Arms and amunition were found."^a

Not content with publishing these "startling facts" in its official papers, the Prussian Government thought proper to forward them by telegraph to the British Foreign Office.

In order to lay bare the mystery of this new police farce, it is necessary to go somewhat back. Two months after the *coup d'état* of Bonaparte, Mr. Hinckeldey, the *Polizei Praesident* of Berlin, and his inferior, Mr. Stieber, the *Polizei Rath*, conspired together, the one to become a Prussian *Maupas*, and the other to become a Prussian *Piétri*. The glorious omnipotence of the French police, perhaps, disturbed their slumbers. Hinckeldey addressed himself to Herr von Westphalen, the Minister of the Interior, making unjust representation to that weak-minded and fanatical reaction-

^a See "Prussia", *The Morning Post*, No. 24734, March 31, 1853.—*Ed.*

ist (Herr von Westphalen being my brother-in-law I had ample opportunity of becoming acquainted with the mental powers of the man), on the necessity of concentrating the whole police force of the Prussian State in the hands of the *Polizei Praesident* of Berlin. He stated, that in order to accelerate the action of the police, it must be made independent of the Minister of the Interior and intrusted exclusively to himself. The minister von Westphalen, represents the ultra Prussian aristocracy and the President of the ministry, Herr von Manteuffel, represents the old bureaucracy; the two are rivals, and the former beheld in the suggestion of Hinckeldey, although it apparently narrowed the circle of his own department, a means of inflicting a blow on his rival, whose brother, M. von Manteuffel, was the director in the ministry of the Interior, and especially charged with the control of the entire police. Herr von Westphalen therefore submitted his proposition to a council of State, presided over by the King himself.^a

The discussion was very angry. Manteuffel, supported by the Prince of Prussia, opposed the plan of establishing an independent ministry of police. The King inclined to the proposition of Herr von Westphalen, and concluded with the Solomonian sentence, that he would follow the example of Bonaparte and create a ministry of police, "if the necessity of that step were proved to him by facts." Now, the affair of the Cologne Communists was chosen by Hinckeldey and Stieber to furnish these facts. You are aware of the heroic performances of those men in the Cologne trials.³³ After their conclusion the Prussian Government resolved to elevate the openly-perjured Stieber, the man who had been hissed wherever he showed himself in the streets of Cologne—to the dignity of a *Polizei-Director* of Cologne. But M. de Bethmann-Hollweg and other well-meaning conservative deputies of Rhenish Prussia, intervened, representing to the ministers that such an open insult to the public opinion of that province might have very ominous consequences at a moment when Bonaparte coveted the *natural limits* of France.³⁴ The Government yielded, contenting itself with the nomination of Stieber as *Polizei-Director* of Berlin, in reward for his perjuries committed at Cologne and his thefts committed at London. There, however, the affair stopped. It was impossible to accomplish the wishes of Mr. Hinckeldey and to create for him an independent ministry of police on the ground of the Cologne trial. Hinckeldey and Stieber watched their time.

^a Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

Happily there came the Milan insurrection. Stieber at once made twenty arrests at Berlin. But the thing was too ridiculous to be proceeded with. But then came Libeny, and now the King was ripe. Overwhelmed with fearful apprehensions he saw at once the necessity of having an independent ministry of police, and Hinckeldey saw his dreams realized. A royal ordinance created him the Prussian *Maupas*, while the brother of Herr von Manteuffel tendered his resignation. The most astounding part of the comedy, however, was yet to come. Scarcely had Mr. Hinckeldey rushed into his new dignity when the "great Berlin conspiracy" was discovered directly. This conspiracy, then, was made for the express purpose of proving the necessity of Mr. Hinckeldey. It was the present Mr. Hinckeldey made over to the imbecile King in exchange for his newly-gained police-autocracy. Hinckeldey's adjunct, the ingenious Stieber, who had discovered at Cologne that whenever letters were found terminating with the words "*Gruss*" and "*Bruderschaft*,"^a there was unquestionably a Communist conspiracy, now made the discovery that there appeared at Berlin for some time since an ominous quantity of "Calabrese hats," and that the Calabrese hat was unquestionably the "rallying sign" of the revolutionists. Strong upon this important discovery, Stieber made on the 18th of March several arrests, chiefly of workmen and foreigners, the charge against whom was the wearing of Calabrese hats. On the 23d ejusdem domiciliary visits were made in the house of Karl Delius, a merchant at Magdeburg and brother of a member of the Second Chamber, who had also an unhappy taste for Calabrese hats. Finally, as I informed you at the beginning of this letter, on the 29th ultimo the great *coup d'état* against the Calabrese hats was struck at Berlin. All those who know anything of the milk-and-water opposition of Waldeck, Berends, &c., will laugh at the "arms and munition" found in the possession of these most inoffensive Brutuses.

But futile as this police comedy may appear to be got up, as it were, by mere personal motives of Messrs. Hinckeldey & Stieber, it is not without significance. The Prussian Government is exasperated at the passive resistance it meets with in every direction. It smells the breath of Revolution in midst of the apparent apathy. It despairs at the want of a tangible form of that specter, and feels alleviated, as it were, from the nightmare every time the police

^a "Greeting" and "Fraternity".—*Ed.*

affords bodily shapes to its ubiquitous but invisible antagonist. It attacks, it will go on attacking, and it will successfully convert the passive resistance of the people into an active one.

Written on April 1, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3745, April 18, 1853; reprinted in the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 824, April 19, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Frederick Engels

WHAT IS TO BECOME OF TURKEY IN EUROPE?

We have seen how the obstinate ignorance, the time-hallowed routine, the hereditary mental drowsiness of European statesmen, shrinks from the very attempt to answer this question. Aberdeen and Palmerston, Metternich and Guizot, not to mention their republican and constitutional substitutes of 1848 to 1852—who will ever be nameless—all despair of a solution.

And all the while Russia advances step by step, slowly, but irresistibly, towards Constantinople, in spite of all the diplomatic notes, plots and manoeuvres of France and England.

Now this steady advance of Russia, admitted by all parties, in all countries of Europe, has never been explained by official statesmen. They see the effect, they see even the ultimate consequence, and yet the cause is hidden from them, although nothing is more simple.

The great motive power which speeds Russia on towards Constantinople, is nothing but the very device, designed to keep her away from it; the hollow, the never-enforced theory of the *status quo*.

What is this *status quo*? For the Christian subjects of the Porte, it means simply the maintenance for ever and a day, of Turkish oppression over them. As long as they are oppressed by Turkish rule, the head of the Greek Church, the ruler of sixty millions of Greek Christians, be he in other respects what he may, is *their natural liberator and protector*. Thus it is, that ten millions of Greek Christians in European Turkey, are forced to appeal to Russian aid, by that very diplomatic scheme, invented in order to prevent Russian encroachments.

Look at the facts as history records them. Even before the reign of Catherine II Russia never omitted an opportunity of obtaining favorable conditions for Moldavia and Wallachia. These stipulations, at last, were carried to such a length in the Treaty of Adrianople (1829)³⁵ that the above-named principalities are now more subject to Russia than to Turkey. When, in 1804, the Servian revolution broke out, Russia took the rebel Rayahs at once under her protection, and in two treaties, after having supported them in two wars, guaranteed the internal independence of their country.³⁶ When the Greeks revolted, who decided the contest? Not the plots and rebellions of Ali Pasha of Janina, not the battle of Navarino, not the French army in the Morea,³⁷ not the conferences and protocols of London, but the march of Diebitsch's Russians across the Balkan into the valley of the Maritza.³⁸ And while Russia thus fearlessly set about the dismemberment of Turkey, western diplomatists continued to guarantee and to hold up as sacred the *status quo* and the inviolability of the Ottoman territory!

So long as the tradition of the upholding, at any price, of the *status quo* and the independence of Turkey in her present state is the ruling maxim of Western diplomacy, so long will Russia be considered, by nine-tenths of the population of Turkey in Europe, their only support, their liberator, their Messiah.

Now, suppose for a moment that Turkish rule in the Graeco-Slavonian peninsula were got rid of; that a government more suitable to the wants of the people existed; what then would be the position of Russia? The fact is notorious, that in every one of the States which have sprung up upon Turkish soil and acquired either total or partial independence, a powerful anti-Russian party has formed itself. If that be the case at a time when Russian support is their only safeguard against Turkish oppression, what, then, are we to expect, as soon as the fear of Turkish oppression shall have vanished?

But to remove Turkish authority beyond the Bosphorus; to emancipate the various creeds and nationalities which populate the peninsula; to open the door to the schemes and machinations, the conflicting desires and interests of all the great powers of Europe;—why is not this provoking universal war? Thus asks diplomatic cowardice and routine.

Of course, it is not expected that the Palmerstons, the Aberdeens, the Clarendons, the Continental Foreign Secretaries, will do such a thing. They cannot look at it without shuddering. But whosoever has, in the study of history, learned to admire the

eternal mutations of human affairs in which nothing is stable but instability, nothing constant but change; whosoever has followed up that stern march of history whose wheels pass relentlessly over the remains of empires, crushing entire generations, without holding them worthy even of a look of pity; whosoever, in short, has had his eyes open to the fact that there was never a demagogic appeal or insurgent proclamation, as revolutionary as the plain and simple records of the history of mankind; whoever knows how to appreciate the eminently revolutionary character of the present age, when steam and wind, electricity and the printing press, artillery and gold discoveries cooperate to produce more changes and revolutions in a year than were ever before brought about in a century, will certainly not shrink from facing a historical question, because of the consideration that its proper settlement may bring about a European war.

No, diplomacy, Government according to the old fashion will never solve the difficulty. The solution of the Turkish problem is reserved, with that of other great problems, to the European Revolution. And there is no presumption in assigning this apparently remote question to the lawful domain of that great movement. The revolutionary landmarks have been steadily advancing ever since 1789. The last revolutionary outposts were Warsaw, Debreczin, Bucharest; the advanced posts of the next revolution must be Petersburg and Constantinople. They are the two vulnerable points where the Russian anti-revolutionary colossus must be attacked.

It would be a mere effort of fancy to give a detailed scheme as to how the Turkish territory in Europe might be partitioned out. Twenty such schemes could be invented, every one as plausible as the other. What we have to do is, not to draw up fanciful programmes, but to seek general conclusions from indisputable facts. And from this point of view the question presents a double aspect.

Firstly, then, it is an undeniable reality that the peninsula, commonly called Turkey in Europe, forms the natural inheritance of the South-Slavonian race. That race furnishes seven millions out of twelve of its inhabitants. It has been in possession of the soil for twelve hundred years. Its competitors—if we except a sparse population which has adopted the Greek language, although in reality of Slavonic descent—are Turkish or Arnaut barbarians, who have long since been convicted of the most inveterate opposition to all progress. The South-Slavonians, on the contrary, are, in the inland districts of the country, the exclusive representa-

tives of civilization. They do not yet form a nation, but they have a powerful and comparatively enlightened nucleus of nationality in Servia. The Servians have a history, a literature of their own. They owe their present internal independence to an eleven years' struggle, carried on valiantly against superior numbers. They have, for the last twenty years, grown rapidly in culture and the means of civilization. They are looked upon by the Christians of Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia and Bosnia as the center, around which, in their future efforts for independence and nationality, all of them must rally. In fact, it may be said that, the more Servia and Servian nationality has consolidated itself, the more has the direct influence of Russia on the Turkish Slavonians been thrown into the background; for Servia, in order to maintain its distinct position as a Christian State, has been obliged to borrow from the West of Europe its political institutions, its schools, its scientific knowledge, its industrial appliances; and thus is explained the anomaly, that, in spite of Russian protection, Servia, ever since her emancipation, has formed a constitutional monarchy.

Whatever may be the bonds which consanguinity and common religious belief may draw between the Russian and the Turkish Slavonians, their interests will be decidedly opposite from the day the latter are emancipated. The commercial necessities arising from the geographical position of the two countries explain this. Russia, a compact inland country, is essentially a country of predominant agricultural, and perhaps, one day, manufacturing production. The Graeco-Slavonian peninsula, small in extent, comparatively, with an enormous extent of shore on three seas, one of which it commands, is now essentially a country of commercial transit, though with the best capacities for independent production. Russia is monopolizing, South Slavonia is expansive. They are, besides, competitors in Central Asia; but while Russia has every interest to exclude all but her own produce, South Slavonia has, even now, every interest to introduce into the Eastern markets the produce of Western Europe. How, then, is it possible for the two nations to agree? In fact, the Turkish South Slavonians and Greeks have, even now, far more interests in common with Western Europe than with Russia. And as soon as the line of railway, which now extends from Ostende, Havre and Hamburg to Pesth, shall have been continued to Belgrade and Constantinople (which is now under consideration), the influence of Western civilization and Western trade will become permanent in the South-east of Europe.

Again: The Turkish Slavonians especially suffer by their

subjection to a Mussulman class of military occupants whom they have to support. These military occupants unite in themselves all public functions, military, civil and judicial. Now what is the Russian system of government, wherever it is not mixed up with feudal institutions, but a military occupation, in which the civil and judicial hierarchy are organized in a military manner, and where the people have to pay for the whole? Whoever thinks that such a system can have a charm for the South Slavonians, may study the history of Servia since 1804. Kara-George, the founder of Servian independence, was abandoned by the people, and Miloš Obrenović, the restorer of that independence, was ignominiously turned out of the country, because they attempted to introduce the Russian autocratic system, accompanied with its concomitant corruption, half-military bureaucracy and pasha-like extortion.

Here then is the simple and final solution of the question. History and the facts of the present day alike point to the erection of a free and independent Christian State on the ruins of the Moslem Empire in Europe. The next effort of the Revolution can hardly fail to render such an event necessary, for it can hardly fail to inaugurate the long-maturing conflict between Russian Absolutism and European Democracy. In that conflict England must bear a part, in whatever hands her Government may for the moment happen to be placed. She can never allow Russia to obtain possession of Constantinople. She must then, take sides with the enemies of the Czar and favor the construction of an independent Slavonian Government in the place of the effete and overthrown Sublime Porte.³⁹

Written at the beginning of April 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3748, April 21, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 607, April 30, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Karl Marx

THE BERLIN CONSPIRACY.—LONDON POLICE.—
MAZZINI.—RADETZKY

London, Friday, April 8, 1853

At the time of writing my last letter concerning the great conspiracy discovered by Mr. Stieber,^a I could not anticipate, that my views on that affair would be more or less confirmed by two Conservative Berlin papers. The *Preussisches Wochenblatt*, the organ of the Conservative faction headed by Mr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, was confiscated on April 2d for recommending its readers "not to believe too hastily in the tales of the police respecting the late arrests."^b But of far greater importance is an article in the *Zeit*, the semi-official journal belonging to the section of the Prussian Ministry headed by M. von Manteuffel. The *Zeit* is compelled to make the following admission:

"Whosoever is not struck with blindness, cannot but be aware that the numerous and inextricable complications presented by the general situation of Europe must lead in a given time, to a violent explosion, which the sincere endeavors of the Great Powers of Europe may postpone for a while, but to prevent which in a permanent way they are utterly unable, notwithstanding all human exertions.... It is for us the accomplishment of a duty not to dissimulate any longer, that discontent is spreading wider and wider and *is the more dangerous and the more deserving of serious attention, as it appears not at the surface but conceals itself more and more in the depth of men's minds*. This discontent, we must say without paraphrase, is created by the efforts to bring about a counter-revolution in Prussia latterly paraded with an incredible *étourderie*."^c

The *Zeit* is only mistaken in its conclusion. The Prussian counter-revolution is not now about to be commenced, it is to be ended. It is not a thing of recent growth, but began on March 20th,

^a See this volume, pp. 28-31.—*Ed*

^b "Die neuesten Verhaftungen und Haussuchungen in Berlin", *Preussisches Wochenblatt*, No. 25, April 2, 1853.—*Ed*

^c "Die Contre-Revolution", *Die Zeit*, No. 77, April 3, 1853.—*Ed*

1848,⁴⁰ and has been steadily advancing ever since that day. At this very moment the Prussian Government is hatching two very dangerous projects, the one of limiting the free sub-division of real property, the other subjecting public instruction to the Church. They could not have selected two objects more appropriate to alienate the peasantry of Rhenish Prussia and the middle classes throughout the monarchy. As a curious incident, I may also mention the forced dissolution of the Berlin Hygienic Society (A Mutual Benefit Sick Club), in consequence of the "great discovery." This society was composed of nearly 10,000 members, all belonging to the working classes. The Government, it appears, are convinced, that the present constitution of the Prussian State is incompatible with "hygienics."

The London press, till now unconscious of the doings of the London police, are surprised by statements in the *Vienna Presse* and the *Emancipation*,^a the leading reactionary journal of Belgium, that the police of London have drawn up a list of all the political refugees in that city, with a variety of details relating to their private circumstances and conduct.

"Once such a system is tolerated with regard to foreigners," exclaims *The Morning Advertiser*, "it will be employed whenever deemed advisable by the Government, or any member of it, in order to become acquainted with the details of the private lives of our own countrymen.... Is it not saddening to think that the London police should be called upon to play the infamous part assigned to their continental colleagues?"

Besides these statements in Belgian and other papers, the London press is this day informed by telegraphic dispatch from Vienna,^b

"that 'the Refugee question is settled: the British Government has promised to keep a strict guard on the refugees, and to visit them with the full severity of the law whenever it should be proved that they have taken part in revolutionary intrigues.'"

"Never before," remarks *The Morning Advertiser*, "did England appear in so humiliating a situation as she does now, in having prostrated herself to the feet of Austria. No degradation could equal this. It was reserved for the Coalition Cabinet."^c

I learn from a very creditable source that the law officers of the Crown will institute a prosecution against Mazzini as soon as his

^a *L'Emancipation*, No. 94, April 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b The report cited below was published in *The Times*, No. 21395, April 6, 1853 and reprinted in several other newspapers on April 7.—*Ed.*

^c *The Morning Advertiser*, No. 19279, April 7, 1853.—*Ed.*

sojourn at London shall be ascertained. On the other hand I hear that the Ministers will be interpellated in the House of Commons with regard to their scandalous transactions with Austria, and their intentions on the refugee question in general.

I have stated in a former letter that Radetzky was glad to have been afforded, by the Milan insurrection, a pretext for "obtaining money under false pretenses."^a This view of the matter has since been confirmed by an act not to be misunderstood. In a recent proclamation Radetzky has declared null and void all loans or mortgages contracted since 1847 on the security of the sequestrated estates of the Lombard emigrants. This confiscation can have no other possible excuse than the *horror vacui*^b of the Austrian exchequer. The sentimental bourgeoisie have everywhere sacrificed the revolution to their god called Property. The counter-revolution now repudiates that god.

A sub-marine telegraphic dispatch of to-day brings the news that Prince Menchikoff has concluded a convention with the Porte, that the Russian armies have received orders to retire from the Turkish frontiers, and that the Eastern question is once more settled.

Written on April 8, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3748, April 21, 1853; reprinted in the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 825, April 22, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a K. Marx, "The Attack on Francis Joseph.—The Milan Riot.—British Politics.—Disraeli's Speech.—Napoleon's Will" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 513-21).—*Ed.*

^b Fear of vacuity.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

HIRSCH'S CONFESSIONS

Hirsch's "Confessions",⁴¹ as I see it, are valid only insofar as they are confirmed by other facts. If only because they contradict themselves. On returning from his mission to Cologne he declared at a workers' public meeting that Willich was his accomplice. Naturally, this ostensible confession was thought too contemptible to record in the minutes. Various people let me know—whether with or without Hirsch's instructions I cannot tell—that Hirsch was willing to make a full confession to me. I turned the offer down. Later, I learned that he was living in the utmost penury. I have no doubt, therefore, that his "very latest" confessions have been written in the interest of the party that is *paying* him at the moment. Strangely, there are people who find it necessary to seek the protection of a person like Hirsch.

For the present, I shall confine myself to a few marginal comments. We have had other spy confessions, those from Vidocq, Chenu, de la Hodde,^a and so on.⁴² There is one point on which they tally. None of them are ordinary spies, but are spies in a higher sense, all of them successors of "Cooper's spy."^b Their confessions are inevitably just so many apologies.

Hirsch, too, tries to make out, for example, that it was not he but Colonel Bangya who informed Greif, and Fleury through Greif, of the day my party comrades held their meetings. These

^a F. Vidocq, *Mémoires*, T. I-IV; A. Chenu, *Les Conspireurs. Les sociétés secrètes. La préfecture de police sous Caussidière. Les corps francs*; L. de la Hodde, *La naissance de la république en février 1848*.—*Ed.*

^b Harvey Birch, the main character of James Fenimore Cooper's novel *The Spy*, performed his work out of patriotic motives.—*Ed.*

took place on Thursdays on the few occasions when Hirsch attended, but on Wednesdays after Hirsch was excluded from them. The false minutes⁴³ of before and after Hirsch's attendances are dated Thursday. Who but Hirsch could have committed this "misstatement"!

Hirsch is luckier on another point. He claims Bangya has repeatedly disclosed information bearing on my correspondence with Germany. And since all the relevant data in the Cologne court records are false, it is certainly impossible to determine who invented them. Now to Bangya.

Spy or no spy, Bangya could never become dangerous either to me or to my party comrades, because I *never* spoke to him about my party affairs, and Bangya himself—as he reminds me in one of his exculpatory letters—had always avoided broaching any of these matters. Hence, spy or no spy, he could betray nothing, because he knew nothing. The Cologne records bear this out.⁴⁴ They show that apart from confessions made in Germany itself and documents seized there, the Prussian police knew nothing of the party to which I belong and were therefore compelled to serve up the silliest cock-and-bull.

But Bangya sold a pamphlet by Marx "about the refugees" to the police, did he not?^a

Bangya learned from me in the presence of other persons that Ernst Dronke, Frederick Engels and I were contemplating a publication about the German refugees in London which was to appear in several instalments. He assured me that he could find a publisher in Berlin. I asked him to see about it at once. Eight or ten days later he announced that a Berlin publisher named Eisermann was prepared to put out the *first* instalment on condition that its authors remain anonymous, since otherwise he feared confiscation. I agreed, but stipulated for my part that the fee should be payable at once on delivery of the manuscript, because I did not wish to repeat the experience I had with the *Revue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, and that the manuscript should be printed on delivery. I then went to see Engels in Manchester where the pamphlet was written. In the meantime, Bangya brought my wife a letter from Berlin in which Eisermann agreed to my conditions with the reservation that the publication of the second instalment would depend on the sales of the first. On my return, Bangya received the manuscript, and I my fee.

^a K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Great Men of the Exile* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 227-326).—Ed

But the printing was delayed on various plausible pretexts. I became suspicious. Not of the manuscript having been given to the police in order that the police should print it. I am now ready to surrender my manuscripts even to the Russian Emperor, so long as he, for his part, should be willing to print them the following day. No, what I feared was suppression of the manuscript.

It attacked the pulpiteers of the day—not, of course, as revolutionaries dangerous to the state, but as windbags of counter-revolution.

My suspicions were confirmed. Georg Weerth, whom I had asked to inquire about Eisermann in Berlin, wrote that no Eisermann could be discovered. Dronke and I went to see Bangya. Eisermann had now become merely Jacob Collmann's manager. Anxious to obtain Bangya's statements in writing, I insisted that he should repeat them in my presence in a letter to Engels in Manchester, giving Collmann's address. I also wrote a few lines to Bruno Bauer, asking him to inquire about who lived in the house that Bangya said belonged to Collmann, but received no answer. The alleged publisher replied to my reminders that no printing date had been *contractually* stipulated. He claimed to be the best judge of the most suitable time. In a subsequent letter he feigned offence. Finally, Bangya informed me that the publisher was refusing to print the manuscript and would return it. He himself disappeared to Paris.

The Berlin letters and Bangya's letters containing the whole negotiations, along with Bangya's exculpatory efforts, are in my possession.

But why was I not put off by the suspicions of Bangya cast about by the refugees? Simply because I knew their "pre-history". And for the time being I propose to leave this pre-history in the obscurity it merits.

Because I *knew* that Bangya had done laudable things as an officer of the revolution in the Hungarian war. Because he corresponded with Szemere, whom I respect, and was on friendly terms with General Perczel. Because I had myself seen a diploma in which Kossuth appointed him police chief *in partibus*,^a countersigned by Count Szirmay, Kossuth's confidant, who lived in the same house as Bangya. This post with Kossuth also explained his inevitable relationship with policemen. If I am not mistaken, Bangya is at present still Kossuth's agent in Paris.

^a *In partibus infidelium*—here in the sense of "in exile". Literally: in the land of infidels. This phrase was added to the title of Catholic bishops appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries.—Ed.

The Hungarian leaders must have known their man. And what was I risking compared to them? Nothing worse than suppression of a copy to which I had retained the original.

Later, I asked Lizius, a publisher in Frankfurt am Main, and other publishers in Germany whether they would publish the manuscript. They said this was not possible in the present circumstances. Lately, an opportunity has arisen to have it printed outside Germany.

Following these explanations, which I am certainly not addressing to Herr Hirsch, but to my countrymen in America, does not there remain the "open question": what interest did the Prussian police have in suppressing a pamphlet against Kinkel, Willich and the other "great men of the exile"?

Solve for me, o Oerindur,
This riddle of Nature!^a

London, April 9, 1853

First published in the *Belletristisches
Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*,
No. 8, May 5, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the news-
paper

Translated from the German

Published in English for the first
time

^a A. Müllner, *Die Schuld*, Act II, Scene 5.—*Ed.*

THE
People's Paper

THE CHAMPION OF
POLITICAL JUSTICE AND UNIVERSAL RIGHT.

50]

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1853.

[Price Fourpence.

Karl Marx

THE NEW FINANCIAL JUGGLE;
OR GLADSTONE AND THE PENNIES⁴⁵

Our readers know, to their cost, and have learned, to the tune of their pockets, that an old financial juggle has imposed a National Debt of £800,000,000 on the people's shoulders. That Debt was chiefly contracted to prevent the liberation of the American colonies, and to counteract the French Revolution of the last century. The influence of the increase of the National Debt on the increase of the national expenditure, may be gathered from the following tabular analysis^a:—

1. *National Debt*

	£
When Queen Anne succeeded to William (1701) ⁴⁶	16,394,702
When George I ascended the Throne (1714)	54,145,363
When George II began his Reign (1727)	52,092,235
When George III assumed the reins of Government (1760)	146,682,844
After the American War (1784)	257,213,043
At the end of the Anti-Jacobin War (1801)	579,931,447
In January, 1810 (during the Napoleonic War)	811,898,082
After 1815	about 1,000,000,000

^a The figures for the following table were taken mainly from W. Cobbett's book, *Paper against Gold*, pp. 21-25.—*Ed.*

2. *National Expenditure*

When Queen Anne succeeded to William (1701), all expenses, including the interest of the National Debt, amounted to	£ 5,610,987
When George I ascended the Throne (1714)	6,633,581
When George II began his Reign (1727)	5,441,248
When George III assumed the reins of power (1760)	24,456,940
At the end of the Anti-Jacobin War (1801)	61,278,018 ^a

3. *National Taxation*

Queen Anne (1701)	4,212,358
George I-(1714)	6,762,643
George II (1727)	6,522,540
George III (1760)	8,744,682
After the American War (1784)	13,300,921
After the Anti-Jacobin War (1801)	36,728,971
1809	70,240,226
After 1815	about 82,000,000

The people well know, from personal pocket-experience, what is the weight of taxation resulting from the National Debt—but many are not aware of the peculiar forms under which this Debt has been contracted, and actually exists. The “State,” that jointocracy of coalesced land and money mongers, wants money for the purpose of home and foreign oppression. It borrows money of capitalists and usurers, and in return gives them a bit of paper, pledging itself to pay them so much money in the shape of interest for each £100 they lend. The means of paying this money it tears from the working classes through the means of taxation—so that the people are the security for their oppressors to the men who lend them the money to cut the people’s throats. This money has been borrowed as a debt under various denominations—sometimes to pay 3 per cent., 3½ per cent., 4 per cent., &c., and according to that percentage and other accidents the funds have various denominations, as the 3 per cents., &c.

Every Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the exception of the Whigs, as not only the working classes, but the manufacturers and

^a *The People’s Paper* erroneously gave £82,027,288 here as national expenditure for 1809. The figure has been corrected according to W. Cobbett’s book.—*Ed.*

landlords also, have to pay a portion of this interest, and wish to pay as little as possible, tries accordingly, in some way or other, to alleviate the pressure of this incubus.

On the 8th of April, before the Budget of the present Ministry was brought forward, Mr. Gladstone laid before the House a statement of several resolutions dealing with the Public Debt—and before this statement had been made *The Morning Chronicle* announced that resolutions of the utmost importance were to be proposed, “heralded by rumours of great interest and magnitude.”^a The funds rose on these rumours; there was an impression that Gladstone was going to pay off the National Debt. Now, “what was all this pother about?”^b

The ultimate aim of Mr. Gladstone’s proposals, as stated by himself, was to reduce the interest on the various public stocks to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now, in the years 1822-3, 1824-5, 1830-1, 1844-5, there had been reductions, from 5 per cent. to $4\frac{1}{2}$, from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 4, from 4 to $3\frac{1}{2}$, from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3, respectively. Why should there not be a reduction from 3 to $2\frac{1}{2}$?

Now, let us see in what manner Mr. Gladstone proposes to achieve this end.

Firstly. He proposes with respect to certain stocks amounting to £9,500,000, chiefly connected with the old South Sea Bubble,⁴⁷ to bring them under one single denomination, and to reduce them compulsorily from 3. per cent. to $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. This gives a permanent annual saving approaching to £25,000. The invention of a new general name of various stocks, and the saving for £25,000 on an annual expense of £30,000,000, does not merit any particular admiration.

Secondly. He proposes to issue a new financial paper, called Exchequer Bonds, not exceeding the amount of £30,000,000, transferable by simple delivery, without cost of any kind, bearing interest at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., up to the 1st of September, 1864, and then $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. up to the 1st of September, 1894. Now this is simply the creation of a new financial instrument for the comfort of the monied and mercantile class. He says “without cost,” that is, without cost to the City Merchant. At the present moment there are £18,000,000 of Exchequer Bills at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Is it not a loss to the country to pay 1 per cent. more upon the Exchequer *Bonds* than upon the Exchequer Bills? At all events the second

^a *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 26922, April 7, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below the quotations are from Benjamin Disraeli’s speech in the House of Commons on April 8, 1853 (*The Times*, No. 21398, April 9, 1853).—*Ed.*

proposition has nothing to do with the reduction of the National Debt. The Exchequer *Bills* can circulate only in Great Britain, but the Exchequer *Bonds* are transferable as common Bills, therefore it is a mere measure of convenience to the City Merchants, for which the people pay a high price.

Now, finally, we come to the only important matter—to the 3 per cent. consols, and the “3 per cent. reduced,” amounting together to a capital of nearly 500,000,000. As there exists a Parliamentary provision forbidding these stocks to be reduced compulsorily, except on twelve months notice, Mr. Gladstone chooses the system of voluntary commutation, offering various alternatives to the holders of the 3 per cent. stock for exchanging them at option with other stocks to be created under his resolutions. The holders of the 3 per cent. stocks shall have the option of exchanging each £100 3 per cent. in one of the three following forms:—

1.—Semi-Exchange, every £100 of the 3 per cent. with an Exchequer Bond for the like amount carrying interest at the rate of £2 15s. until 1864, and then at the rate of £2 10s. until 1894. If the whole of the £30,000,000 of Exchequer Bonds at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. replaced £30,000,000 of 3 per cents., there would be a saving in the first ten years of £75,000; and after the first ten years of £150,000; together £225,000; but the Government would be bound to repay the whole of the £30,000,000, after forty years. In no respect is this a proposition dealing largely, or even at all, with the National Debt. For what is a saving of £225,000 in an annual expense of £30,000,000?

2.—The second proposal is, that the holders of stock shall retain for every £100 in 3 per cents., £82 10s. in new stock of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which would be paid at the rate of £3 10s. per cent. until the 5th of January, 1894. The result of that would be to give a present income to the persons accepting the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock, of £2 17s. 9d., instead of £3—reduction of 2s. 3d. on the interest of every £100. If the £500,000,000 were all converted under this proposal, the result would be that, instead of paying, as at present, £15,000,000 per annum, the nation would only pay £14,437,500, and this would be a gain of £562,500 a year. But, for this saving of £562,500 Parliament would tie up its hands for half a century, and grant higher interest than 2 four-fifths per cent. at a time of transition and of utter insecurity of every rate of interest! One thing, however, would be gained for Gladstone—at the expiration of forty years there would be, in the place of the 3 per cent. stock being now *defended* by twelve months' notice, a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock

redeemable at par by Parliament. Gladstone proposes not to fix any limit on that $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock.

3.—The third proposal is, that the holders of every £100 3 per cent. shall receive £110 in a new stock of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. until 1894. When Mr. Gladstone first introduced his plan in the House of Commons, on the 8th of April, he had not limited the amount of the new $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to be issued, but Mr. Disraeli having pointed out that, contrasting this proposal with the two other ones, every man in his senses would choose the conversion of £100 3 per cent. into £110 $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and that by the conversion of the £500,000,000 3 per cent. into the new stock, the nation would gain on one side, £1,250,000 per annum, but be saddled on the other hand with an addition to the Public Debt of £50,000,000, Mr. Gladstone, on the following day, altered his proposition, and proposed to limit the new $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock to £30,000,000. By this limitation, his proposal loses almost all effect on the great stock of the Public Debt, and augments its capital only by £3,000,000.

Now you know “one of the most important and gigantic financial proposals that ever has been brought forward.”^a There exists, perhaps, in general, no greater humbug than the so-called finance. The simplest operations relating to the Budget and the Public Debt, are clothed by the adepts of that “occult science” in abstruse terminology, concealing the trivial manoeuvres of creating various denominations of stocks, the commutation of old stocks for new ones, the diminishing the interest, and raising the nominal capital—the raising the interest and reducing the capital, the instalment of premiums, bonuses, priority shares—the distinction between redeemable and irredeemable annuities—the artificial graduation in the facility of transferring the various papers—in such a manner that the public understanding is quite bamboozled by these detestable stock-jobbing scholastics and the frightful complexity in details; while with every such new financial operation the usurers obtain an eagerly-seized opportunity for developing their mischievous and predatory activity. Mr. Gladstone is, without any doubt, a master in this sort of financial alchemy, and this proposal cannot be better characterised than by the words of Mr. Disraeli:—

More complicated and ingenious machinery to produce so slight a result, appeared to him never to have been devised by the subtlety and genius of the most

^a A quotation from the speech of Edward Ellice, M.P. from Coventry, cited by Benjamin Disraeli in his House of Commons speech on April 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

skilful casuist. In Saint Thomas Aquinas^a there was a chapter that speculated upon the question of how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. It was one of the rarest productions of human genius; and he recognised in these resolutions something of that master mind.

You will remember that we have stated that the ultimate end of Gladstone's plan was the establishment of a "normal" 2½ per cent. fund. Now, in order to achieve this end, he creates a very limited 2½ per cent. fund, and an illimited 3½ per cent. stock. In order to create his limited 2½ per cent. stock, he reduces the interest by a half per cent., and augments the capital by a bonus of 10 per cent. In order to rid himself of the difficulty of all legislation on the 3 per cents. being defended by twelve months' notice, he prefers legislating for half a century to come; in conclusion, he would, if successful, cut off all chance of financial liberation for half a century from the British people.

Every one will confess, that if the Jewish Disabilities Bill was a little attempt at establishing religious tolerance—the Canada Reserves Bill a little attempt at granting colonial self-government⁴⁸—the Education Resolution^b a little attempt at avoiding National Education—Gladstone's financial scheme is a mighty little attempt at dealing with that giant-monster, the National Debt of Britain.

Written on April 12, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The People's Paper*,
No. 50, April 16, 1853

Signed: C. M.

^a Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 51-52.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE MINISTRY

London, Tuesday, April 12, 1853

The best thing perhaps that can be said in favor of the Coalition Ministry is that it represents impotency in power at a moment of transition, when not the reality, but only the appearance of government, is possible, with evanescent old parties and not yet consolidated new ones.

The "administration of all the talents," what has it accomplished during its first quarter's trial? Two readings of the Jewish Disabilities Bill and three of the Canada Clergy Reserves Bill.⁴⁹ The latter enables the Canadian Legislature to dispose of a certain portion of the proceeds of the land-sales hitherto reserved exclusively for the benefit of the favorite churches of England and Scotland. When first laid before the House by Lord John Russell, it consisted of three clauses, the third clause repealing the enactment by which the consolidated fund was charged to supply the deficiency, if in any year the Canada land-sales could not produce £9,285. This bill had been carried through a second reading, but on the House going into Committee⁵⁰ upon it (March 18) Lord John suddenly moved the withdrawal of his own third clause. Now, if the Canadian Legislature were to secularize the Clergy Reserves, about £10,000 per annum would be taken out of the pockets of the British people for the maintenance of a sect thousands of miles away. The Radical Minister, Sir W. Molesworth who disclaims all ecclesiastical endowments, appeared himself to have become a convert to Lord John's doctrine "that British Colonies were not to be freed from the incubus of the Established Church, except at the cost and risk of the British people at home."

Three Radical resolutions were proposed during the first quarter's trial. Mr. Collier moved the abolition of the Ecclesiastical

Courts, Mr. Williams the extension of the legacy and probate-duty to real property, and Mr. Hume the extinction of all "strictly protective" duties. The Ministry, of course, opposed all these "sweeping" reforms. But the Coalition Ministry opposes them in quite a different manner from the Tories. The latter resolutely announced their decision to resist the "encroachments of Democracy." The former actually do the same, but do it under the pretence of attending to reform measures more carefully. They live on reforms, as the others lived on abuses. Apparently eagerly engaged in reforms they have contrived a perfect system of postponing them. One day it is "advisable to await the result of an impending inquiry." Then "a Commission has just been appointed and nothing can be done till it has given its decisions." Again "the object is just under the consideration of the Government," who expect not to be interrupted in their lucubrations. Next, "the subject deserves the attention of the House—when a fitting opportunity shall occur." "The proper season has not yet arrived." "The time is not far distant when something must be done." Particular measures must be postponed in order to readjust entire systems, or entire systems must be conserved in order to carry out particular measures. The "policy of abstention" proclaimed on the Eastern question is also the Ministerial policy at home.

When Lord John Russell first^a announced the programme of the Coalition Ministry, and when it was received amid general consternation, his adherents exclaimed, "We must have something to be enthusiastic at. Public education shall be the thing. Our Russell is breeding a wonderful Education scheme. You will hear of it."

Now we have heard of it. It was on the 4th of April that Russell gave a general description of his intended Educational Reform. Its principal features consist in enabling the municipal councils to levy a local rate for the assistance of *existing* schools in which the Church of England doctrines are required to be taught. As to the Universities, those pet-children of the State Church, those chief opponents to every reform, Lord John hopes "that the Universities will reform themselves."^b The malversation of the charities destined for educational establishments is notorious. Their value may be guessed from the following:

^a February 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below John Russell's speech is quoted from *The Times*, No. 21394, April 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

“There are 24 of £2,000 a year and under £3,000, 10 of £3,000 and under £4,000, 4 of £4,000 and under £5,000, 2 of £5,000 and under £6,000, 3 of £8,000 and under £9,000, and single ones of £10,000, £15,000, £20,000, £29,000, £30,000 and £35,000 a year each.”

It needs no great sagacity to conceive why the oligarchs living on the malversation of these funds are very cautious in dealing with them. Russell proposes:

“Charities are to be examined into, those under £30 per annum in the County Courts, those above by the Master of the Rolls. But *no suit* in either of those Courts is to be instigated *without the permission of a Committee of the Council appointed for the purpose.*”

The *permission* of a committee is necessary to institute a suit in the Imperial Courts to redress the plunder of the charities originally destined for the education of the people. A permission! But Russell, even with this reservation, feels not quite sure. He adds:

“If the administration of a school is *found* to be corrupt, *nobody but the Committee of Council shall be allowed to interfere.*”

This is a true Reform in the old English sense of the word. It neither creates anything new, nor abolishes anything old. It aims at conserving the old system, by giving it a more reasonable form and teaching it, so to say, new manners. This is the mystery of the “hereditary wisdom” of English oligarchical legislation. It simply consists in making abuses hereditary, by refreshing them, as it were, from time to time, by an infusion of new blood.

If everybody must confess that the Jewish Disabilities Bill was a *little* attempt at establishing religious tolerance, the Canada Reserves Bill a *little* attempt at granting Colonial Self-Government, the Education Bill a *little* attempt at avoiding public education, Gladstone’s financial scheme is, undoubtedly, a *mighty little* attempt at dealing with that giant monster, the National Debt of Great Britain.

On the 8th of April, before the promulgation of the budget, Mr. Gladstone laid before the House of Commons a statement of several resolutions dealing with the public debt, and, before this statement had been made, *The Morning Chronicle* had made a special announcement that resolutions of the utmost importance were about to be proposed, “heralded by rumors of great interest and magnitude.”^a The funds rose on this rumor. There was an

^a *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 26922, April 7, 1853 (cf. this volume, pp. 48-49).—Ed.

impression that Gladstone was going to pay off the National Debt; but on the 8th of April, the moment the Committee met for deliberation on these resolutions, Mr. Gladstone suddenly altered them, and in such a manner as to divest them both of "magnitude and interest." Now, let us ask, with Mr. Disraeli, "what was all this pother about?"^a

The ultimate aim of Mr. Gladstone's propositions, as stated by himself, was to reduce the interest on the public stocks to the standard rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now, in the years 1822-23-24-25, 1830-31, 1844-45, reductions were made from 5 per cent. to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent., from 4 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent. respectively. Why should there not be a reduction from 3 per cent. to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.? Mr. Gladstone's proposals are as follows:

Firstly. With respect to various stocks amounting to £9,500,000, and chiefly connected with the old South Sea bubble,⁵¹ to bring them under one single denomination, and to reduce them compulsorily from 3 to $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. This would give a permanent annual saving approaching to £25,000. The invention of a new common name for various stocks, and the saving of £25,000 on an annual expense of £30,000,000, is certainly not to be boasted of.

Secondly. He proposes the issue of a new financial paper called *Exchequer Bonds*, not exceeding in amount £30,000,000, transferable by simple delivery without costs of any kind, bearing interest at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. up to Sept. 1, 1864, and then $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. up to Sept. 1, 1894. Now this is merely the creation of a new financial instrument limited in its use by the wants of the monied and mercantile classes. But how can he keep £18,000,000 of Exchequer Bills at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in circulation, with Exchequer Bonds at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.? And is it not a loss to the country to pay 1 per cent. more upon Exchequer Bonds than upon Exchequer Bills? Be this as it may, this second proposition has at least nothing to do with the reduction of the public debt.

Thirdly and lastly. We come to the chief object, the only important point of Gladstone's resolutions, to the 3 per cent. consols and the 3 per cent. reduced, amounting together to a capital of nearly £500,000,000. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*^b As there exists a Parliamentary provision forbidding these stocks to be

^a Here and below the quotations are from Benjamin Disraeli's speech in the House of Commons on April 8, 1853 (*The Times*, No. 21398, April 9, 1853).—*Ed.*

^b Words addressed to a braggart in a tale by Aesop. He boasted of his leaps on the Island of Rhodes.—*Ed.*

reduced compulsorily, *except on twelve months notice*, Mr. Gladstone chooses the system of voluntary commutation, offering various alternatives to the [option] holders of the 3 per cent. stocks for exchanging them at option with other stocks to be created under his resolutions. They are to have the option of exchanging every £100 of the 3 per cent. stock in one of the following ways.

1. They may exchange every £100 of 3 per cent. stock for an Exchequer Bond of the like amount, bearing interest at the rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. until 1864, and then at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. until 1894. If the whole of the £30,000,000 Exchequer Bonds at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. should thus replace £30,000,000 of 3 per cent. there would be a saving in the first ten years of £75,000, and after the first ten years of £150,000—together £225,000; but Government would be bound to repay the whole of the £30,000,000. In any case this is not a proposition to deal largely with the public debt.

2. The second proposal is, that the holders of stock shall obtain for every £100 in 3 per cent. £82 10s. in new stock at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which shall be paid at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. until the 5th January, 1894. The result of this would be to give a present income to the persons accepting the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock of £2 17s. 9d., instead of £3. Here then is a reduction of 2s. 3d. annually in every £100. If the £500,000,000 were all converted upon this proposal, the result would be that instead of paying as at present £15,000,000 a-year, the nation would only pay £14,437,500, and this would be a gain of £562,500 a-year. But for this small saving of £562,500 Parliament would tie up its hands for half a century and guaranty a higher interest than 2 4-5 per cent. at a time of transition and of utter uncertainty as to the future standard rate of interest. On the other hand, one thing at least would be gained for Mr. Gladstone. At the expiration of 40 years, he would not be troubled with a 3 per cent. stock, being defended, as now, by a twelve months' notice. He would only have to deal with the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock redeemable at par by Parliament. Gladstone proposes not to fix any limit on his $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock.

3. The third proposal is that the holders of every £100 3 per cent. should receive £110 in a new stock of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. until 1894. When Mr. Gladstone introduced his plan in the House of Commons on the 8th April, he had not limited the amount (the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cents.) to be issued. But Mr. Disraeli having pointed out that, contrasting this proposal with the two other modes proposed, every man in his senses would choose the conversion of £100 into $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cents., and that by the conversion of the whole £500,000,000 3 per cents. into the new stock, the country would

gain on one side £1,250,000 per annum, but be saddled on the other side with an addition to the capital of the public debt of £50,000,000, Mr. Gladstone on the following day altered this proposition and proposed to limit this new 2½ stock to £30,000,000. By this alteration the whole of the third proposal loses its significance with respect to the public debt. The capital of that debt would be augmented only by £3,000,000.

Here you have “one of the most important and gigantic financial proposals that has ever been brought forward.”^a There exists perhaps in general no greater humbug than the so-called Finance. The most simple operations on the Budget and the Public Debt are clothed by the adepts of that occult science in an abstruse terminology, concealing the trivial maneuvers of creating various denominations of stocks—the commutation of old stocks into new ones, the diminishing the interest and raising the nominal capital, the raising the interest and reducing the capital, the installing of premiums, of bonus, priority-shares, the distinctions between redeemable and irredeemable annuities, the artificial graduation in the facility of transferring the various descriptions of paper—in a manner which quite bamboozles the public with these detestable stock-jobbing scholastics and frightful complexity of details, while the usurers obtain with every such new scheme an eagerly seized opportunity for developing their mischievous and predatory activity. On the other hand, the political economist finds in all this apparent intricacy of commutations, permutations and combinations, not so much a matter of financial policy as a simple question of arithmetic or of mere phraseology.

Mr. Gladstone is certainly a master in this sort of financial alchymics, and his scheme cannot be better characterized, than in the words of Mr. Disraeli:

“More complicated and ingenious machinery, to produce so slight a result, appeared to him never to have been devised by the subtlety and genius of the most skilful casuist. In St. Thomas Aquinas^b there was a chapter that speculated upon the question of how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. It was one of the rarest productions of human genius; and he recognised in these resolutions something of that master mind.”

You will remember that I stated that the end of Mr. Gladstone's plan was the establishment of a “normal” 2½ per cent. stock. Now, in order to achieve this end, he creates a very limited 2½

^a A quotation from the speech of Edward Ellice, M.P. from Coventry, cited by Benjamin Disraeli in his House of Commons speech on April 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*.—*Ed.*

per cent. stock and an unlimited $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock. In order to create his small $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock, he reduces the interest by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and gives on the other hand a bonus of 10 per cent. for the purpose of accomplishing that reduction. In order to rid himself of the difficulty of the 3 per cent., being "defended" by a twelve-months notice, he prefers legislating for the 40 years next to come, and in conclusion he would, if successful, bereave two generations of all possible fortunate chances in their financial affairs.

The position of the Coalition Ministry in the House, is clearly shown by the statistics of votes. On the question of Maynooth⁵² in a large house, it had but the narrow majority of 30. On the Jewish Disabilities Bill (not yet carried through the third reading), in a house of 439 members, its majority amounted not even to 30 votes. In the Canada Reserves Bill, when Russell withdrew his own third clause, the Ministers were saved by the Tories from their own supporters. Their majority was almost entirely supplied from the benches of the Conservatives.

I shall not dwell on the internal dissensions of the Cabinet, which appeared in the debates on the Canada Bill, in the hot controversy of the ministerial papers with regard to the Income-Tax, and above all, in their foreign policy. There is not one single question to which the Coalition Ministry might not answer, as did Gaysa, the Magyar king, who, after having been converted to Christianity, continued, notwithstanding, to observe the rites of his ancient superstition. When questioned to which of the two faiths he really belonged, he replied: "I am rich enough to belong to two sorts of faith."

Written on April 12, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3753, April 27, 1853; reprinted in the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 827, April 29, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

FEARGUS O'CONNOR.—
MINISTERIAL DEFEATS.—THE BUDGET

London, Tuesday, April 19, 1853

The Commission which met last week to examine into the state of mind of Feargus O'Connor, late M.P. for Nottingham, returned the following verdict:

"We find that Mr. Feargus O'Connor has been insane since the 10th of June, 1852, without any lucid intervals."^a

As a political character O'Connor had outlived himself already in 1848. His strength was broken, his mission fulfilled, and unable to master the proletarian movement organised by himself, he had grown almost a hindrance to it. If historical impartiality oblige me not to conceal this circumstance, it also obliges me in justice to the fallen man, to lay before the same public, the judgment given on O'Connor, by Ernest Jones, in *The People's Paper*:

"Here was a man who broke away from rank, wealth, and station; who threw up a lucrative and successful practice; who dissipated a large fortune, not in private self-denial, but in political self-sacrifice; who made himself an eternal exile from his own country, where he owned broad acres and represented one of its largest Counties; who was hated by his family because he loved the human race; whose every act was devotion to the people; and who ends almost destitute after a career of unexampled labor.... There is his life. Now look at his work: At a time of utter prostration, of disunion, doubt and misery, he gathered the millions of this country together, as men had never yet been gathered. O'Connell rallied the Irish, but it was with the help of the priests; Mazzini roused the Italians, but nobles and traders were on his side; Kossuth gathered the Hungarians, but Senates and armies were at his back; and both the Hungarians and Italians were burning against a foreign conqueror. But O'Connor, without noble, priest or trader, rallied and upheld one downtrodden class against them all! without even the leverage of national feeling to

^a *The People's Paper*, No. 50, April 16, 1853; below is cited a passage from Ernest Jones' article "The People's Friend" published in this issue.—*Ed.*

unite them! La Fayette had the merchants, Lamartine had the shopkeepers. O'Connor had the people! But the people in the nineteenth century, in Constitutional England, are the weakest of all. He taught them how to become the strongest."

Last week was a week of defeats for the Coalition Cabinet. It met for the first time with a Coalition Opposition. On Tuesday the 12th inst., Mr. Butt moved to maintain for the Irish soldiers the Asylum of Kilmainham Hospital. The Secretary at War^a opposed the motion; but it was carried against the Government by 198 against 131. On this occasion it was beaten by a Coalition of the Irish Brigade⁵³ with the Conservative Opposition. On the following Thursday it was defeated by a Coalition of the Conservatives and the Manchester School.⁵⁴ Mr. Milner Gibson having brought in his yearly motion for the abolition of the "Taxes on Knowledge," the repeal of the Advertisement Duty was voted,⁵⁵ notwithstanding the protestations of Gladstone, Russell and Sidney. They lost, by 200 against 169. Bright, Gibson and MacGregor voted side by side with Disraeli, Pakington, etc., and Mr. Cobden made the formal declaration, "That he accepted the assistance of Mr. Disraeli and his friends with all his heart."^b But by far the greatest defeat the Government has sustained was brought upon it, not by a division in the House, but by an act of its own.

Of the Kossuth rocket affair^c full particulars will already have reached the readers of the *Tribune*, but in order to prove that the whole of it was a premeditated affair between Palmerston and the Foreign Powers, it is merely necessary to state what his own official journal, *The Morning Post*, contains with regard to the occurrence:

"The promptitude and vigilance of the course adopted by Government will give confidence to those foreign powers who have doubted the efficacy of our laws in repressing mischief among our troublesome guests."^d

This business will have its serious consequences for the Coalition Ministry. Already, and this is of great significance, it has demasked old Palmerston's revolutionary dandyism. Even his most credulous but honest admirer, *The Morning Advertiser*, openly disavows him. Palmerston's star began to pale at the time when he bestowed his sympathies on the hero of the 2d December and of the plain of

^a S. Herbert.— *Ed.*

^b Richard Cobden's speech in the House of Commons on April 14 is quoted from the leading article published in *The Times*, No. 21403, April 15, 1853.— *Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 82-84.— *Ed.*

^d *The Morning Post*, April 18, 1853.— *Ed.*

Satory; it has vanished, since he became professedly an "Austrian Minister."⁵⁶ But, the mission of the Coalition Ministry is precisely the demoralization of all the current talents and *renommées* of the old Oligarchy. And this problem it is resolving with an admirable perseverance. Should Palmerston's Ministry survive this catastrophe, then he may indeed, with a slight alteration of the saying of Francis I, jocosely proclaim "Nothing is lost except honor."^a

I come now to the event of the day—Mr. Gladstone's budget—laid before the House of Commons in its yesterday's sitting, in a speech which occupied no less than five hours.^b It is a Coalition Budget, elaborated in an encyclopedical manner, exceedingly fitted for an article in *Ersch & Gruber's* voluminous Dictionary of Arts and Sciences. You know that the era of encyclopedists arrives always when facts have become bulky, and genius remains proportionably small.

In every budget the principal question is the relation between income and expenditure, the balance in the shape of a surplus or a deficiency prescribing the general conditions of either a relaxation or an increase to be established in the taxation of the country. Mr. Disraeli had estimated the revenue for the year 1852-53 at £52,325,000, and the expenditure at £51,163,000. Now, Mr. Gladstone informs us that the actual revenue has been £53,089,000, and the real expenditure only £50,782,000. These figures show an actual surplus of income over expenditure amounting to £2,460,000. Thus far, Mr. Gladstone would seem to have improved Mr. Disraeli. The latter could only boast of a surplus of £1,600,000; Gladstone comes with a saving of £2,460,000. Unfortunately, unlike Disraeli's surplus, that of Mr. Gladstone, on nearer examination, dwindles down to the moderate amount of £700,000, the millions having already found their way out of his pocket by various votes of the House of Commons and other extraordinary expenditure; and, as Mr. Gladstone cautiously adds:

"It must be remembered that £215,000, out of the £700,000, is derived from occasional and not permanent sources of income."

Then, the only basis of operations left to Mr. Gladstone is a surplus of £485,000. Accordingly any proposed remission of old

^a After his defeat and capture at Pavia in 1525, in the war against the King of Spain and the Emperor of Germany, Charles V, Francis I wrote in a letter to his mother: "All is lost except honour."—*Ed*

^b The reference is to William Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on April 18, 1853, quoted below from the report in *The Times*, No. 21406, April 19, 1853.—*Ed*.

taxes beyond this amount has to be balanced by the imposition of new ones.

Mr. Gladstone opened his speech with the "*question brûlante*" of the Income Tax. He said that it was possible to part with that tax at once, but that the Government were not prepared to recommend its immediate abandonment. The first thing to which he called attention was, that "we draw from this tax £5,500,000." Next he attempted a "brilliant" vindication of the effects of this tax, on the history of which he expended a good deal of breath.

"The Income Tax," he remarked, "has served in a time of vital struggle to enable you to raise the income of the country above its expenditure for war and civil government.... If you do not destroy the efficacy of this engine, it affords you the means, should unhappily hostilities again break out, of at once raising your army to 300,000 men, and your fleet to 100,000, with all your establishments in proportion."

Further Mr. Gladstone observed, that the Income Tax had not only served in carrying on the Anti-Jacobin war, but also the free-trade policy of Sir Robert Peel. After this apologetic introduction we are suddenly startled by the announcement that "the Income Tax is full of irregularities." In fact, Mr. Gladstone admits, that in order to preserve the tax, it must be reconstructed so as to avoid its present inequalities; but that in order to remove these inequalities, you must break up the whole set. Strangely contradicting himself, he is afterwards at great pains to show that there exist no such inequalities at all, and that they are merely imaginary. As to the question of realized and precarious incomes, he reduces it to a question of "land and of trade," and tries to persuade people, through some awkward calculations, that land actually pays 9d. in the pound, while trade only pays 7d. He then adds:

"that the assessment on land and houses does not depend on the returns of the owners, whereas in trade the returns of income are made by the holders themselves, and in many cases in a fraudulent manner."

With regard to fundholders, Mr. Gladstone asserts that to tax the capitalised value of their income, would be a gross breach of the public faith. Any distinction, in short, between realized or precarious income, as proposed by Mr. Disraeli, is flatly rejected by Mr. Gladstone. On the other hand he is ready to extend the Income Tax to Ireland, and an income above £100, the limit of its area having hitherto been at £150 a year. Quite inconsistently, however, with his just pronounced doctrine, that "it is impossible to distinguish between the respective value of

intelligence, labor and property, and to represent these relations in arithmetical results," he proposes to subject incomes between £100 and £150 to a rate of only 5d. in the pound. Lastly, in order to reconcile his admiration for the Income Tax, with the avowed necessity of its abolition, Mr. Gladstone proposes

"to renew the tax for two years, from April, 1853, at 7d. in the pound; for two years more, from April, 1855, at the rate of 6d. in the pound; and for three years more, from April, 1857, at the rate of 5d. in the pound; under which proposal the tax would expire on 5th April, 1860."

Having thus conferred, what he imagines to be a boon, [on] the landed aristocracy and the fundholders, by his refusal to acknowledge the principle of distinction between realized and precarious incomes, Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, is careful to hold out a similar bait to the Manchester School by the adjustment of the legacy duty, extending it to all kinds of property, but declining to deal with the probates.

"I have no doubt," he remarked, "that this tax, if adjusted by the House, will add £500,000 more to our permanent means in 1853-'54; will add £700,000 more in 1854-'55; £400,000 in 1855-'56; and £400,000 more in 1856-'57; making a total addition to the permanent means of the country of £2,000,000."

Respecting Scotland, Mr. Gladstone proposed, that 1/ should be added to the present Spirits' Duty of 3/8 (the gain would be £318,000), and also an increased impost on the licenses of tea-dealers, brewers, maltsters, tobacco-manufacturers and dealers, and soap-boilers.

The whole amount of the increased taxes available for the year 1853-'54 would thus be:

Upon the Income Tax	£ 295,000
Upon the Legacy Duty	500,000
Upon Spirits	436,000
Upon Licenses	113,000
	<hr/>
Total	£1,344,000
Which with the surplus of	805,000
	<hr/>
Would give us for the remission of taxes a sum amounting to	£2,149,000

Now, what are the propositions of Mr. Gladstone with respect to the remission of old taxes? I shall restrain myself, of course, from entering too deeply into this labyrinth. It cannot be fathomed in a

moment. Accordingly I shall touch merely on the principal points, which are:

1. The abolition of the duty on Soap, the gross amount of which is actually £1,397,000.
 2. Gradual reduction of the duties on Tea, when the descent from $2/2\frac{1}{4}$ to 1/ is to be brought about in about three years.
 3. Remission of the duties upon a large number of minor articles.
 4. Relaxation of the £4,000,000 owed by Ireland in the shape of Consolidated Annuities.
 5. Reduction of the Attorney's Certificate Duty by one-half, according to the motion of Lord R. Grosvenor, which abolished the whole.
 6. Reduction of the Advertisement Duty to /6, according to the motion of Mr. Gibson (the House having, however, already noted its entire abolition).
- Lastly:
7. Abolition of the Stamp Duty on Newspaper Supplements (a huge *pièce de réjouissance*^a for *The Times*, the only paper issuing Supplements).

These are, in short, the principal features of the budget which Mr. Gladstone has been hatching now for more than four months. The debate in the House of Commons, fixed for Monday next, will afford me the opportunity of further commenting upon that coalition product.

Written on April 19, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3758, May 3, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Enjoyment.— *Ed.*

Karl Marx

L. S. D., OR CLASS BUDGETS,
AND WHO'S RELIEVED BY THEM

Gladstone has brought forth his Budget. We have heard two cocks on a barn floor crowing against each other, in style somewhat similar to that of the two Chancellors of the Exchequer—Ex^a and Actual—on the floor of the House of Commons—with this difference, that the Whig Bantam has borrowed some of the notes of the Conservative Turkey. Last week we analysed that portion of Mr. Gladstone's financial plan which deals with the National Debt, and showed how it was a miserable paltering with the question, and a mere matter of convenience to usurers, stockjobbers, and merchants, to facilitate and cheapen their transactions.^b We shall see, on the present occasion, that the Budget is a class Budget—a middle class Budget—written by an aristocratic pen. We will, first, give a brief outline of this notable affair:—

I.—As to Expenditure and Revenue:

The Chancellor states that the National Expenditure for the present year will exceed that of the last, by £1,400,000!! A promising way of opening a Budget of Financial Reform. The cause of the increase is not less encouraging.

It comprises an increase in our naval force of £617,000; in the army and commissariat of £90,000; for the ordnance £616,000; for the militia £230,000. While education, the arm of enlightenment and the defence of knowledge, receives an increase of only £100,000. The total estimated expenditure of the country for

^a Benjamin Disraeli.—*Ed*

^b See this volume, pp. 44-49.—*Ed*

the current year, is placed at £52,183,000. The total income is estimated at £52,990,000—showing a surplus of £807,000, from which, however, £100,000 is deducted for the packet service, and altogether an available surplus predicted of £500,000.

We now approach

II.—The Financial Scheme.

Here the Chancellor deals:—*Firstly*. With the Income Tax; and makes no distinction between fixed and precarious incomes. He proposes to reduce, after two years, the tax from 7d. to 6d. in the pound. Then, after two years more, from 6d. to 5d. for three years—to extend the tax to Ireland, and to lower it so as to embrace incomes of £100 per annum. This, he says, “will not touch upon the ranks of labour.” The incomes between £100 and £150 are to pay only 5d. in the pound. The effect of this will be, to lighten the burdens of the rich, and cast that alleviation as a weight upon the less rich. The wealthy tradesman is to pay less, but, to make up for it, the poor tradesman is to pay where he did not pay directly before. This is strange justice—for four years, it is true, the man of £100 is to pay 2d. in the pound less than he of £150, or £150,000—but after that period they pay the same—while after two years the rich man comes into the benefit of a reduction effected by taxing the poorer one. Our notion of taxation would far sooner incline to a graduated scale in which the percentage increased with the amount of the income, for 10,000 fivepences are less to the man of £10,000 per annum, than 100 fivepences to him of £100. So much for Whig Finance—with a specious, paltry, and roundabout tinkering, it gradually but surely lightens the burdens of the rich and increases the burdens of the poor. As to saying that the Income Tax does not affect the working man, it is a patent absurdity, for under our present social system of employer and employed, the middle class man generally indemnifies himself for additional taxation in diminished wages or increased prices.

Secondly. The Chancellor proceeds to the legacy duties. Here he relieves the sons-in-law and daughters-in-law from the “relations” duty of 10 per cent. reducing theirs to 7 per cent.—infinitesimal boon!—and includes all property within the operations of the tax, the succession to rateable property being taxed on the life interest. By this means he adds £2,000,000 to the taxation of the country, and takes credit to himself for supporting skill and industry as against property. This clause recognises a principle, and is a significant concession, extorted by industrial and commercial

development from propertied monopoly. It is, we repeat, a concession; but one the evasion of which is not only easy, but may possibly have been borne in mind by the propertied legislators of the financial world.

Thirdly. The stamp duties for receipts are to be repealed, and the affixing of a penny postage stamp to a receipt of any amount is in future to be sufficient. A great measure of convenience—to the rich—in which the increased use of stamps is supposed to counterbalance the loss of revenue, but in which, again, no benefit is conferred on the working classes, in but very few of whose transactions matter of sufficient value (£5) to demand a stamp ever comes under consideration.

Fourthly. The Advertisement Duty is reduced to 6d., instead of 1s. 6d., as now. This is another instance of miserable tinkering. No sound reason can be advanced for keeping the sixpence if you give up the shilling—inasmuch as the cumbrous and expensive machinery for collecting the sixpence will eat up the proceeds of the tax! But the reason may possibly be, not to have to give up the posts and appointments connected with the levying of that impost. Supplements to newspapers containing advertisements only—are to go free by post. Both these clauses are a concession to the middle class—while the retention of the newspaper stamp still fronts with its massive barrier the spread of Democratic education. “The present papers shall have advantages,” says the Chancellor, “but new ones, and cheaper ones, shall not be started.”

Fifthly. The Tax on Life Assurance is reduced from 2s. 6d. to 6d.—another instance of the same paltering spirit; indentures of apprenticeship, without consideration, from £1 to 2s. 6d.; attorneys' certificates from £12 and £8 to £9 and £6; and the articles of clerks from £120 to £80. The first and two last items of the above are again a manifest relief to the middle class, but not the shadow of a benefit to the poor—while the tax of 6d. is kept on advertisements, the Newspaper Stamp Duties and the Taxes on Paper are retained, in order that those on servants, dogs, and horses, may be reduced to benefit the rich.

Sixthly. In Scotland and Ireland an addition is to be made to the Spirit Duties—and the distillers are to have an allowance for “waste.”

Seventhly. Tradesmen's Licences (another boon to the middle class) are to be more equalised.

Eighthly. The Soap Duties, and a host of others, are to be dealt with, and the Duty on Tea is to be reduced from 2s. 2¼ d. to 1s. 10d. up to '54; to 1s. 3d. to '56; and to 1s. after that date.

Such is a fair outline of the Whig Budget; and we ask our readers whether a more contemptible piece of "Penny Legislation," to use the Chancellor's own expression, ever emanated from the Treasury Bench? It is plausible, specious, and sets forth some showy points; but what real benefit, what real relief, is conferred on the working classes of this country? The reduction of the duties on soap and tea are the only features at which one can catch; but small indeed is the relief thus conferred. The margin has everywhere been nicely measured, beyond which the working man would gain—the aristocrat and middle classes lose; and the transgression of that margin has been studiously avoided. The Budget is likely to catch the thoughtless among the people: "Reduction of Advertisement Duty to 6d. and Suppression of the Supplement Stamp!" But what does it practically amount to for the people? Nothing! "Penny Receipt Stamps!" But what is that to the wages-slaves who "receive" starvation? Absolutely nothing. "Life Assurances reduced from 2s. 6d. to 6d." What is it to the toiler at 6s., 8s., 10s., per week—who cannot insure his life from the crushing slavery of Manchester? Ay, or even to him at £1 and 30s? Nothing! What is it to the workingman that attorneys can get certificates for £3 less? Or clerks be articulated for £80 instead of £40 more? What to them is the lightening of the legacy duty in one item, and its general extension so easily avoided? Does it ease their burthen by the weight of a single feather? What is it to them that the shopkeepers' licences shall be more equalised, while their profits on labour's wants find no equality with labour's wage? "Financial Reform" was the one cry out of two which seated this Parliament and raised this ministry. There you have it—the Reform of Whigs, aristocrats, and moneymongers. Something was necessary—some slight concession—the task was to make it so slight, that it should scarcely be perceptible, and admirably has the financial artist succeeded in his attempt. In his own words—to use his own expressions—Gladstone's Budget is framed "for the convenience of the trading classes," and yet it is but a piece of "Penny Legislation."

Written about April 20, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The People's Paper*,
No. 51, April 23, 1853

Karl Marx

RIOT AT CONSTANTINOPLE.—
GERMAN TABLE MOVING.—THE BUDGET⁵⁷

London, Friday, April 22, 1853

A telegraphic dispatch has been received to the effect that on the 12th inst. there was a great tumult at Constantinople and the vicinity, fifteen Christians having been killed or wounded by the fanatic Turkish mob.

“Order was immediately restored by means of the military force.”

Another dispatch from Copenhagen states that the Chamber or Folketing has rejected the ministerial message on the proposed succession of the Danish Crown. This we may consider as an important check to the diplomacy of Russia, whose interests the message represented, according to the London protocol acknowledging Russia as ultimate heir of the Danish kingdom.⁵⁸

From the Hague we learn that an agitation similar to that which visited England two years ago in the shape of “Roman Catholic aggression,”⁵⁹ has now taken hold of the Netherlands, and led to the formation of an ultra-Protestant ministry. Concerning Germany, or rather that portion of it formerly known under the name of the Empire,⁶⁰ nothing can be more significant of the present state of mind prevailing through the educated middle-class, than a declaration of the editor of *The Frankfort Journal*, under date of April 19. For the edification of your readers I give you a translation of it:

“The communications we receive by every post, on the subject of table-moving (*Tisch-Rücken*),^a are assuming an extent to which, since the memorable ‘Song on the Rhine,’ by Nic. Becker, and the first days of the revolution of March, 1848, we

^a The reference is to spiritism, very much in vogue in Germany at the time.—*Ed.*

have seen nothing equal. Satisfactory as these communications are, since they prove better than any political *raisonnement*, in what *harmless and innocent* times we again find ourselves, we regret that we cannot take further notice of them, fearing that they might entirely overwhelm our readers and ourselves, and absorb in the end all the space of this journal."

"*An Englishman*"^a has addressed a letter to *The Times*, and Lord Palmerston, on the latest Kossuth affair, at the conclusion of which he says:

"When the Coalition Cabinet is gathered to its fathers, or its uncles, or grandfathers, we would delicately hint to the noble lord a new edition of *Joe Miller*. In fact we opine we shall hear no more of Joe. Palmerston will be the word. It is long. That is a fault! We believe, however, it has already been improved into the Anglo-Saxon *Pam*. This will suit verse as well as prose, and rhyme with 'sham, flam, and cram.'"^b

In my letter of Tuesday last^c I gave you a rough sketch of Mr. Gladstone's budget. I have now before me an official publication, filling 50 pages in folio: "The Resolutions to be proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer," and "An expository Statement to accompany the Resolutions," but I shall only touch on those details which would be of interest to foreign readers in the event of their becoming the law of Great Britain.

The most important resolutions are those concerning the Customs. There is a proposal to abolish the duties on 123 minor articles, yielding about £55,000 per annum, and including all furniture woods with four exceptions, as well as fixtures and frames, bricks and tiles. There is to be a reduction, firstly, on the tea duties from $2/2\frac{1}{4}$ to $1/10$ till 5th April, 1854; secondly, on 12 articles of food. The present duty on almonds is to be reduced to $2/2$ per cwt.; upon cheese from $5/$ to $2/6$ per cwt.; on cocoa from 2d. to 1d. per lb.; on nuts from $2/$ to $1/$ per bushel; on eggs from 10d. to 4d. a hundred; on oranges and lemons to 8d. a bushel; on butter from $10/$ to $5/$ per cwt.; on raisins from $15/9$ to $10/$ per cwt.; and on apples from $2/$ to $3d.$ per bushel. The whole of these articles yield, at present, a revenue of £262,000. There is, in the third place, to be a reduction on 133 articles of food, yielding a revenue of £70,000. Besides, a simplification is to be applied on a number of articles by the levy of specific instead of *ad valorem* duties.

^a The pen-name of A. Richards.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from the anonymous article "*The Times* and the New Gunpowder Plot" by A. Richards, published in *The Morning Advertiser*, No. 19291, April 21, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 57-62.—*Ed.*

As to the Excise, I have already stated the proposed abolition of the soap tax, and the increase in the scale of licenses to brewers and dealers in tea, coffee, tobacco and soap.

As to the Stamps, besides the reduction on attorneys' certificates, and in the advertisement duty, there is to be a reduction of the duty on life assurances, on receipt stamps, on indentures of apprenticeship, and on hackney carriages.

As to Assessed taxes, there is to be a reduction of the taxes on men-servants, private carriages, horses, ponies and dogs, and a reduction of 17½ per cent. in the charge for redemption of land tax.

As to the Post-Office, there is to be a reduction of colonial postages to a uniform rate of 6d.

A general feature of the budget deserving note, is the circumstance of most of its provisions having been forced on the Coalition Ministry, after an obstinate opposition to them in the course of the present session.

Mr. Gladstone proposes *now* to extend the legacy duty to real property; but on the 1st of March he still opposed Mr. Williams's motion, that real property should be made to pay the "same probate and legacy duties as are now payable on personal property!" He affirmed on that occasion, as the Tory journals do at this very moment, that the exemption was only apparent, and counterbalanced by other duties peculiar to real property. It is equally true, that on the same 1st of March, Mr. Williams threatened Mr. Gladstone with "being replaced by Mr. Disraeli, if he were not to give way on that point."

Mr. Gladstone proposes *now* to abolish or reduce the protective duties on about 268 minor articles; but on the 3d of March he still opposed Mr. Hume's motion, of "speedily repealing the strictly protective duties on about 285 articles." It is also true that Mr. Disraeli declared on that day that

"we could not cling to the rags and tatters of the Protective System."

Mr. Gladstone proposes *now* to reduce the advertisement duty by one half; but only four days before he brought out his Budget he opposed Mr. Milner Gibson's motion, to repeal that duty. It is true that he was defeated by a division of the House.

It would be easy to augment this enumeration of concessions made by the Coalition Ministry to the Manchester School.⁶¹ What do these concessions prove? That the industrial bourgeoisie, weakly represented as it is in the House, are yet the real masters

of the situation, and that every Government, whether Whig, Tory, or Coalition, can only keep itself in office, and the bourgeoisie out of office, by doing for them their preliminary work. Go through the records of British legislation since 1825, and you will find that the bourgeoisie is only resisted politically by concession after concession financially. What the Oligarchy fail to comprehend, is, the simple fact that political power is but the offspring of commercial power, and that the class to which they are compelled to yield the latter, will necessarily conquer the former also. Louis XIV himself, when legislating through Colbert in the interest of the manufacturers, was only preparing the revolution of 1789, when his "*l'état c'est moi*" was answered by Sieyès with "*le tiers état est tout.*"^a

Another very striking feature of the budget is the strict adoption of the policy of Mr. Disraeli, "that reckless adventurer" who dared to affirm in the House that the necessary result of commercial free-trade was a financial revolution, that is to say, the gradual commutation of indirect into direct taxation. Indeed, what does Mr. Gladstone propose? He strengthens and extends the system of direct taxation, in order to weaken and to contract the system of indirect taxation.

On the one side he renews the income-tax unaltered for seven years. He extends it to a whole people, to the Irish. He extends it by copying Mr. Disraeli, to a whole class, to the holders of incomes from £100 to £150. He accepts, partially, the extension of the house-tax, proposed by Mr. Disraeli, giving it the name of an altered license-tax and raising the charge for licenses in proportion to the size of the premises. Lastly, he augments direct taxation by £2,000,000, by subjecting real property to the legacy-duty, which was also promised by Mr. Disraeli.

On the other side he attacks indirect taxation under the two forms of Customs and of Excise; in the former by adopting Disraeli's reduction of the tea duties, or by abolishing, reducing, or simplifying the customs duties on 268 articles; in the latter by entirely abolishing the soap-tax.

The only difference between his budget and that of his predecessor, is this, that the one was the author, and that the other is the plagiarist; that Disraeli removed the excise-duties in favor of the land-interest, and that Gladstone removes them in

^a This refers to the following passage from Emmanuel Sieyès' *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*: "What is the third estate? Everything.—What was it until now politically? Nothing.—What is it striving for? To be something."—*Ed.*

favor of the town-interest; that Disraeli proclaimed the principle, but was forced by his exceptional position to falsify the practice, while Gladstone, opposed to the principle, is enabled by his coalition character to carry details through a series of compromises.

What will be the probable fate of the Coalition budget, and what will be the probable attitude assumed by the respective parties?

There are, in general, but three points on which the battle can be fought—the Income-Tax, the Legacy-Duty, and Ireland.

The Manchester School has pledged itself to oppose any prolongation of that “horrid inequality,” the present Income-Tax. The oracle of Printinghouse-square,^a *The Times*, has thundered for ten years against that same “monstrosity,” and the public prejudice of Great Britain in general has doomed the present system of charging equally all descriptions of income. But on this one point Mr. Gladstone repudiates compromise. As Mr. Disraeli, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed to modify the Income-Tax by establishing a distinction between precarious revenues and realized property, charging the former with 5d. and the latter with 7d. in the pound, the Income-Tax would seem to become the rallying point for the common opposition of the Conservatives, the Manchester School and the “general opinion” represented by *The Times*.

But will the Manchester men redeem their pledge? This is very doubtful. They are in the commercial habit of pocketing the present profits, and of letting principles shift for themselves. And the present profits offered by Mr. Gladstone’s budget are by no means contemptible. Already the tone of the Manchester organs has become very moderate and very conciliatory with regard to the Income-Tax. They begin to comfort themselves with the prospect held out by Mr. Gladstone, that “the whole Income-Tax shall expire in seven years,”^b forgetting at the opportune moment that, when the late Sir Robert Peel introduced it in 1842, he promised its expiration by the year 1845, and that the extension of a tax is a very awkward way toward its ulterior extinction.

As to *The Times*, that is the only journal which will profit by Mr. Gladstone’s proposal of abolishing the stamp on newspaper supplements. It has to pay for double supplements every day that it publishes them during the week 40,000 pence, or £166 3s. The

^a The square in London where *The Times* had its main offices.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from William Gladstone’s speech in the House of Commons on April 18, 1853, published in *The Times*, No. 21406, April 19, 1853.—*Ed.*

whole of the 40,000d. remitted by Mr. Gladstone will go into its coffers. We can then conceive that the Cerberus will be soothed down into a lamb, without Mr. Gladstone being metamorphosed into a Hercules. It would be difficult to find in all the Parliamentary history of Great Britain, a more undignified act than this of Mr. Gladstone, buying up the support of a journal by inserting a special provision for it in the budget. The abolition of the Taxes on Knowledge was chiefly asked for with a view to break down the monopoly of the newspaper-leviathans. The "unctuous" Mr. Gladstone adopts only so much of that measure as tends exactly to double the monopoly of *The Times*.

In principle, we contend that Mr. Gladstone is right in rejecting all distinctions between the sources from which income is derived. If you distinguish between the quality of incomes you must also distinguish between quantity, as in 99 cases out of 100, the quantity of an income constitutes its quality. If you distinguish between their quantities you arrive unavoidably at progressive taxation, and from progressive taxation you tumble directly into a very trenchant sort of Socialism, a thing certainly abhorred by the opponents of Mr. Gladstone. With the narrow and interested interpretation of the difference between fixed and precarious incomes, as made by the Manchester School, we arrive at the ridiculous conclusion that the income of the richest class of England, the trading class, is only a precarious one. Under the pretence of philanthropy they aim at changing a portion of the public burdens from their own shoulders to the backs of the land-owners and fundholders.

As to the extension of the legacy-duty to real property the country party, as cannot be doubted, will vehemently resist it. They naturally desire to receive their successions as heretofore, untaxed; but Mr. Disraeli, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, has acknowledged the injustice of that exception, and the Manchester men will vote as one man with the Ministers. *The Morning Advertiser* in its number of yesterday^a informs the country party that should they be imprudent enough to take their stand on the legacy duty, they must abandon all idea of being supported by the Liberals. There exists hardly any privilege to which the British middle class are more bitterly opposed, and there exists also no more striking instance of oligarchic legislation. Pitt introduced in 1796 two bills, the one subjecting personal property to the probate and legacy-duty, and the other imposing the same duties on real

^a April 21, 1853.—*Ed.*

property. The two measures were separated because Pitt apprehended a successful opposition from members of both houses to subjecting their estates to those taxes. The first bill passed the House with little or no opposition. Only one division took place, and only 16 members voted against it. The second bill was proceeded with through all its stages, until it came to the third reading, when it was lost by a division of 30 against 30. Pitt, seeing no chance of passing the bill through either house, was forced to withdraw it. If the probate and legacy-duties had been paid on real property since 1796, by far the greater portion of the public debt might have been paid off. The only real objection the country party could now make is the plea that the fundholders enjoy a similar exemption, but they would, of course, not strengthen their position by rousing against them the fundholders, who are gifted with a particular taste for fiscal immunities.

There remains then but one probable chance of successfully opposing the Coalition budget, and this is a coalition of the country party with the Irish Brigade.⁶² It is true Mr. Gladstone has endeavored to induce the Irish to submit to the extension of the Income-Tax to Ireland, by making them the gift of four millions and a half of Consolidated Annuities. But the Irish contend that three out of these four and a half millions, connected with the famine of 1846-47,⁶³ were never intended to constitute a national debt, and have never been acknowledged as such by the Irish people.

The ministry itself seems not to be quite sure of success, since it menaces an *early dissolution* of the House, unless the budget be accepted as a whole. A formidable suggestion this for the great majority of members whose "pockets have been materially affected by the *legitimate* expenses of the last contest," and for those Radicals who have clung as closely as possible to the old definition of an Opposition; namely, that it does, in the machine of Government, the duty of the safety-valve in a steam-engine. The safety-valve does not stop the motion of the engine, but preserves it by letting off in *vapor* the power which might otherwise blow up the whole concern. Thus they let off in vapor the popular demands. They seem to offer motions only to withdraw them afterward, and to rid themselves of their superfluous eloquence.

A dissolution of the House would only reveal the dissolution of the old parties. Since the appearance of the Coalition Ministry, the Irish Brigade has been split up into two factions—one governmental, the other independent. The country party is likewise split up into two camps—the one led by Mr. Disraeli, the other by Sir

John Pakington; although now, in the hour of danger, they both rally again around Disraeli. The Radicals themselves are broken up into two sets—the Mayfair-men⁶⁴ and the Manchester-men. There is no longer any power of cohesion in the old parties, but at the same time there is no power of real antagonism. A new general election would not mend, but only confirm this state of things.

By the election-disclosures the Lower House is sunk as low as it can possibly go. But simultaneously, week after week, it has denounced the rottenness of its foundation, the thorough corruption of the *constituencies* themselves. Now after these disclosures, will the ministry venture on an appeal to these branded constituencies—an appeal to the country? To the country at large they have nothing to offer, holding in one hand the refusal of parliamentary reform, and in the other an Austrian patent, installing them as general informers of the continental police.⁶⁵

Written on April 22, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3761, and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 829, May 6, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

SOAP FOR THE PEOPLE, A SOP FOR *THE TIMES*.—
THE COALITION BUDGET

Everybody knows that a Budget is simply an estimate of the probable Revenue and Expenditure of Government for the year current, which estimate is based on the financial experience, i.e., on the balance sheet for the past year.

The first thing, therefore, for Mr. Gladstone was to produce the balance sheet for the year 1852-3. Mr. Disraeli, in his statement as Chancellor of the Exchequer, has estimated the probable income for 1852-3 at £52,325,000, and the Expenditure for the same period at £51,163,000, thus anticipating a surplus of £1,162,000. Mr. Gladstone, in making up the actual balance from the books, discovers that the real amount of Revenue for the past year was £53,089,000, and the real Expenditure only £50,782,000, showing an actual surplus of £2,307,000, or, as Mr. Gladstone calculates (we know not in what way) £2,460,000.

As it is the fashion, or rather as Parliament affects, to consider the Chancellor of the Exchequer as the mysterious conjuror who, by nobody knows what secret tricks, contrives to produce the whole yearly Revenue of the nation, it is no wonder that that personage, whoever he happens to be, takes care not to discountenance so flattering a delusion. Consequently, if the nation, by increasing the rate of production, is found to have swelled the amount of Tax Revenues above the estimate, it is taken for granted that the Minister of Finance who, by this process, can present more than double the surplus his predecessor had promised, is undoubtedly the man of the greater financial capacities. This was the cheerful idea of Mr. Gladstone, cheerfully received and appreciated by the supporters of the Coalition Oligarchy in the House.

Two Millions Four Hundred and Sixty Thousand Pounds Surplus!

But not a farthing out of the two millions will the House permit to go to the people. Where, then, are they to go to? Mr. Gladstone explains it:

“Favourable as this statement may seem, the House must not forget that it has already largely drawn on this surplus by various extraordinary votes on the estimates of the current year.”^a

The House knew from Mr. Disraeli that there would be at all events a surplus of more than one million of pounds. Accordingly, on going into Committee of Ways and Means,⁶⁶ it voted merrily the following additional sums above and beyond the ordinary surplus:—

	£
For the Navy, including Packet Service	617,000
Army and Commissariat	90,000

To these sums, as Mr. Gladstone announced, will have to be added:—

For the Kaffir war ⁶⁷ (no peace?)	270,000
Increase on Ordnance	616,000
Increase on Militia	230,000
Public (read private) Education	100,000

Making a total of £1,923,000

Mr. Gladstone again (probably by omitting the Kaffir war item on account of its uncertainty) calculates the total at only £1,654,000. Deducting this sum from the original (barely figurative) surplus of £2,460,000, there would remain an actual surplus of £806,000, or, still calculating with Mr. Gladstone, £807,000. Yet, even from this moderate sum the House is warned to deduct £220,000, accruing from precarious, and not recurring sources of Revenue. Thus the original two millions, so cheerfully announced, are after all but £587,000, by no means a very extensive basis for any even the most moderate reform of taxation. As, however, the country is assured that it has a Ministry of Reform, Reforms there must be; and Mr. Gladstone forthwith engages to bring out these Reforms.

An ordinary Free Trader, a Mr. Hume for instance, would perhaps have advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do good

^a Here and below William Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on April 18, 1853 is quoted from *The Times*, No. 21406, April 19, 1853.—*Ed*

with his surplus, by the abolition of duties on such foreign articles, the revenue of which, as shown by the Customs' Returns, would balance exactly the £587,000. What a vulgar, commonplace, profane suggestion to so learned and profound a financial alchemist as Mr. Gladstone! Do you think that the man who contemplates nothing short of the suppression of the entire public debt, would gratify his ambition by the simple remission of £500,000 of taxes? Surely, for so small a purpose, Sancho Timber needed not have been removed to his Indian Barataria,^a to make room for the great Don Quixote of coalition finance.

Gladstone's Taxation Reform bears the proud Oxford Street shop-frontispiece of—

"Immense Reduction!"

"Five millions, and several odd thousand pounds, forthwith to be dispensed with!"

There is something to attract the people, and to beguile even the most protected Parliamentary old female.

Let us enter the shop. "Mr. Gladstone, your bill of fare, if you please. What is it really that you mean, Sir? Five millions of pounds reduction?" "Decidedly, my dear Sir," answers Mr. Gladstone. "Would you like to look at the figures? Here they are:—

1. Abolition of the entire Soap Tax	1,126,000
2. Reduction of duty on Life Assurances, from 2s. 6d. to 6d.	29,000
3. Reduction of duty on Receipt Stamps to uniform rate of 1d.	155,000
4. Reduction on duty on Apprentice Indentures, from 20s. to 2s. 6 d.	} 50,000
5. Reduction on duty on Attorney's Certificates.....	
6. Reduction on duty on Advertisements, from 1s. 6d. to 6d.	160,000
7. Reduction on duty on Hackney Carriages, from 1s. 5d. to 1s. per day	26,000
8. Reduction on duty on Men Servants to £1 1s. for those above eighteen years, and 10s. 6d. for those under	87,000

^a Allusion to the appointment of Charles Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Whig Cabinet of 1846-52, as President of the Control Council on India. Barataria is a fictitious island given over to Sancho Panza in Cervantes' *Don Quixote*.—*Ed.*

9. Reduction on duty on Private Carriages	95,000
10. Reduction on duty on Horses, Ponies, and Dogs	108,000
11. Reduction on duty on Post Horses, by substituting licenses to charge on mileage	54,000
12. Reduction on duty on Colonial Postage (6d. a letter) ...	40,000
13. Reduction on duty on Tea, from 2s. 2 ¹ / ₄ d. to 1s. 10d. till 5th of April, '54, to 1s. 6d. in 1855, to 1s. 3d. in 1856, and to 1s. thereafter	3,000,000
14. Reduction on duty on Apples, Cheese, Cocoa, Eggs, Butter, and Fruit	262,000
15. Reduction on duty on 133 minor articles	70,000
16. Abolition of duty on 123 minor articles	53,000
Total	5,315,000

Why, a remission of £5,315,000 taxes would unquestionably be a handsome thing. But is there no drawback in this most liberal Budget? To be sure, there is. Else, how could it be called a Reform? Constitutional Reforms and Oxford Street shops, handsome as they both look, are sure to have always a very handsome drawback.

Of all clever tricks men contrive in the end to catch the secret. Mr. Gladstone, with only *half a million* in his bag, bestows a donation on the public of *five million and a half*. Whence does he get it? Ay, from the same blindfold public whom he bewilders with his generosity. He makes them a present, but invites them to return the favour. Of course, not in a direct or petulant manner, nor even from the same people whom it is his purpose to win over now. There are various customers with whom he intends to deal, and Russell, the juggler, has taught the adept Gladstone how to redeem his liberality of to-day by a revenge on to-morrow.

Gladstone remits old taxes to the amount of £5,315,000. Gladstone imposes new ones to the amount of £3,139,000. Still Gladstone would give to us a benefit of £2,176,000. But Gladstone is, at the best, but the Minister of the year; and the amount of his contemplated reduction for the year is only £2,568,000, which will cause a loss to the Revenue of £1,656,000, to be balanced by the anticipated yield of the new taxes for the year, viz., £1,344,000, leaving a deficiency of £312,000, which, set off against the actual surplus, as stated in the Budget, of £807,000, would still show a favourable balance of £495,000.

These are the principal features of the Coalition Budget. We shall now state to our readers what are the points of which the Ministry hope to make the most—what objections are most likely

to be raised against it by the various Parliamentary parties in opposition—and, in conclusion, what is our own opinion of the question.

Gladstone, in all his anxiety to create a sensation, and to secure to himself both financial notoriety and popular favour by a large remission of taxes, felt the necessity of introducing his proposal for an increase of £3,139,000, under some plausible and apparently rational pretence. He was aware that he would not be permitted to nibble with the whole system of taxation, for the sole purpose of an uncalled for and unwarranted personal gratification, without some show of what Parliamentary and middle class men call “principle and justice.” Accordingly, he astutely resolved to take the legislating Pecksniffs by what he knew to be their weakest side, adroitly screening his intended augmentation of the public burdens behind the pleasant and acceptable phrase of a “just extension of certain taxes, with a view to their final and lasting equalisation.” The imposts he chose for that object were:—

1. The Legacy Duty.
2. The Spirits Excise; and,
3. The Income Tax.

The Legacy Duty he demands to embrace equally all kinds of property. As landed property was heretofore exempted, this proposal is expected to gratify the commercial and manufacturing interests. The Spirits Excise is to be extended to Scotland and Ireland, so as to bring them more on a par with distilling England.

Lastly, the Income Tax is to extend, in its area, to incomes between £150 and £100; and also to Ireland. The Income Tax proposal is certainly not one of the points on which Gladstone can expect, or will obtain, much applause. But of that anon, when we come to the objections.

Besides the Legacy and Spirits proposition, the Free Trade reductions on a vast number of import articles are undoubtedly considered by Ministers as the most attractive bait; and some favourable clamour is likely to be got up on this point by the shopkeepers, housewives, and the small middle class in general, before they discover that, with regard to Tea, at least, a very trifling benefit will accrue to the consumers, the profit of the holders and the monopoly of producers tending to absorb the greater part of the advantage. But, then, there is the entire abolition of the duty on Soap—a measure by which he hopes to enable the country to wash away not only its own dirty, filthy, and miserable appearance, by making all faces clean, comfortable and happy; but also to entirely abolish black slavery, and make an end

to the misfortunes of numberless Uncle Toms, by the impulse given to "legitimate trading and production of African palm oil." Assured by this, Gladstone bids fair to out-puff the fastest haberdasher and the most bombastic quack doctor. To these attractive features he adds a good number of minor bribes, including one of several millions to the Irish Brigade,⁶⁸ in the shape of a remission of the famine loan, and to *The Times*, the big supporter of the "good Aberdeen," and his colleagues of the Coalition. This latter bribe consists in the abolition of the Stamp on Newspaper Supplements, containing advertisements only, *The Times* being notoriously the only journal issuing any of the kind to any extent.

We come now to the objections that are most likely to be raised against the Budget from oppositional quarters. The discussion on Monday last, in the House, having been only an introductory skirmish, we must glean, if possible, from the daily papers the intentions of parties. And here we are very scantily supplied. *The Times*, *Chronicle*, and *Post*, are actually in the bonds of the Coalition Government, and *The Daily News* can scarcely be regarded as the organ of the Manchester School.⁶⁹ Besides, it is still vacillating, and apparently much tempted by the Free Trade propositions. But if we look at *The Herald*, the Tory-Conservative paper, we already find its judgment given; and with a truly unusual frankness:—

"The whole Budget of Mr. Gladstone," it says, "is nothing but a contemptible admixture of bribes and jobs."^a

The Tories, therefore, are sure to oppose the scheme of Gladstone, from whom Disraeli will not fail to revindicate the stolen feathers of the Legacy and Income Tax extension, the Tea reduction, and other impudently-appropriated merits of his own. The landed aristocracy desire, at all events, if they must submit to a further loss of privileges, to reserve to themselves the merit of a voluntary surrender. But as they cannot well take their stand on the Legacy Duty, Mr. Disraeli will cause them to rally around the principle of distinction between real and precarious incomes, on which ground he will have a considerable portion of the Brigade fighting alongside with him. It is obvious that the Irish can and will never acknowledge the obligation of a debt, forced by the English upon their country only in consequence of the previous ruin of its population. Besides, for all practical purposes, the

^a Marx's rendering of the statement from *The Morning Herald*, No. 22137, April 20, 1853.—*Ed*

remission of the interest from £3,000,000 imaginary capital, must appear to them a very inadequate concession for the imposition of a Spirit Excise and an Income Tax. As far as the Manchester School is concerned, although they are pledged to their constituents, if not on the abolition, at least on the transformation of the Income Tax, it is not to be expected that they will act otherwise than as business men, *i.e.* without any political honour, but with a very due regard to profit. And the profit on the side of Mr. Gladstone's Budget, as a "whole," is by no means despicable, as far as those gentlemen are concerned.

Now, as to our opinion on the question at issue, we desire most eagerly to see a ministry defeated, which deserves equal contempt for its reactionary deceitful dodgery at home, as for its cowardly subservient policy abroad. And we think we are the more right in doing so, as such an event would certainly promote the interests of the people. One thing is clear: as long as an aristocratic coalition does the work required from them by the manufacturing and trading class, the latter will neither make any political effort themselves, nor allow the working class to carry their own political movement. If, however, the country party once more obtain the upper hand, the middle class cannot get rid of them without remodelling the rotten oligarchic parliament, and then it is no longer in their power to agitate for a limited reform, but they must go the whole length of the people's demands. The people, of course, can never, without abandoning both their principles and interests, join and appeal to the middle classes: but for the *bourgeoisie*, it would not be the first time that they are forced to throw themselves on the shoulders of the people. And such a contingency would lead to a very decided revolution in the present financial system. Already, it is evident that even middle class society inevitably tends towards the substitution of one direct property-tax in lieu of the traditional fiscal *olla podrida*. The Manchester School has long since registered, Disraeli has acknowledged, and even the oligarchic coalition has confirmed, the principle of direct taxation. But let the machinery of a direct property-tax be once properly established, and the people, with political power in their hands, have only to put that engine into motion, in order to create the

Budget of Labour.

Written about April 25, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The People's Paper*,
No. 52, April 30, 1853

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

THE ROCKET AFFAIR.—
THE SWISS INSURRECTION⁷⁰

London, Friday, April 29, 1853

The notorious *Polizei-Director* Stieber, accompanied by the Police Lieutenant, Goldheim, and the *Criminal-Rath*, Nörner, arrived here a few days ago, from Berlin, on the special mission of connecting the Rotherhithe gunpowder-plot with the Calabrian hat-conspiracy at Berlin.^a I know, from private information, that they met at Kensington, in the house of Fleury, and that the ex-clerk Hirsch was also present at that meeting. A day later the same Hirsch had a secret interview with Mr. Kraemer, the Russian consul. If your readers recollect my letter on the Cologne trials,^b they must be aware, that the identical personages who concocted that plot, are again at work.

On Saturday, 23d inst., proceedings were commenced, before Mr. Henry, the Bow-st. Police Magistrate, against Mr. Hale, the proprietor of the Rotherhithe rocket manufactory, where the Government seizure had been made. On that day, the question discussed was merely relating to the point, whether the explosive material under seizure was gunpowder, or not. Mr. Henry who had reserved his decision until yesterday, has now pronounced, contradictorily to Mr. Ure, the celebrated chemist's opinion, that it was gunpowder. Accordingly, he fined Mr. Hale 2s. for every pound of gunpowder, beyond the legal allowance, found in his possession, which quantity amounted to 57 lbs. W. Hale, R. Hale, his son, and J. Boylin, then appeared at the side bar to answer the charge of having, at various intervals, between Sept. 13, 1852 and

^a See this volume, pp. 28-31.—*Ed.*

^b F. Engels, "The Late Trial at Cologne" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 388-93).—*Ed.*

April 13, 1853, made or caused to be made divers large quantities of rockets. Mr. Bodkin, the Government solicitor, stated that Mr. W. Hale had made several unsuccessful applications to the British Government with regard to his rockets, that from October, 1852, a great number of workmen had been employed by him, some of whom were foreign refugees; that the whole of their proceedings had been carried on in the greatest possible secrecy, and that the shipping records at the Customs refuted Mr. Hale's statement of having been an exporter through the Customs. At the conclusion he said:

"The cost of the rockets found in possession of Mr. Hale, was estimated at from £1,000 to £2,000. Where did the money come from? Mr. Hale was only lately a bankrupt, and superseded his bankruptcy by paying only 3s. in the pound."^a

J. Saunders, a sergeant of the Detective Police, stated, that he took possession of

"1,543 loaded rockets, 3,629 rocket heads, 2,482 rocket bottoms, 1,955 empty rockets, 22 iron shot, 2 instruments for firing rockets."

A witness, Mr. Usener, next appeared, who said that he had been for 15 years an officer in the Prussian artillery, and served in the Hungarian war as Major of the staff. He was employed by the Messrs. Hale in making rockets at Rotherhithe. Before going to the factory he had been in prison for theft for five or six months at Maidstone, to which step he declared he had been driven by utter destitution. The most important part of his deposition was literally as follows:

"I was introduced to the Hales by M. Kossuth; I first saw M. Kossuth on the subject last summer, on his return from America; about the middle of September I saw the elder Mr. Hale in the company of M. Kossuth, at the house of the latter; a Hungarian, the adjutant, was also there; M. Kossuth said to Mr. Hale, 'This person was in the Hungarian service, and a late officer of the Prussian artillery, and I can recommend him to your employ to assist in making *our* rockets, or *your* rockets,' I don't remember which was the word he said; M. Kossuth said my wages should be 18s. per week, and he recommended me to keep the affair quite secret; Mr. Hale, he said, would point out what I was to do; M. Kossuth spoke partly in the Hungarian and partly in the English language; I believe Mr. Hale does not understand the German language. The word *secret* was said to me in German; [...] I was sent to Pimlico by R. Hale to see M. Kossuth; I saw M. Kossuth at Pickering Place; W. Hale and another Hungarian were there; we went to try a firing machine; when we were all together, the machine was set up, and a trial was made with the rockets; the conversation took place partly in English, and chiefly about the quality of the rockets, etc.; we were there an hour and a half, and when it was

^a Here and below the authors quote from the article "The War Rocket Factory and the Government", *The Times*, No. 21415, April 29, 1853.—*Ed.*

all over, M. Kossuth and Mr. Hale desired us to leave the house carefully, one by one, and Mr. Hale joined us at the corner of the street; on this occasion M. Kossuth repeatedly told us to keep his connection with the rockets secret."

W. Gerlach, another German, was then examined through an interpreter. He was employed at Mr. Hale's factory, in making rockets. There were, besides him, three Hungarians. He was recommended to Mr. Hale by M. Kossuth, but he never saw them in company together.

Mr. Henry, who had the alternative of committing summarily in the penalty of £5, or sending the case before the Assizes, adopted the latter course, but was willing to accept bail for each of the Hales. Mr. W. Hale declared that he would not ask any friend to become bail, either for himself or for his son, and accordingly the defendants were removed to Horsemonger-lane Jail.

The depositions of the witnesses, it is clear, are in strong contradiction with the letter of Mr. Hale, Jr.; the substance of which I have already communicated to you,⁷¹ and, with the letters addressed by Kossuth to Captain Mayne Reid and Lord Dudley Stuart,^a wherein he affirmed he knew nothing either of Mr. Hale, or his rockets. It would be unjust, however, to draw any inference from this circumstance, before further explanations shall have been given by M. Kossuth. As to Mr. Usener, is it not a shame that a talented countryman of ours in exile, and a man most willing to labor, as is proved by the fact of his agreeing to become an ordinary workman at 18s. a week, should have been driven by mere destitution to theft, while certain German refugees, notorious idlers, assume the privilege of squandering the small funds destined for the revolutionists, in self-imposed missionary trips, ridiculous plots, and public house *conciliabules*?

On Friday, the 22d inst., an insurrection broke out again at Fribourg, in Switzerland, the fifth, already, since the late Sonderbund war.⁷² The insurrection was to be commenced simultaneously all over the surface of the canton; but at the given moment, the majority of the conspirators did not come forward. Three "colonnes," who had promised their cooperation in the affair, remained behind. The insurgents, who actually entered the town, were chiefly from the district of Farvagny, and from the communes of Autigny, Prez, Torny [le Grand], Middel, and other neighborhoods. At 4¹/₂ a. m., the body of 400 peasants, all wearing the colors of the Sonderbund, and carrying the emblem of the Virgin on their standard, moved towards Fribourg, on the road

^a See *The Times*, No. 21412, April 26, 1853.—Ed.

from Lausanne, headed by Colonel Perrier, and the notorious peasant Carrard, the chief of the insurrection of 1851, who had been amnestied by the Grosse-Rath. About 5 o'clock they entered the town, by the "Porte des Etangs," and took possession of the College and the Arsenal, where they seized 150 guns. Alarm having been beaten, the town council immediately declared the state of siege, and Major Gerbex assumed the command of the assembled civic guard. While he ordered the streets at the back of the college to be occupied with cannon, he pushed a body of riflemen forward, to attack the insurgents in front. The riflemen advanced up the two flights of steps, leading to the college, and soon dislodged the peasants from the windows of the buildings. The combat had lasted for about an hour, and the assailants already numbered eight dead and eighteen wounded, when the insurgents, attempting in vain to escape through the back streets, where they were received with grape shot, sent forth a priest with a white flag, declaring their readiness to surrender.

A Committee of the Civic Guard instantly formed a Court-martial, which condemned Col. Perrier to thirty years' imprisonment, and which is still sitting. The number of prisoners is about two hundred, among whom Messrs. Wuilleret, Weck and Chollet. M. Charles, the president of the well-known Committee at Posieux, has been seen at the gate of Romont, but not captured. Besides the parson of Torny le Grand, two other priests are included in the number of prisoners. As to the expenses of the affair, the canton appears to be safe, half the property of the patrician, Mr. Weck, being sufficient for that object.

Written on April 26-29, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3768, May 14, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 832, May 17, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Frederick Engels
POLITICAL POSITION OF THE SWISS REPUBLIC⁷³

London, May 1, 1853

Royal families formerly used to employ whipping-boys, who had the honor of receiving condign punishment on their profane backs, whenever any of the scions of royalty had committed an offense against the rules of good behavior. The modern European political system continues this practice, in a certain degree, in the erection of small intermediate States, which have to act the scapegoat in any domestic squabble by which the harmony of the "balance of power" may be troubled. And in order to enable these smaller States to perform this enviable part with suitable dignity, they are, by the common consent of Europe "in Congress assembled,"⁷⁴ and with all due solemnity, declared "*neutral*." Such a scapegoat, or whipping-boy, is Greece—such is Belgium and Switzerland. The only difference is this—that these modern political scapegoats, from the abnormal conditions of their existence, are seldom quite undeserving of the inflictions they are favored with.

The most conspicuous of this class of States has of late been Switzerland,

Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur—^a

the Swiss. And wherever the *people* of any European State came into collision with their rulers, the Swiss were equally sure to come in for their share of the trouble; until since the beginning of this year, Switzerland, after having made itself gratuitously contempti-

^a Q. Horatii Flacci, *Epistolarum*, Liber Primus, Epistola II, Ad Lollium; the line ends with "Achivi"—Achaeans.—*Ed.*

ble to the revolutionary party, has been placed in a sort of interdict by the rulers of Continental Europe. Squabbles about refugees with the Emperor Bonaparte, for whose sake Switzerland once came very near risking a war; squabbles with Prussia on account of Neuchâtel; squabbles with Austria about Tessine and the Milan insurrection⁷⁵; squabbles with the minor German States about subjects which nobody cares for; squabbles on all hands, threatening notes, expulsions, passport chicanes, blockades, raining down upon poor Switzerland thick as hailstones in a storm, and yet, such is human nature, the Swiss are happy, contented and proud in their own way, and feel more at home in this shower of abuse and insult, than if the political horizon was cloudless and bright.

This honorable political position of Switzerland is, by the popular mind of Europe, rather vaguely and clumsily expressed in the common saying: Switzerland has been invented by the rulers of Europe in order to bring republican governments into contempt; and certainly, a Metternich or Guizot may have often said: If Switzerland did not exist, we should have to create it. To them, a neighbor like Switzerland, was a real god-send.

We cannot be expected to repeat the multifarious charges brought of late, against Switzerland and Swiss institutions, by real or would be revolutionists. Long before the movements of 1848, the organs of the revolutionary Communist party of Germany analyzed that subject, they showed why Switzerland, as an independent State, must ever be lagging behind in the march of European progress, and why that country, with all its republican shows, will ever be reactionary at heart.^a They were even violently attacked, at that time, by divers democratic spouters and manufacturers of clandestine declamation, who celebrated Switzerland as their "model-republic," until the model institutions were once tried upon themselves. The subject is now as trite as can be; nobody disputes the fact, and a few words will suffice to put the matter in its true light.

The mass of the Swiss population follow either pastoral or agricultural pursuits; pastoral, in the high mountains, agricultural wherever the nature of the ground admits of it. The pastoral tribes, for tribes you may call them, rank among the least civilized populations of Europe. If they do not cut off heads and ears like the Turks and Montenegrins, they perform acts of hardly less

^a The reference is to Engels' article "The Civil War in Switzerland", *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung*, November 1847 (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 367-74).— *Ed.*

barbarity by their judicial assemblies; and what cruelty and beastly ferocity they are capable of, the Swiss mercenaries at Naples and elsewhere have proved.⁷⁶ The agricultural population is quite as stationary as the pastoral; they have nothing in common with the agricultural population of the American Far West, whose very aliment is change, and who clear every twelvemonth an amount of land far larger than all Switzerland. The Swiss peasant tills the patch of ground his father and grandfather tilled before him; he tills it in the same slovenly way as they did; he earns about as much as they did; he lives about as they did, and consequently he thinks very nearly in the same way as they did. Had it not been for feudal burdens and imposts levied upon them, partly by aristocratic families, partly by patrician corporations in the towns, the Swiss peasantry would always have been quite as stationary in their political existence as their neighbors, the cowherds, are up to the present day. The third components of the Swiss people, the industrial population, although necessarily far more advanced in civilization than the two classes mentioned before, yet live under circumstances which exclude them in a great degree from the progressive giant impulse which the modern manufacturing system has imparted to Western Europe. Steam is hardly known in Switzerland; large factories exist in a few localities only; the cheapness of labor, the sparseness of the population, the abundance of small mountain-streams fit for mills; all these and many other circumstances tend to produce a petty and sporadic sort of manufactures mixed up with agricultural pursuits, the most eligible industrial system for Switzerland. Thus watch-making, ribbon-weaving, straw-plaiting, embroidery, &c. are carried on in several cantons, without ever creating or even increasing a town; and Geneva and Basle, the richest, and with Zurich, the most industrial towns, have hardly increased for centuries. If, then, Switzerland carries on her manufacturing production almost exclusively upon the system in practice all over Europe *before* the invention of steam, how can we expect to find other than corresponding ideas in the minds of the producers; if steam has not revolutionized Swiss production and intercommunication, how could it overthrow the hereditary ways of thinking?

The Hungarian Constitution bears a certain resemblance to that of Great Britain, which circumstance has been turned to good account by Magyar politicians, who thence would make us jump to the conclusion that the Hungarian nation is almost as advanced as the English; and yet there are many hundreds of miles and of years between the petty tradesman of Buda and the Cotton lord of

Lancashire, or between the traveling tinker of the Puszta^a and the Chartist working-man of a British manufacturing metropolis. Thus, Switzerland would give itself the airs of a United States on a smaller scale; but barring the superficial resemblance of political institutions, no two countries are more unlike than ever-moving, ever-changing America, with a historical mission whose immensity people on both sides of the Atlantic are but just beginning to divine, and stationary Switzerland, whose never-ending petty distractions would result in the perpetual round-about motion within the narrowest circle, were she not in spite of herself dragged forward by the industrial advance of her neighbors.

Whoever doubts this, will be satisfied after a perusal of the history of Swiss railways. Were it not for the traffic from south to north moving round Switzerland on both sides, not a railroad would ever have been constructed in that country. As it is, they are made twenty years too late.

The French invasion of 1798, and the French revolution of 1830, gave occasion to the peasantry to throw off their feudal burdens; to the manufacturing and trading population to throw off the mediaeval yoke of patrician and corporative control. With this progress the revolution of *Cantonal* Government was completed. The more advanced cantons had obtained constitutions to suit their interests. This Cantonal revolution reacted upon the Central Representation Assembly^b and Executive. The party vanquished in the individual cantons was here strong; the struggle was fought over again. The general political movement of 1840-'47, which everywhere in Europe brought about preliminary conflicts, or prepared decisive collisions, was in all second- and third-rate States—thanks to the jealousies of the great powers—favorable to the opposition, which may be described as the middle-class party. It was the case, too, in Switzerland; the moral support of Britain, the indecision of Guizot, the difficulties which kept Metternich at bay in Italy, carried the Swiss over the Sonderbund war⁷⁷; the party which had been victorious in the liberal cantons in 1830, now conquered the Central Powers. The revolutions of 1848 made it possible for the Swiss to reform their feudal constitutions in accordance with the new political organization of the majority of the cantons⁷⁸; and now we may say that Switzerland has attained the highest political development of which she, as an independent State, is capable. That the new

^a Hungarian steppe.—*Ed.*

^b The Federal Diet.—*Ed.*

federal constitution is quite adequate to the wants of the country, the constant reforms in the monetary system, the means of communication, and other legislative matters affecting the industry of the country, abundantly show; but, alas! these reforms are of a nature that any other State would be ashamed of, on account of the mass of traditionary nuisances, and the antediluvian state of society, the existence of which, up to that date, they disclose.

What, at most, can be said in favor of the Swiss Constitution 1848 is this: that by its enactment the more civilized portion of the Swiss declared themselves willing to pass, to a certain extent, from the Middle Ages into modern society. Whether, however, they will at any time be able to do away with privileged trades' corporations, guilds, and such-like mediaeval amenities, must remain very doubtful to any one who has the least knowledge of the country, and who has seen in a single instance the strenuous efforts with which respectable "vested interests" oppose even the most matter-of-course reform.

Thus we see the Swiss, true to their character, moving on quietly in their own restricted domestic circle while the year 1848 uprooted all the stability of the European Continent around them. The revolutions of Paris, of Vienna, of Berlin, of Milan, were by them reduced to as many levers of Cantonal intrigue. The European earthquake had even for the radical Swiss no other interest but this—that it might vex some conservative neighbor by upsetting his crockery. In the struggle for Italian independence Sardinia solicited an alliance with Switzerland, and there is no doubt that an addition to the Sardinian army of 20 or 30,000 Swiss would have very soon driven the Austrians out of Italy. When 15,000 Swiss in Naples were fighting against Italian liberty it certainly might be expected that Switzerland, in order to maintain her boasted "*neutrality*," should send an equal number to fight for the Italians; but the alliance was rejected and the cause of Italian independence was lost as much through Swiss as through Austrian bayonets. Then came the disasters of the revolutionary party, and the wholesale emigration from Italy, from France, from Germany, to the *neutral* Swiss soil. But there neutrality ceased; Swiss radicalism was satisfied with what it had achieved, and the very insurgents, who, by holding in check the tutors and natural superiors of Switzerland, the absolutist governments of the Continent, had enabled the Swiss to carry out their internal reform undisturbed—these very insurgents were now treated in Switzerland with every possible insult and turned out of the country at the first bidding of their persecutors. Then began that series of degradation and insult

which one neighboring government after another heaped upon Switzerland, and which would make the blood of every Swiss boil if Swiss nationality had any foundation and Swiss independence any existence other than in boast or fame.

Never has such treatment been offered to any people as the Swiss have been made to submit to by France, Austria, Prussia, and the minor German States. Never were demands half as humiliating made upon any country, without being resented by a struggle for life or death. The surrounding Governments, by their agents, presumed to exercise the office of Police upon the Swiss territory; they exercised it not only over the refugees, but over the Swiss Police officers also. They laid complaints against subaltern agents, and demanded their dismissal; they even went so far as to hint at the necessity of changes in the Constitutions of several cantons. As for the Swiss Government, to every bolder demand, it gave an humbler reply; and whenever its words breathed a spirit of opposition, its acts were sure to make up for it by increased subserviency. Insult after insult was pocketed, command after command was executed, until Switzerland was brought down to the lowest level of European contempt,—till she was more despised than even her two “neutral” rivals, Belgium and Greece. And now, when the demands of her chief assailant, Austria, have reached that high of impudence which even a statesman of the temper of M. Druey could hardly swallow, without some show of resistance—now, in her most recent, most spirited notes to Vienna, she shows how far she is reduced.

The champions of Italian independence,—men who, far from showing any wicked Socialist or Communist tendencies, would, perhaps, not even go to the length of wishing for Italy the same Constitution as that under which Switzerland lives,—men who have and make no claim to the demagogical celebrity even of Mazzini, are there treated as assassins, incendiaries, brigands, and upsetters of all social order. As to Mazzini, the language is of course far stronger; and yet everybody knows that Mazzini, with all his conspiracies and insurrections, is as much a supporter of social order, as at present constituted, as M. Druey himself. Thus, the result of the whole exchange of notes is, that, in principle, the Swiss give in to the Austrians. How, then, is it to be expected they will not give in in practise?

The fact is this: Any bold and persistent Government can get from the Swiss what it likes. The isolated life which the mass of them lead, deprives them of all sense of their common interest as a nation. That a village, or a valley, or a canton should stick

together is no wonder. But, to stick together as a Nation for a common purpose, be what it may, they never will. In all invasions, as soon as the danger becomes serious, as in 1798, one Swiss has betrayed the other, one canton abandoned the next. The Austrians have expelled 18,000 Tessinese from Lombardy, without any cause. The Swiss make a great outcry about it and collect money for their unfortunate confederates. Now, let Austria hold out, and continue to prohibit the return of these Tessinese, and in a very short time you will see a wonderful change in Swiss opinion. They will get tired of collecting money, they will say that the Tessinese always meddled in Italian politics and deserved no better; in fact they are no true Swiss confederates (*Keine guten Eidgenossen*). Then the expelled Tessinese will settle in the other cantons of Switzerland and “turn the natives out of employment.” For in Switzerland a man is not a Swiss, but a native of such and such a canton. And when that comes to pass then you will see our brave confederates muster up their indignation, then you will see intrigues of all sorts directed against the victims of Austrian despotism, then you will see the Tessinese Swiss as much hated, persecuted, calumniated as the foreign refugees were during their time in Switzerland, and then Austria will obtain everything she wants and a great deal more if she takes the trouble to ask for it.

When the nations of Europe have recovered their faculty of free and normal action they will take into consideration what is to be done with these petty “*neutral*” States, which while subservient to counter-revolution when it is ascendant, are neutral and even hostile to every revolutionary movement and yet pass themselves off as free and independent Nations. But, perhaps, by that time, not a trace will be left of these excrescences of an unsound body.

Written about April 26, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3770, May 17, 1853 and in abridged form in German in *Die Reform*, Nos. 18 and 19, June 1 and 4, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

REVOLUTION IN CHINA AND IN EUROPE

A most profound yet fantastic speculator on the principles which govern the movements of Humanity,^a was wont to extol as one of the ruling secrets of nature, what he called the law of the contact of extremes. The homely proverb that "extremes meet" was, in his view, a grand and potent truth in every sphere of life; an axiom with which the philosopher could as little dispense as the astronomer with the laws of Kepler or the great discovery of Newton.

Whether the "contact of extremes" be such a universal principle or not, a striking illustration of it may be seen in the effect the Chinese revolution⁷⁹ seems likely to exercise upon the civilized world. It may seem a very strange, and a very paradoxical assertion that the next uprising of the people of Europe, and their next movement for republican freedom and economy of government, may depend more probably on what is now passing in the Celestial Empire,—the very opposite of Europe,—than on any other political cause that now exists,—more even than on the menaces of Russia and the consequent likelihood of a general European war. But yet it is no paradox, as all may understand by attentively considering the circumstances of the case.

Whatever be the social causes, and whatever religious, dynastic, or national shape they may assume, that have brought about the chronic rebellions subsisting in China for about ten years past, and now gathered together in one formidable revolution, the occasion of this outbreak has unquestionably been afforded by the English cannon forcing upon China that soporific drug called opium.⁸⁰

^a G.W.F. Hegel.—*Ed.*

Before the British arms the authority of the Manchu dynasty fell to pieces; the superstitious faith in the eternity of the Celestial Empire broke down; the barbarous and hermetic isolation from the civilized world was infringed; and an opening was made for that intercourse which has since proceeded so rapidly under the golden attractions of California and Australia.⁸¹ At the same time the silver coin of the Empire, its lifeblood, began to be drained away to the British East Indies.

Up to 1830, the balance of trade being continually in favor of the Chinese, there existed an uninterrupted importation of silver from India, Britain and the United States into China. Since 1833, and especially since 1840, the export of silver from China to India has become almost exhausting for the Celestial Empire. Hence the strong decrees of the Emperor against the opium trade, responded to by still stronger resistance to his measures. Besides this immediate economical consequence, the bribery connected with opium smuggling has entirely demoralized the Chinese State officers in the Southern provinces. Just as the Emperor was wont to be considered the father of all China, so his officers were looked upon as sustaining the paternal relation to their respective districts. But this patriarchal authority, the only moral link embracing the vast machinery of the State, has gradually been corroded by the corruption of those officers, who have made great gains by conniving at opium smuggling. This has occurred principally in the same Southern provinces where the rebellion commenced. It is almost needless to observe that, in the same measure in which opium has obtained the sovereignty over the Chinese, the Emperor and his staff of pedantic mandarins have become dispossessed of their own sovereignty. It would seem as though history had first to make this whole people drunk before it could rouse them out of their hereditary stupidity.

Though scarcely existing in former times, the import of English cottons, and to a small extent of English woollens, has rapidly risen since 1833, the epoch when the monopoly of trade with China was transferred from the East India Company to private commerce, and on a much greater scale since 1840, the epoch when other nations, and especially our own, also obtained a share in the Chinese trade. This introduction of foreign manufactures has had a similar effect on the native industry to that which it formerly had on Asia Minor, Persia and India. In China the spinners and weavers have suffered greatly under this foreign competition, and the community has become unsettled in proportion.

The tribute to be paid to England after the unfortunate war of 1840, the great unproductive consumption of opium, the drain of the precious metals by this trade, the destructive influence of foreign competition on native manufactures, the demoralized condition of the public administration, produced two things: the old taxation became more burdensome and harassing, and new taxation was added to the old. Thus in a decree of the Emperor,^a dated Peking, Jan. 5, 1853, we find orders given to the viceroys and governors of the southern provinces of Wu-chang and Hang-Yang to remit and defer the payment of taxes, and especially not in any case to exact more than the regular amount; for otherwise, says the decree, "how will the poor people be able to bear it?"

"And thus, perhaps," continues the Emperor, "will my people, in a period of general hardship and distress, be exempted from the evils of being pursued and worried by the tax-gatherer."^b

Such language as this, and such concessions we remember to have heard from Austria, the China of Germany, in 1848.

All these dissolving agencies acting together on the finances, the morals, the industry, and political structure of China, received their full development under the English cannon in 1840, which broke down the authority of the Emperor, and forced the Celestial Empire into contact with the terrestrial world. Complete isolation was the prime condition of the preservation of Old China. That isolation having come to a violent end by the medium of England, dissolution must follow as surely as that of any mummy carefully preserved in a hermetically sealed coffin, whenever it is brought into contact with the open air. Now, England having brought about the revolution of China, the question is how that revolution, will in time react on England, and through England on Europe. This question is not difficult of solution.

The attention of our readers has often been called to the unparalleled growth of British manufactures since 1850. Amid the most surprising prosperity, it has not been difficult to point out the clear symptoms of an approaching industrial crisis. Notwithstanding California and Australia, notwithstanding the immense and unprecedented emigration, there must ever without any particular accident, in due time arrive a moment when the extension of the markets is unable to keep pace with the extension

^a Hsien Fêng.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from the article "China", *The Economist*, No. 505, April 30, 1853.—*Ed.*

of British manufactures, and this disproportion must bring about a new crisis with the same certainty as it has done in the past. But, if one of the great markets suddenly becomes contracted, the arrival of the crisis is necessarily accelerated thereby. Now, the Chinese rebellion must, for the time being, have precisely this effect upon England. The necessity for opening new markets, or for extending the old ones, was one of the principal causes of the reduction of the British tea-duties, as, with an increased importation of tea, an increased exportation of manufactures to China was expected to take place. Now, the value of the annual exports from the United Kingdom to China amounted, before the repeal in 1833 of the trading monopoly possessed by the East India Company, to only £600,000; in 1836, it reached the sum of £1,326,388; in 1845, it had risen to £2,394,827; in 1852, it amounted to about £3,000,000. The quantity of tea imported from China did not exceed, in 1793, 16,167,331 lbs.; but in 1845, it amounted to 50,714,657 lbs.; in 1846, to 57,584,561 lbs.; it is now above 60,000,000 lbs.

The tea crop of the last season will not prove short, as shown already by the export lists from Shanghai, of 2,000,000 lbs. above the preceding year. This excess is to be accounted for by two circumstances. On one hand, the state of the market at the close of 1851 was much depressed, and the large surplus stock left has been thrown into the export of 1852. On the other hand, the recent accounts of the altered British legislation with regard to imports of tea, reaching China, have brought forward all the available teas to a ready market, at greatly enhanced prices. But with respect to the coming crop, the case stands very differently. This is shown by the following extracts from the correspondence of a large tea-firm in London:

“In Shanghai the terror is extreme. Gold has advanced upward of 25 per cent., *being eagerly sought for hoarding*; silver has so far disappeared that *none could be obtained* to pay the China dues on the British vessels requiring port clearance; and in consequence of which Mr. Alcock has consented to become responsible to the Chinese authorities for the payment of these dues, on receipt of East India Company's bills, or other approved securities. *The scarcity of the precious metals* is one of the most unfavorable features, when viewed in reference to the immediate future of commerce, as this abstraction occurs precisely at that period when their use is most needed, to enable the tea and silk buyers to go into the interior and effect their purchases, for which a *large portion of bullion is paid in advance, to enable the producers to carry on their operations...* At this period of the year it is usual to begin making arrangements for the new teas, whereas at present nothing is talked of but the means of protecting person and property, all transactions being at a stand.... If the means are not applied to secure the leaves in April and May, the early crop,

which includes all the finer descriptions, both of black and green teas, will be as much lost as unreaped wheat at Christmas.”^a

Now the means for securing the tea leaves, will certainly not be given by the English, American or French squadrons stationed in the Chinese seas, but these may easily, by their interference, produce such complications, as to cut off all transactions between the tea-producing interior and the tea-exporting sea ports. Thus, for the present crop, a rise in the prices must be expected—speculation has already commenced in London—and for the crop to come a large deficit is as good as certain. Nor is this all. The Chinese, ready though they may be, as are all people in periods of revolutionary convulsion, to sell off to the foreigner all the bulky commodities they have on hand, will, as the Orientals are used to do in the apprehension of great changes, set to hoarding, not taking much in return for their tea and silk, except hard money. England has accordingly to expect a rise in the price of one of her chief articles of consumption, a drain of bullion, and a great contraction of an important market for her cotton and woolen goods. Even *The Economist*, that optimist conjuror of all things menacing the tranquil minds of the mercantile community, is compelled to use language like this:

“We must not flatter ourselves with finding as extensive a market for our exports to China as hitherto.... It is more probable that our export trade to China should suffer, and that there should be a diminished demand for the produce of Manchester and Glasgow.”

It must not be forgotten that the rise in the price of so indispensable an article as tea, and the contraction of so important a market as China, will coincide with a deficient harvest in Western Europe, and, therefore, with rising prices of meat, corn, and all other agricultural produce. Hence contracted markets for manufactures, because every rise in the prices of the first necessities of life is counterbalanced, at home and abroad, by a corresponding deduction in the demand for manufactures. From every part of Great Britain complaints have been received on the backward state of most of the crops. *The Economist* says on this subject:

“In the South of England not only will there be left much land unsown, until too late for a crop of any sort, but much of the sown land will prove to be foul, or otherwise in a bad state for corn-growing. On the wet or poor soils destined for

^a Here and below the quotations are from the article “China and the Tea Trade”, *The Economist*, No. 508, May 21, 1853.—*Ed.*

wheat, signs that mischief is going on are apparent. The time for planting mangel-wurzel may now be said to have passed away, and very little has been planted, while the time for preparing land for the turnip is rapidly going by, without any adequate preparation for this important crop having been accomplished.... Oat-sowing has been much interfered with by the snow and rain. Few oats were sown early, and late sown oats seldom produce a large crop.... In many districts losses among the breeding flocks have been considerable."^a

The price of other farm-produce than corn is from 20 to 30, and even 50 per cent. higher than last year. On the Continent, corn has risen comparatively more than in England. Rye has risen in Belgium and Holland full 100 per cent. Wheat and other grains are following suit.

Under these circumstances, as the greater part of the regular commercial circle has already been run through by British trade, it may safely be augured that the Chinese revolution will throw the spark into the overloaded mine of the present industrial system and cause the explosion of the long-prepared general crisis, which, spreading abroad, will be closely followed by political revolutions on the Continent. It would be a curious spectacle, that of China sending disorder into the Western World while the Western powers, by English, French and American war-steamers, are conveying "order" to Shanghai, Nanking, and the mouths of the Great Canal. Do these order-mongering powers, which would attempt to support the wavering Manchu dynasty, forget that the hatred against foreigners and their exclusion from the Empire, once the mere result of China's geographical and ethnographical situation, have become a political system only since the conquest of the country by the race of the Manchu Tartars⁸²? There can be no doubt that the turbulent dissensions among the European nations who, at the later end of the 17th century, rivaled each other in the trade with China, lent a mighty aid to the exclusive policy adopted by the Manchus. But more than this was done by the fear of the new dynasty, lest the foreigners might favor the discontent existing among a large proportion of the Chinese during the first half century or thereabouts of their subjection to the Tartars. From these considerations, foreigners were then prohibited from all communication with the Chinese, except through Canton, a town at a great distance from Peking and the tea-districts, and their commerce restricted to intercourse with the Hong⁸³ merchants, licensed by the Government expressly for the foreign trade, in order to keep the rest of its subjects from all connection

^a "Backwardness of the Season", *The Economist*, No. 507, May 14, 1853.—Ed.

with the odious strangers. In any case an interference on the part of the Western Governments at this time can only serve to render the revolution more violent, and protract the stagnation of trade.

At the same time it is to be observed with regard to India, that the British Government of that country depends for full one seventh of its revenue on the sale of opium to the Chinese, while a considerable proportion of the Indian demand for British manufactures depends on the production of that opium in India. The Chinese, it is true, are no more likely to renounce the use of opium than are the Germans to forswear tobacco. But as the new Emperor is understood to be favorable to the culture of the poppy and the preparation of opium in China itself, it is evident that a death-blow is very likely to be struck at once at the business of opium-raising in India, the Indian revenue, and the commercial resources of Hindostan. Though this blow would not immediately be felt by the interests concerned, it would operate effectually in due time, and would come in to intensify and prolong the universal financial crisis whose horoscope we have cast above.

Since the commencement of the eighteenth century there has been no serious revolution in Europe which had not been preceded by a commercial and financial crisis. This applies no less to the revolution of 1789 than to that of 1848. It is true, not only that we every day behold more threatening symptoms of conflict between the ruling powers and their subjects, between the State and society, between the various classes; but also the conflict of the existing powers among each other gradually reaching that height where the sword must be drawn, and the *ultima ratio* of princes be resorted to. In the European capitals, every day brings dispatches big with universal war, vanishing under the dispatches of the following day, bearing the assurance of peace for a week or so. We may be sure, nevertheless, that to whatever height the conflict between the European powers may rise, however threatening the aspect of the diplomatic horizon may appear, whatever movements may be attempted by some enthusiastic fraction in this or that country, the rage of princes and the fury of the people are alike enervated by the breath of prosperity. Neither wars nor revolutions are likely to put Europe by the ears, unless in consequence of a general commercial and industrial crisis, the signal of which has, as usual, to be given by England, the representative of European industry in the market of the world.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the political consequences such a crisis must produce in these times, with the unprecedented extension of factories in England, with the utter dissolution of her

official parties, with the whole State machinery of France transformed into one immense swindling and stock-jobbing concern, with Austria on the eve of bankruptcy, with wrongs everywhere accumulated to be revenged by the people, with the conflicting interests of the reactionary powers themselves, and with the Russian dream of conquest once more revealed to the world.

Written on May 20-21, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3794, June 14, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 615, June 25, 1853

Karl Marx

AFFAIRS IN HOLLAND.—DENMARK.—
CONVERSION OF THE BRITISH DEBT.—
INDIA, TURKEY AND RUSSIA⁸⁴

London, Tuesday, May 24, 1853

The general elections in Holland, necessitated by the late dissolution of the States-General, are now completed, and the result has been the return of a majority of 12 in favor of the Ultra-Protestant and Royalist ministry.

Denmark is by this time inundated with anti-governmental pamphlets, the most prominent of which are the *Dissolution of Parliament Explained to the Danish People*, by Mr. Grundtvig, and one anonymous entitled *The Disputed Question of the Danish Succession; or What Is to Be Done by the Powers of Europe*. Both these pamphlets aim at proving that the abolition of the ancient law of succession as demanded by the ministry and stipulated in the London protocol,⁸⁵ would turn to the ruin of the country, by converting it, in the first instance, into a province of Holstein, and later into a dependency of Russia.

Thus, it appears, the Danish people have at last become aware of what their blind opposition to the demands for independence raised by the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein in 1848 has brought over them. They insisted upon their country's permanent union with Holstein, for which purpose they made war on the German revolution—they won in that war, and they have retained Holstein. But, in exchange for that conquest, they are now doomed to lose their own country. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in '48 and '49 never ceased to warn the Danish democrats of the ultimate consequences of their hostility to the German revolution.⁸⁶ It distinctly predicted that Denmark, by contributing to disarm revolution abroad, was tying itself forever to a dynasty which, as the legitimate course of succession had obtained its

sanction and validity through their own consent, would surrender their nationality to the "bon plaisir"^a of the Russian czar. The Danish democracy refused to act upon that advice, and are now receiving the same price for their short-sighted folly as the Bohemian Slaves did, who, in order to "preserve their nationality against the Germans," rushed to the destruction on the Viennese revolutionists, their only possible liberators from that German despotism which they hated. Is not this a grave lesson which is now being received by these two peoples, who allowed themselves to be arrayed in self-destructive warfare against the cause of the revolution, by the intrigues of the counter-revolution?

Now that Mr. Gladstone's scheme for the reduction of the public debt has passed through Parliament, and is undergoing its practical test, his apologists—and almost the entire London press seemed highly to approve of that famous scheme—have all of them become mute at once. Mr. Gladstone's three alternatives for voluntarily converting the five hundred millions of 3 per cents., turn out so very innocent, that none of them has as yet met with an acceptance worth mentioning.—As to the conversion of the South Sea⁸⁷ stock, up to the evening of May 19 only £100,000 out of the £10,000,000 had been converted into new stock. It is a general rule that such operations, if not effected in the first weeks, lose every day something of the probability of their being carried out at all. Besides, the rate of interest is just rising in slow but steady progression. It is, therefore, almost an exaggeration to suppose that ten millions of old paper will be converted into new stock within the time fixed for that operation. But even in this case, Mr. Gladstone will have to repay at least eight millions of pounds to those holders of South Sea Funds, who are unwilling to convert them into his new stock. The only fund he has provided for such an eventuality is the public balance at the Bank of England, amounting to about eight or nine millions. As this balance, however, is no excess of income over expenditure, but is only lodged in the Bank, because the public income is paid a few months in advance of the time when it is necessary to expend it, Mr. Gladstone will find himself at a future moment in a very heavy financial embarrassment, which will produce, at the same time, a most serious disturbance in the monetary transactions of the Bank and in the money market in general, the more so as a presumed deficient crop will cause a more or less extensive drain of bullion.

^a Caprice.—*Ed.*

The charter of the East India Company expires in 1854. Lord John Russell has given notice in the House of Commons, that the Government will be enabled to state, through Sir Charles Wood, their views respecting the future Government of India, on the 3d of June. A hint has been thrown out in some ministerial papers, in support of the already credited public rumor, that the Coalition have found the means of reducing even this colossal Indian question to almost Lilliputian dimensions. *The Observer* prepares the mind of the English people to undergo a new disenchantment.

"Much less," we read in that confidential journal of Aberdeen, "than is generally supposed will remain to be done in the new organization for the Government of our Eastern Empire."^a

Much less even than is supposed, will have to be done by my lords Russell and Aberdeen.

The leading features of the proposed change appear to consist in two very small items. Firstly, the Board of Directors will be "refreshed" by some additional members, appointed directly by the Crown, and even this new blood will be infused "sparingly at first." The cure of the old directorial system is thus meant to be applied, so that the portion of blood now infused with "great caution" will have ample time to come to a standstill before another second infusion will be proceeded upon. Secondly, the union of Judge and of Exciseman in one and the same person, will be put an end to, and the Judges shall be educated men. Does it not seem, on hearing such propositions, as if one were transported back into that earliest period of the Middle Ages, when the feudal lords began to be replaced as Judges, by lawyers who were required, at any rate, to have a knowledge of reading and writing?

The "Sir Charles Wood" who, as President of the Board of Control, will bring forward this sensible piece of reform, is the same timber who, under the late Whig Administration, displayed such eminent capacities of mind, that the Coalition were at a dreadful loss what to do with him, till they hit upon the idea of making him over to India. Richard the Third offered a kingdom for a horse^b;—the Coalition offers an ass for a kingdom. Indeed, if the present official idiocy of an Oligarchical Government be the expression of what England *can* do now, the time of England's ruling the world must have passed away.

^a *The Observer*, May 22, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Shakespeare, *King Richard III*, Act V, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

On former occasions we have seen that the Coalition had invariably some fitting reason for postponing every, even the smaller measure. Now, with respect to India their postponing propensities *are* supported by the public opinion of two worlds. The people of England and the people of India simultaneously demand the postponement of all the legislation on Indian affairs, until the voice of the natives shall have been heard, the necessary materials collected, the pending inquiries completed. Petitions have already reached Downing-st., from the three Presidencies,⁸⁸ deprecating precipitate legislation. The Manchester School have formed an "Indian Society,"⁸⁹ which they will put immediately into motion, to get up public meetings in the metropolis and throughout the country, for the purpose of opposing any legislation on the subject for this session. Besides, two Parliamentary Committees are now sitting with a view to report respecting the state of affairs in the Indian Government. But this time the Coalition Ministry is inexorable. It will not wait for the publication of any Committee's advice. It wants to legislate instantly and directly for 150 millions of people, and to legislate for 20 years at once. Sir Charles Wood is anxious to establish his claim as the modern Manu. Whence, of a sudden, this precipitate legislative rush of our "cautious" political valetudinarians?

They want to renew the old Indian Charter for a period of 20 years. They avail themselves of the eternal pretext of Reform. Why? The English oligarchy have a presentiment of the approaching end of their days of glory, and they have a very justifiable desire to conclude such a treaty with English legislation, that even in the case of England's escaping soon from their weak and rapacious hands, they shall still retain for themselves and their associates the privilege of plundering India for the space of 20 years.

On Saturday last dispatches were received by telegraph from Brussels and Paris, with news from Constantinople to May 13. Immediately after their arrival a Cabinet-Council was held at the Foreign-Office, which sat 3 hours and a half. On the same day orders were sent by Telegraph to the Admiralty at Portsmouth, directing the departure of two steam-frigates, the *London* 90, and *Sanspareil* 71, from Spithead for the Mediterranean. The *Highflyer* steam-frigate 21, and *Oden* steam-frigate 16, are also under orders for sea.

What were the contents of these dispatches which threw ministers into so sudden an activity, and interrupted the quiet dulness of England?

You know that the question of the Holy Shrines had been settled to the satisfaction of Russia,⁹⁰ and according to the assurances of the Russian Embassy at Paris and London, Russia asked for no other satisfaction than a priority share in those holy places. The objects of Russian diplomacy were merely of such a chivalric character, as were those of Frederick Barbarossa and Richard Cœur de Lion. This, at least, we were told by *The Times*.

"But," says the *Journal des Débats*, "on the 5th of May the Russian steam-frigate *Bessarabia* arrived from Odessa, having on board a Russian Colonel with dispatches for Prince Menchikoff, and on Saturday, 7th inst., the Prince handed to the Ministers of the Porte the draught of a convention or special treaty, in which the new demands and pretensions were set forth. This is the document called the ultimatum, since it was accompanied by a very brief note, fixing Tuesday, 10th May, as the last day on which the refusal or the acceptance of the Divan could be received. The note terminated in nearly the following words: 'If the Sublime Porte should think proper to respond by refusal, the Emperor would be compelled to see in that act the complete want of respect for his person, and for Russia, and would receive intelligence of it with *profound regret*.'"^a

The principal object of this treaty was to secure to the Emperor of Russia the Protectorate of all Greek Christians subject to the Porte. By the treaty of Kutshuk-Kainardji, concluded at the close of the 18th century, a Greek chapel was allowed to be erected at Constantinople, and the privilege was granted to the Russian Embassy of interfering in instances of collision of the priests of that chapel with the Turks. This privilege was confirmed again in the treaty of Adrianople.⁹¹ What Prince Menchikoff now demands, is the conversion of that exceptional privilege into the general Protectorate of the whole Greek Church in Turkey, i.e., of the vast majority of the population of Turkey in Europe. Besides, he asks that the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antiochia, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, as well as the metropolitan archbishops, shall be immovable, unless proved guilty of high-treason (against the Russians), and then only upon the consent of the Czar,—in other words, he demands the resignation of the Sultan's^b sovereignty into the hands of Russia.

This was the news brought by the telegraph on Saturday: firstly, that Prince Menchikoff had granted a further delay until 14th inst., for the answer to his *ultimatum*; that then a change in the Turkish Ministry ensued, Reshid Pasha, the antagonist of

^a Quoted from an editorial by X. Raymond in the *Journal des Débats*, May 23, 1853. The editorial gave the wrong date of handing the note to the Ministers. It was handed on May 5, 1853 (see this volume, p. 110).—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

Russia, being appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Fuad Effendi reinstated in his office; lastly, that the *Russian ultimatum* had been rejected.

It would have been impossible for Russia to make more extensive demands upon Turkey, after a series of signal victories. This is the best proof of the obstinacy with which she clings to her inveterate notion, that every interregnum of the counter-revolution in Europe constitutes a right for her to exact concessions from the Ottoman Empire. And, indeed, since the first French revolution, Continental retrogression has ever been identical with Russian progress in the East. But Russia is mistaken in confounding the present state of Europe with its condition after the congresses of Laybach and Verona, or even after the peace of Tilsit.⁹² Russia herself is more afraid of the revolution that must follow any general war on the Continent, than the Sultan is afraid of the aggression of the Czar.^a If the other powers hold firm, Russia is sure to retire in a very decent manner. Yet, be this as it may, her late maneuvers have, at all events, imparted a mighty impetus to the elements engaged in disorganizing Turkey from within. The only question is this; Does Russia act on her own free impulse, or is she but the unconscious and reluctant slave of the modern *fatum*, Revolution? I believe the latter alternative.

Written on May 24, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3790, June 9, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 839, June 10, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

MAZZINI.—SWITZERLAND AND AUSTRIA.—
THE TURKISH QUESTION⁹³

London, Friday, May 27, 1853

The presence of M. Mazzini in England is now, at last, confirmed by a quasi-official announcement in a London paper connected with him.

The trial of the Messrs. Hale, on account of the "gunpowder-plot,"^a will not be brought before the present assizes, but will take place in August next, the Coalition Government being anxious to let time and oblivion interpose between its "discoveries" and the judicial discussion of their value.

Count Karnicky, the Austrian Chargé d'Affaires at Berne, received orders from his Government, on the 21st inst., to quit his post immediately, and return to Vienna, after notifying the President of the Helvetic Confederation^b of the rupture of diplomatic relations between Austria and Switzerland. The *Bund*, of the 23d, states, however, that the Austrian Envoy had already previously received permission to take a discretionary *congé* when he should think proper. The ultimatum of Count Karnicky is declared by the same journal to be the answer of Austria to the note of the *Bundesrath*,^c of May 4. That the ultimatum contained something beside a mere answer, may be inferred from the fact, that the Bundesrath has just called upon the Fribourg Government to account for their "extreme" measures recently taken against the defeated rebels. The English journals publish the following dispatch from Berne, dated May 23:

"In consequence of the notification made by the Austrian Chargé d'Affaires to the President of the Helvetic Confederation of the rupture of diplomatic relations

^a See this volume, pp. 82-84.—*Ed.*

^b Wilhelm Naeff.—*Ed.*

^c Federal Council.—*Ed.*

between Austria and Switzerland, the Federal Council has decided on putting an immediate end to the functions of the Swiss Envoy at Vienna.”

The substance of this dispatch is, however, refuted by the following article in *La Suisse*, dated May 23:

“We are about in the same situation as Piedmont.⁹⁴ The negotiations between the two countries are interrupted.... The Austrian Legation remains at Berne for the disposal of the ordinary current of business. The *Bund* says that the recall of the Swiss Chargé d’Affaires at Vienna was desirable, since he drily managed there his own affairs on pretext of transacting those of the nation, for he was merely engaged in the silk trade. Mr. Steiger is but a diplomatist of the second-hand order, and we happen to know that he understands a great deal more about silkworms than about his official business. There was, then, no necessity for recalling such a diplomatist, since he had never been commissioned, but was already at Vienna on his own account.”^a

Let nobody imagine, therefore, that the Swiss are recalling to their memory the celebrated motto with which Loustallot adorned, in 1789, his *Révolutions de Paris*:

Les grands ne sont pas grands,
Que parce que nous sommes à genoux.
— Levons nous!^b

The mystery of the Swiss courage is sufficiently explained by the presence of the Duke of Genoa^c at Paris, and that of the King of Belgium^d in Vienna and perhaps no less by an article in the French *Moniteur* of May 25th.

“No other nation must ever interpose between France and Switzerland; all other considerations must subside before this fundamental condition.”

The hopes of the Prussian King^e for the recovery of Neuchâtel, thus obtain no great encouragement. A rumor prevails, even of the formation of a French *corps d’observation* on the frontiers of Switzerland. Louis Napoleon, of course, would be but too glad of having an opportunity to revenge himself on the Emperors of Russia and Austria, and the Kings of Prussia and Belgium, for the contempt and ridicule with which they have loaded him during the latter months.⁹⁵

^a *La Suisse*, No. 120, May 24, 1853.— *Ed.*

^b The great are only great
Because we are kneeling.
Let us rise!— *Ed.*

^c Ferdinando Alberto Amedeo.— *Ed.*

^d Leopold I.— *Ed.*

^e Frederick William IV.— *Ed.*

The intelligence I transmitted to you in my last,^a of the rejection of the Russian ultimatum and of the formation of an anti-Russian Ministry at Constantinople has since been fully confirmed. The most recent dispatches are from Constantinople, of May 17.

“On assuming office, Reshid Pasha requested from Prince Menchikoff a delay of six days. Menchikoff refused, declaring diplomatic relations broken off, and adding that he would remain at Constantinople three days more, to make the necessary preparations for his departure, and he exhorted the Porte to reflection and to profit by the short time he should be detained.”

Under date of Constantinople, May 19, we further learn:

“On the 17th, a meeting of the Divan was held, at the issue of which it was definitively resolved that the convention, as proposed by Prince Menchikoff, could not be accepted. Nevertheless, on this being notified to Prince Menchikoff, he did not quit Constantinople. On the contrary, he has opened new communications with Reshid Pasha. The day of the departure of the Russian Embassy is *no longer fixed*.”

Contradictorily to the latter dispatch, the French Government evening organ, *La Patrie*, positively announces that the Government has received intelligence that Prince Menchikoff has taken his departure for Odessa, and that the occurrence had occasioned but little sensation at Constantinople. The *Pays* agrees with this statement, but is contradicted by the *Presse*.^b Girardin adds, however, that if the news was correct, it might easily be accounted for.

“If Prince Menchikoff really departed from Bujukdere⁹⁶ for Odessa, the fact is that, having failed in his mission (*manqué son effet*), no alternative was left to him but to withdraw, from station to station.”

Some papers assert that the fleet of Admiral Delassus has passed the Dardanelles, and is now at anchor in the Golden Horn, but this assertion is contradicted by *The Morning Post*. The *Triester Zeitung* assures its readers that, before giving an answer to Prince Menchikoff, the Porte had asked Lord Redcliffe and M. De la Cour whether it could eventually count upon their support. To this *The Times* gives its solemn contradiction.

I now give you a literal translation from the Paris *Siècle*, containing some curious details with respect to the negotiations from May 5 to 12th at Constantinople—an exposure of the ridiculous behaviour of Prince Menchikoff, who, in the whole of this transaction, has combined in a most disgusting style, Northern

^a See this volume, pp. 105-06.—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to Charles Schiller's report published in *La Patrie*, No. 146, May 26, 1853 and confirmed by the article of J. Augier in *Le Pays*, No. 146, May 26, 1853, and by E. de Girardin's article in *La Presse*, May 27, 1853, quoted below.—*Ed.*

barbarity with Byzantine duplicity, and has succeeded in making Russia the laughing-stock of Europe. This "Grec du Bas-Empire"^a presumed to conquer the sovereignty over a whole empire by mere theatrical performances. For Russia there remains no step from the sublime to the ridicule—a ridicule which can only be wiped out by blood. But these days of stockjobbing moneyocracy are not the days of chivalrous tournaments. The article in the *Siècle*^b runs thus:—

"On Thursday, the 5th of May, the day of departure of the French steam-packet, the Sublime Porte communicated copies of the firman resolving the question of the Holy Places to M. De la Cour and Prince Menchikoff. The day passed away without any declamation, without any *démarche* on the part of Prince Menchikoff, and all the ambassadors, thinking that question to be settled, profited by the departure of the French steamer, for the announcement of the happy turn of affairs to their respective governments. Prince Menchikoff, however, who had just accepted the firman respecting the Holy Places, dispatched, as soon as midnight had arrived, a common *cavas*, i.e. a gens'-d'arme, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs,^c with an ultimatum in which he demanded a *sened* (treaty) containing the solution of the Holy Shrines' question and the future guaranty of the privileges and immunities of the Greek Church, i.e. the most extensive protectorate of that Church for the benefit of Russia, such as would establish two distinct Emperors in Turkey—the Sultan for the Mussulmans, and the Czar for the Christians. For answering this ultimatum, the Prince allowed only four days to the Porte, requiring, besides, an immediate acknowledgment of the receipt of his ultimatum by a government officer. The Minister of Foreign Affairs returned him a kind of receipt by his aga, an inferior officer of the gendarmery. The Prince dispatched a steamer for Odessa in the course of the same night. On Friday, 6th, the Sultan,^d having been informed of the presentation of the ultimatum by such an unusual proceeding, called together the Divan, and gave official notice to Lord Redcliffe and M. De la Cour of what had happened. Those two ambassadors immediately concerted measures for a common policy, advising the Porte to reject the ultimatum with the greatest moderation in language and terms. M. De la Cour, besides, is said to have most formally declared that France should oppose every Convention infringing the rights secured to her by the treaty of 1740, respecting the Holy Places. Prince Menchikoff, in the meantime, had retired to Bujukdere (like Achilles to his tent). Mr. Canning, on the 9th, there requested an interview with the Prince with a view of engaging him to a more moderate conduct. Refused. On the 10th the Ministers of War^e and of Foreign Affairs, were at the Grand Vizir's,^f who had invited Prince Menchikoff to join him there for the purpose of attempting to arrive at a reasonable arrangement. Refused. Nevertheless, Prince Menchikoff had intimated to the Porte that he was inclined to grant a further delay of three days. Then, however, the Sultan and his Ministers replied, that their

^a A Byzantine of the Eastern Roman Empire.—*Ed.*

^b Below is quoted H. Lamarche's article "Affaires d'Orient.—Rejet de l'Ultimatum Russe". *Le Siècle*, May 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Rifaat Pasha.—*Ed.*

^d Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^e Mehemed Mutergim Pasha.—*Ed.*

^f Mehemet Ali Pasha.—*Ed.*

resolutions were taken and that time would not modify them. This negative answer of the Porte was sent toward midnight on the 10th, to Bujukdere, where the whole of the Russian Embassy was collected, and where demonstrations for an approaching departure had been made for several days past. The Turkish Ministry, informed of this circumstance, was just about to yield, when the Sultan dismissed it and formed a new Administration."

I conclude my report on Turkish affairs by an excerpt from the *Constitutionnel*, showing the conduct of the Greek clergy during all these transactions.

"The Greek clergy, so deeply interested in this question, had pronounced in favor of the *status quo*, i.e., in favor of the Porte. They are protesting *en masse* against the protectorate threatened to be imposed on them by the Emperor of Russia.^a Generally speaking, the Greeks desire the support of Russia, but only on condition of not being subject to her direct domination. It is repulsive to their minds to think that the Oriental Church, which is the mother of the Russian Church, should ever become subordinate to the latter, a thing which of necessity would happen, if the designs of the Petersburg Cabinet should be accepted."^b

Written on May 27, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3791, June 10, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 840, June 14, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from the editorial by L. Boniface in *Le Constitutionnel*, No. 146, May 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE TURKISH QUESTION.—*THE TIMES*.—
RUSSIAN AGGRANDIZEMENT⁹⁷

London, Tuesday, May 31, 1853

Admiral Corry's fleet has been seen in the Bay of Biscay on the way to Malta, where it is to reinforce the squadron of Admiral Dundas. *The Morning Herald* justly observes:

"Had Admiral Dundas been permitted to join the French squadron at Salamis, several weeks ago, the present state of affairs would be quite different."^a

Should Russia attempt, were it only for the salvation of appearances, to back up the ridiculous demonstrations of Menchikoff by actual maneuvers of war, her first two steps would probably consist in the re-occupation of the Danubian Principalities, and in the invasion of the Armenian province of Kars and the port of Batum, territories which she made every effort to secure by the treaty of Adrianople. The port of Batum being the only safe refuge for ships in the eastern part of the Black Sea, its possession would deprive Turkey of her last naval station in the Pontus and make the latter an exclusively Russian Sea. This port added to the possession of Kars, the richest and best cultivated portion of Armenia, would enable Russia to cut off the commerce of England with Persia by way of Trebizond, and afford a basis of operations against the latter power, as well as against Asia Minor. If, however, England and France hold firm, Nicholas will no more carry out his projects in that quarter, than the Empress Catherine carried out hers against Aga Mahmed, when he commanded his slaves to drive the Russian Ambassador Voinovich

^a *The Morning Herald*, No. 22168, May 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

and his companions with scourges to their ships, away from Astrabad.

In no quarter did the latest news create greater consternation than in Printing-House-square.^a The first attempt made by *The Times* to lift up its head under the terrible blow, was a desperate diatribe against the electric telegraph, that "most extraordinary" instrument. "No correct conclusions could be drawn," it exclaimed, "from that mendacious wire." Having thus laid its own incorrect conclusions to the fault of the electric wire, *The Times*, after the statement of Ministers in Parliament, endeavors now also to get rid of its ancient "correct" premises. It says:

"Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the Ottoman Empire, or rather of that Mohammedan Power which has ruled it for four centuries, there can be no difference of opinion between *all* parties in this country and in Europe, that the gradual progress of the indigenous Christian population toward civilization and independent government is the interest of the world, and that these races of men ought never to be suffered to fall under the yoke of Russia, and to swell her gigantic dominions. On that point we confidently hope, that the resistance offered to these pretensions of Russia would be not only that of Turkey, but of all Europe; and this spirit of annexation and aggrandizement needs but to display itself in its true shape to excite universal antipathy and an insurmountable opposition, in which the Greek and Slavonian subjects of Turkey are themselves prepared to take a great part."^b

How did it happen, that the poor *Times* believed in the "good faith" of Russia toward Turkey, and her "antipathy" against all aggrandizement? The good will of Russia toward Turkey! Peter I proposed to raise himself on the ruins of Turkey. Catherine persuaded Austria, and called upon France to participate in the proposed dismemberment of Turkey, and the establishment of a Greek Empire at Constantinople, under her grandson,^c who had been educated and even named with a view to this result. Nicholas, more moderate, only demands the *exclusive Protectorate* of Turkey. Mankind will not forget that Russia was the *protector* of Poland, the *protector* of the Crimea, the *protector* of Courland, the *protector* of Georgia, Mingrelia, the Circassian and Caucasian tribes. And now Russia, the protector of Turkey! As to Russia's antipathy against aggrandizement, I allege the following facts from a mass of the acquisitions of Russia since Peter the Great.

^a The square in London where *The Times* had its main offices.—*Ed.*

^b *The Times*, No. 21440, May 28, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Constantine.—*Ed.*

The Russian frontier has advanced.

Toward Berlin, Dresden and Vienna about	700 miles
Toward Constantinople	500 "
Toward Stockholm	630 "
Toward Teheran	1,000 "

Russia's acquisitions from Sweden are greater than what remains of that Kingdom; from Poland nearly equal to the Austrian Empire; from Turkey in Europe, greater than Prussia (exclusive of the Rhenish Provinces); from Turkey in Asia, as large as the whole dominion of Germany proper; from Persia equal to England; from Tartary to an extent as large as European Turkey, Greece, Italy and Spain, taken together. The total acquisitions of Russia during the last 60 years are equal in extent and importance to the whole Empire she had in Europe before that time.

Written on May 31, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3794, June 14, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

THE RUSSIAN HUMBUG.—GLADSTONE'S FAILURE.—
SIR CHARLES WOOD'S EAST INDIAN REFORMS⁹⁸

London, Tuesday, June 7,^a 1853

According to a dispatch from Berne, the *Bundesrath*^b has cancelled the judgment pronounced by the Court Martial at Fribourg against the late insurrectionists, ordering them to be brought before the Ordinary Courts, *unless* they should be pardoned by the Cantonal Council. Here, then, we have the first of the heroic deeds accompanying the "rupture between Switzerland and Austria," the infallible result of which I traced in a former letter on the European "Model Republic."^c

In transmitting to you the news of the Prussian Government having ordered several Artillery officers on furlough abroad to return immediately to their duties, I stated, by mistake, that those officers were engaged in instructing the Russian army, while I intended to have said the Turkish artillery, in field-practice.⁹⁹

All the Russian Generals, and other Russians residing at Paris have received orders to return to Russia without delay. The language adopted by M. de Kisseleff, the Russian Envoy at Paris, is rather menacing, and letters from Petersburg are ostentatiously shown by him, in which the Turkish question is treated *assez cavalièrement*.^d A rumor has issued from the same quarter, reporting that Russia demands from Persia the cession of the territory of Astrabad, at the south-eastern extremity of the Caspian Sea. Russian merchants, at the same time, dispatch, or are *reported* to have dispatched, orders to their London agents, "*not* to press any sales of grain at the present juncture, as prices were expected to rise in the imminent eventuality of a war." Lastly, confidential hints are being communicated to every newspaper, that the Rus-

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* erroneously has "Saturday, May 7".—*Ed.*

^b Federal Council.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 107-08.—*Ed.*

^d Too freely.—*Ed.*

sian troops are marching to the frontiers—that the inhabitants of Jassy are preparing for their reception—that the Russian Consul at Galatz^a has bought up an immense number of trees for the throwing of several bridges across the Danube, and other *canards*, the breeding of which has been so successfully carried on by the *Augsburg Gazette*^b and other Austro-Russian journals.

These, and a lot of similar reports, communications, etc., are nothing but so many ridiculous attempts on the part of the Russian agents to strike a wholesome terror into the western world, and to push it to the continuance of that policy of extension, under the cover of which Russia hopes, as heretofore, to carry out her projects upon the East. How systematically this game of mystification is being played, may be seen from the following:

Last week, several French papers notoriously in the pay of Russia, made the discovery, that the

“real question was less between Russia and Turkey than between Petersburg and Moscow—*i.e.* between the Czar and the Old-Russian party; and that for the autocrat, there would be less danger in war, than in the vengeance of that conquest-urging party, which has so often shown how it deals with monarchs that displease it.”^c

Prince Menchikoff, of course, is the “head of this party.” *The Times* and most of the English papers did not fail to reproduce this absurd statement, the one in consciousness of its meaning; the others, perhaps, its unconscious dupes. Now, what conclusion was the public intended to draw from this novel revelation? That Nicholas, in retreating under ridicule, and abandoning his warlike attitude against Turkey, has won a victory over his own warlike Old-Russians, or that Nicholas, in actually going to war, only does so from the necessity of yielding to that (fabulous) party. At all events, “there would only be a victory of Moscow over Petersburg, or of Petersburg over Moscow;” and, consequently, *none of Europe over Russia*.

Respecting this famous Old-Russian party, I happen to know from several well-informed Russians, aristocrats themselves, with whom I have had much intercourse at Paris, that it has long been entirely extinct, and is only occasionally called back into apparent existence, when the Czar stands in need of some bugbear to frighten the West of Europe into passive endurance of his arrogant claims. Hence the resurrection of a Menchikoff, and his appropriate outfit in the

^a M. Cola.—*Ed.*

^b *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted, with slight changes, from *The Times*, No. 21446, June 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

fabulous Old-Russian style. There is but one party among the Russian nobles actually feared by the Czar—the party whose aim is the establishment of an aristocratico-constitutional system, after the pattern of England.

Besides these different spectres conjured up by Russian diplomacy, for the misguidance of England and France, another attempt to bring about the same result has just been made, by the publication of a work entitled, *L'Empire Russe depuis le Congrès de Vienne*, by Viscount de Beaumont-Vassy. It will be sufficient to extract one sentence only, for the purpose of characterising this *opusculum*:

"It is well known that a deposit of coin and ingots exists in the cellar of the fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul. This *hidden treasure* was officially estimated, on the 1st of January, 1850, at 99,763,361 silver rubles."^a

Has any one ever presumed to speak of the *hidden treasure* in the Bank of England? The "hidden treasure" of Russia is simply the metal reserve balancing a three times larger circulation of *convertible* notes, not to speak of the *hidden* amount of inconvertible paper issued by the Imperial Treasury. But, perhaps, this treasure may yet be called a "hidden" one, inasmuch as nobody has ever seen it, except the few Petersburg merchants selected by the Czar's Government for the annual inspection of the bags which hide it.

The chief demonstration of Russia in this direction is, however, an article published in the *Journal des Débats*, and signed by M. de St.-Marc Girardin, that old Orleanist sage. I extract:

"Europe has two great perils, according to us: *Russia*, which menaces her independence; and the *Revolution*, which menaces her *social order*. Now, she cannot be saved from one of these perils except by exposing herself entirely to the other. [...] Does Europe believe that the knot of her independence, and especially of the independence of the Continent, is at Constantinople, and that it is there that the question must be boldly decided; then, that is war against Russia. In that war France and England would struggle to establish the independence of Europe. What would Germany do? We know not. But what we know is, *that in the present state of Europe, war would be the social revolution.*"

As a matter of course, M. de St.-Marc Girardin concludes in favor of peace on any condition against the social revolution, forgetting, however, that the Emperor of Russia has, at least, as much "horreur" of the revolution as he himself and his proprietor, M. Bertin.

Notwithstanding all these soporifics, administered by Russian diplomacy to the Press and people of England, "that old and

^a A quotation from Viscount de Beaumont-Vassy's book as cited by *The Times*, No. 21446, June 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

obstinate" Aberdeen has been compelled to order Admiral Dundas to join the French fleet on the coast of Turkey, and even *The Times*, which, during the last few months, knew only how to write Russian, seems to have received a more English inspiration. It talks now very big.

The Danish (once Schleswig-Holstein) question is beginning to create considerable interest in England, since the English Press, too, has at length discovered that it involves the same principle of Russian extension, as supplies the foundation of the Eastern complication. Mr. Urquhart, M.P., the well-known admirer of Turkey and Eastern Institutions, has published a pamphlet on the Danish Succession,^a of which an account will be given in a future letter.¹⁰⁰ The chief argument put forward in this publication is that the Sound is intended by Russia to perform the same functions for her in the North as the Dardanelles in the South, viz., the securing her maritime supremacy over the Baltic, in the same manner as the occupation of the Dardanelles would do with regard to the Euxine.

Some time since I gave you my opinion that the rate of interest would rise in England, and that such an occurrence would have an unfavorable effect on Mr. Gladstone's financial projects.^b Now, the minimum rate of discount has in the past week been actually raised by the Bank of England from 3 per cent. to 3½ per cent., and the failure I predicted for Mr. Gladstone's scheme of conversion has become already a fact, as you may see from the following statement:

BANK OF ENGLAND, Thursday, June 2, 1853		
Amount of new stock accepted until this day:		
3½ per cent	£ 138,082	0/ 3
2½ per cent	1,537,100	10/10
Exchange Bonds	4,200	0/ 0

Total	£ 1,679,382	11/1
SOUTH SEA HOUSE, ¹⁰¹ Thursday, June 2, 1853		
Amount of convertible annuities till this day:		
For 3½ per cent annuities	£ 17,504	12/8
For 2½ per cent annuities	986,528	5/7
Exchequer Bonds	5,270	18/4

Total	£ 1,009,303	16/7

^a The reference is to the section, "The Danish Succession", in David Urquhart's pamphlet, *Progress of Russia in the West, North and South*.—Ed.

^b See this volume, p. 102.—Ed.

Thus, of the whole amount of South Sea annuities offered for conversion, only one-eighth has been taken, and of the twenty millions new stock created by Mr. Gladstone, only one-twelfth has been accepted. Mr. Gladstone will, therefore, be obliged to contract for a loan at a time when the rate of interest has increased and will most likely continue to increase, which loan must amount to £8,157,811. Failure! The saving of £100,000 anticipated from this conversion, and already placed to the credit of the Budget, has, accordingly, to be dispensed with. Respecting the great bulk of the Public Debt, viz.: the £500,000,000 of 3 per cents., Mr. Gladstone has obtained, as the only result of his financial experiment, that another year will have elapsed on the 10th of Oct., 1853, during which he has been unable to give notice of any conversion. The greatest mischief, however, is this, that £3,116,000 must be paid in money in a few days to holders of Exchequer Bills, who refuse to renew them on the terms offered by Mr. Gladstone. Such is the financial success of the Government of "all the talents."

Lord John Russell, in the debate on the Ecclesiastical Revenues of Ireland (House of Commons, 31st ult.), expressed himself as follows:

"It has been evident, of late years, that the Roman Catholic Clergy—looking to its proceedings in this country—looking to that church acting under the direction of its head,^a who himself a foreign sovereign, has aimed at political power [hear! hear!], which appears to me to be at variance with the due attachment to the Crown of this country [hear! hear!]^b—with the due attachment to the general cause of liberty—with the due attachment to the duties a subject of the State should perform toward it—now, as I wish to speak with as much frankness as the honorable gentleman who spoke last,^b let me not be misunderstood in this House. I am far from denying that there are many members of this House, and many members of the Roman Catholic persuasion, both in *this country* and in Ireland, who are attached to the Throne, and to the liberties of *this country*; but what I am saying, and that of which I am convinced, is, that if the Roman Catholic clergy had increased power given to them, and if they, as ecclesiastics, were to exercise greater control and greater political influence they do now, that power would not be exercised in accordance with the *general freedom* that prevails in *this country*—[Hurrah!]^b—and that neither in respect of political power, nor upon other subjects, would they favor that *general freedom* of discussion and that activity and energy of the human mind, that belongs to the spirit of the constitution of *this country*. [Flourish of trumpets!] I do not think that, in that respect, they are upon a par with the Presbyterians of Scotland [bagpipes!], the Wesleyans of *this country*,¹⁰² and the Established Church of *this country*. [General rapture.] ... I am obliged, then, to conclude, most unwillingly to conclude, but most decidedly, that the endowment of

^a Pope Pius IX.—*Ed.*

^b F. Lucas.—*Ed.*

the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland, in the place of the endowment of the Protestant Church in *that country*, in connection with the State, is not an object which the Parliament of *this country* ought to adopt or to sanction."^a

Two days after this speech of Lord John, in which he attempted for the six-thousandth time, to make a show of his love of "general freedom," by his zealous genuflexions before particular sects of Protestant bigotry, Messrs. Sadleir, Keogh, and Monsell gave in their resignations to the Coalition Ministry, in a letter addressed by Mr. Monsell to My Lord Aberdeen. My Lord Aberdeen in his answer dated 3d June, assures these gentlemen that

"The reasons given by Lord John Russell and the sentiments of which you complain, are not shared by me, nor by many of my colleagues.... Lord John Russell desires me to say, that he did not impute want of loyalty to the Roman Catholics."^b

Messrs. Sadleir, Keogh and Monsell accordingly withdrew their resignations, and the arrangements for a general reconciliation passed off last night in Parliament, "to the greatest satisfaction of Lord John Russell."

The last India Bill of 1783 proved fatal to the Coalition Cabinet of Mr. Fox and Lord North. The new India Bill of 1853 is likely to prove fatal for the Coalition Cabinet of Mr. Gladstone and Lord John Russell. But if the former were thrown overboard, because of their attempt to abolish the Courts of Directors and of Proprietors, the latter are threatened with a similar fate for the opposite reason. On June 3, Sir Charles Wood moved for leave to bring in a bill to provide for the Government of India. Sir Charles commenced by excusing the anomalous length of the speech he was about to deliver, by the "magnitude of the subject," and "the 150,000,000 of souls he had to deal with."^c For every 30,000,000 of his fellow-subjects, Sir Charles could do no less than sacrifice one hour's breath. But why this precipitate legislation on that "great subject," while you postpone it "for even the most trifling matters?" Because the Charter of the East India Company expires on the 30th April, 1854. But why not pass a temporary

^a John Russell's speech is quoted, with slight changes, from the report in *The Times*, No. 21443, June 1, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See *The Times*, No. 21447, June 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Here and below Charles Wood's speech is quoted from the report in *The Times*, No. 21446, June 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

continuance bill, reserving to future discussion more permanent legislation? Because it cannot be expected that we shall ever find again "such an opportunity of dealing quietly with this vast and important question"—i.e., of burking it in a Parliamentary way. Besides, we are fully informed on the matter, the Directors of the East India Company express the opinion that it is necessary to legislate in the course of the present session, and the Governor-General of India, Lord Dalhousie, summons the Government by an express letter by all means to conclude our legislation at once. But the most striking argument wherewith Sir Charles justifies his immediate legislation, is that, prepared as he may appear to speak of a world of questions, "not comprised in the bill he proposed to bring in," the

"measure which he has to submit is, so far as legislation goes, *comprised in a very small compass.*"

After this introduction Sir Charles delivered himself of an apology for the administration of India for the last twenty years. "We must look at India with somewhat of an Indian eye"—which Indian eye seems to have the particular gift of seeing everything bright on the part of England and everything black on the side of India.

"In India you have a race of people slow of change, bound up by religious prejudices and antiquated customs. There are [...], in fact, [...] all obstacles to rapid progress."

(Perhaps there is a Whig Coalition party in India.)

"The points," said Sir Charles Wood, "upon which the greatest stress has been laid, and which are the heads of the complaints contained in the petitions presented to the Committee, relate to the administration of justice, the want of public works, and the tenure of land."

With regard to the Public Works, the Government *intends* to undertake some of "the greatest magnitude and importance." With regard to the tenure of lands, Sir Charles proves very successfully that its three existing forms—the *Zemindari*, the *Ryotwari*, and the *Village* systems—are only so many forms of fiscal *exploitation* in the hands of the Company,^a none of which could well be made general, nor deserved to be made so. An idea of establishing another form, of an altogether opposite character, does not in the least preoccupy the mind of Sir Charles.

^a See this volume, pp. 213-16.—*Ed*

“With regard to the *administration of justice*,” continues he, “the complaints relate principally to the inconvenience arising from the technicalities of English law, to the alleged incompetency of English judges, and to the corruption of the native officers and judges.”

And now, in order to prove the hard labor of providing for the administration of justice in India, Sir Charles relates that already, as early as 1833, a Law Commission was appointed in India. But in what manner did this Commission act, according to Sir Charles Wood’s own testimony? The first and last result of the labors of that Commission was a *penal code*, prepared under the auspices of Mr. Macaulay. This code was sent to the various local authorities in India, which sent it back to Calcutta, from which it was sent to England, to be again returned from England to India. In India, Mr. Macaulay having been replaced as legislative counsel by Mr. Bethune, the code was totally altered, and on this plea the Governor-General, not being then of opinion “that delay is a source of weakness and danger,” sent it back to England, and from England it was returned to the Governor-General, with authority to pass the code in whatever shape he thought best. But now, Mr. Bethune having died, the Governor-General thought best to submit the code to a third English lawyer,^a and to a lawyer who knew nothing about the habits and customs of the Hindoos, reserving himself the right of afterward rejecting a code concocted by wholly incompetent authority. Such have been the adventures of that yet unborn code. As to the technical absurdities of the law in India, Sir Charles takes his stand on the no less absurd technicalities of the English law-procedure itself; but while affirming the perfect incorruptibility of the English judges in India, he nevertheless is ready to sacrifice them by an alteration in the manner of nominating them. The general progress of India is demonstrated by a comparison of the present state of Delhi with that under the invasion of Khuli-Khan. The salt-tax is justified by the arguments of the most renowned political economists, all of whom have advised taxation to be laid on some article of first necessity. But Sir Charles does not add what those same economists would have said, on finding that in the two years from 1849-’50, and 1851-’52, there had been a decrease in the consumption of salt, of 60,000 tuns, a loss of revenue to the amount of £415,000, the total salt revenue amounting to £2,000,000. The measures proposed by Sir Charles, and “comprised in a very small compass,” are:

^a B. Peacock.— *Ed.*

1. The Court of Directors, to consist of eighteen instead of twenty-four members, twelve to be elected by the Proprietors, and six by the Crown.

2. The revenue of Directors to be raised from £300 to £500 a year, the Chairman to receive £1,000.

3. All the ordinary appointments in the civil service, and all the scientific in the military service of India, to be thrown open to public competition, leaving to the Directors the nomination to the Cadetships in the Cavalry-of-the-Line.

4. The Governor-Generalship to be separated from the Governorship of Bengal, and power to be given to the Supreme Government to constitute a new Presidency in the districts on the Indus.

5. And lastly, the whole of this measure only to continue until the Parliament shall provide otherwise.

The speech and measure of Sir Charles Wood was subjected to a very strong and satirical criticism by Mr. Bright, whose picture of India ruined by the fiscal exertions of the Company and Government did not, of course, receive the supplement of India ruined by Manchester and Free Trade. As to last night's speech of an old East-Indiaman, Sir J. Hogg, Director or ex-Director of the Company, I really suspect that I have met with it already in 1701, 1730, 1743, 1769, 1772, 1781, 1783, 1784, 1793, 1813, etc., and am induced, by way of answer to his directorial panegyric, to quote merely a few facts from the annual Indian accounts published, I believe, under his own superintendence.

Total Net-Revenues of India

1849-'50	£ 20,275,831	} Loss of Revenue within three years, £348,792
1850-'51	20,249,932	
1851-'52	19,927,039	

Total Charges

1849-'50	£ 16,687,382	} Increase of expenditure within three years, £1,214,284
1850-'51	17,170,707	
1851-'52	17,901,666	

Land-Tax

Bengal oscillated in last four years from	£ 3,500,000	to	£ 3,560,000
North West oscillated in last four years from	4,870,000		4,900,000
Madras oscillated in last four years from	3,640,000		3,470,000
Bombay oscillated in last four years from	2,240,000		2,300,000

	Gross Revenue in 1851-52	Expenditure on Public Works in 1851-52
Bengal	£ 10,000,000	£ 87,800
Madras	5,000,000	20,000
Bombay	<u>4,800,000</u>	<u>58,500</u>
Out of	£ 19,800,000	not £166,300

have been expended on roads, canals, bridges and other works of public necessity.

Written on June 7, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3801, June 22, 1853; reprinted without the section "The Russian Humbug" in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 615, June 25, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Karl Marx

THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA¹⁰³

London, Friday, June 10, 1853

Telegraphic dispatches from Vienna announce that the pacific solution of the Turkish, Sardinian and Swiss questions, is regarded there as a certainty.

Last night the debate on India was continued in the House of Commons, in the usual dull manner. Mr. Blackett charged the statements of Sir Charles Wood and Sir J. Hogg with bearing the stamp of optimist falsehood. A lot of Ministerial and Directorial advocates rebuked the charge as well as they could, and the inevitable Mr. Hume summed up by calling on Ministers to withdraw their bill. Debate adjourned.

Hindustan is an Italy of Asiatic dimensions, the Himalayas for the Alps, the Plains of Bengal for the Plains of Lombardy, the Deccan for the Apennines, and the Isle of Ceylon for the Island of Sicily. The same rich variety in the products of the soil, and the same dismemberment in the political configuration. Just as Italy has, from time to time, been compressed by the conqueror's sword into different national masses, so do we find Hindostan, when not under the pressure of the Mohammedan, or the Mogul,¹⁰⁴ or the Briton, dissolved into as many independent and conflicting States as it numbered towns, or even villages. Yet, in a social point of view, Hindostan is not the Italy, but the Ireland of the East. And this strange combination of Italy and of Ireland, of a world of voluptuousness and of a world of woes, is anticipated in the ancient traditions of the religion of Hindostan. That religion is at once a religion of sensualist exuberance, and a religion of

self-torturing asceticism; a religion of the Lingam and of the Juggernaut; the religion of the Monk, and of the Bayadere.¹⁰⁵

I share not the opinion of those who believe in a golden age of Hindostan, without recurring, however, like Sir Charles Wood, for the confirmation of my view, to the authority of Khuli-Khan.^a But take, for example, the times of Aurangzeb; or the epoch, when the Mogul appeared in the North, and the Portuguese in the South; or the age of Mohammedan invasion, and of the Heph-tarchy in Southern India¹⁰⁶; or, if you will, go still more back to antiquity, take the mythological chronology of the Brahman himself, who places the commencement of Indian misery in an epoch even more remote than the Christian creation of the world.

There cannot, however, remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindostan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all Hindostan had to suffer before. I do not allude to European despotism, planted upon Asiatic despotism, by the British East India Company, forming a more monstrous combination than any of the divine monsters startling us in the Temple of Salsette.¹⁰⁷ This is no distinctive feature of British Colonial rule, but only an imitation of the Dutch, and so much so that in order to characterise the working of the British East India Company, it is sufficient to literally repeat what Sir Stamford Raffles, the *English* Governor of Java, said of the old Dutch East India Company:

“The Dutch Company, actuated solely by the spirit of gain, and viewing their [Javan] subjects, with less regard or consideration than a West India planter formerly viewed a gang upon his estate, because the latter had paid the purchase money of human property, which the other had not, employed all the existing machinery of despotism to squeeze from the people their utmost mite of contribution, the last dregs of their labor, and thus aggravated the evils of a capricious and semi-barbarous Government, by working it with all the practised ingenuity of politicians, and all the monopolizing selfishness of traders.”^b

All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid, and destructive as the successive action in Hindostan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the entire framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstitution yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of the Hindoo, and separates

^a See this volume, p. 122.—*Ed.*

^b Th. S. Raffles, *The History of Java*, Vol. 1, p. 151.—*Ed.*

Hindustan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history.

There have been in Asia, generally, from immemorial times, but three departments of Government; that of Finance, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and, finally, the department of Public Works. Climate and territorial conditions, especially the vast tracts of desert, extending from the Sahara, through Arabia, Persia, India, and Tartary, to the most elevated Asiatic highlands, constituted artificial irrigation by canals and water-works the basis of Oriental agriculture. As in Egypt and Persia, &c.; advantage is taken of a high level for feeding irrigative canals. This prime necessity of an economical and common use of water, which, in the Occident, drove private enterprise to voluntary association, as in Flanders and Italy, necessitated, in the Orient where civilization was too low and the territorial extent too vast to call into life voluntary association, the interference of the centralizing power of Government. Hence an economical function devolved upon all Asiatic Governments, the function of providing public works. This artificial fertilization of the soil, dependent on a Central Government, and immediately decaying with the neglect of irrigation and drainage, explains the otherwise strange fact that we now find whole territories barren and desert that were once brilliantly cultivated, as Palmyra, Petra, the ruins in Yemen, and large provinces of Egypt, Persia, and Hindostan; it also explains how a single war of devastation has been able to depopulate a country for centuries, and to strip it of all its civilization.

Now, the British in East India accepted from their predecessors the department of finance and of war, but they have neglected entirely that of public works. Hence the deterioration of an agriculture which is not capable of being conducted on the British principle of free competition, of *laissez-faire* and *laissez-aller*.^a But in Asiatic empires we are quite accustomed to see agriculture deteriorating under one government and reviving again under some other government. There the harvests correspond to good or bad government, as they change in Europe with good or bad seasons. Thus the oppression and neglect of agriculture, bad as it is, could not be looked upon as the final blow dealt to Indian

^a *Laissez-faire, laissez-aller* was the formula of the advocates of free trade and non-intervention of the state in economic relations.—*Ed.*

society by the British intruder, had it not been attended by a circumstance of quite different importance, a novelty in the annals of the whole Asiatic world. However changing the political aspect of India's past must appear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the 19th century. The hand-loom and the spinning-wheel, producing their regular myriads of spinners and weavers, were the pivots of the structure of that society. From immemorial times, Europe received the admirable textures of Indian labor, sending in return for them her precious metals, and furnishing thereby his material to the goldsmith, that indispensable member of Indian society, whose love of finery is so great that even the lowest class, those who go about nearly naked, have commonly a pair of golden ear-rings and a gold ornament of some kind hung round their necks. Rings on the fingers and toes have also been common. Women as well as children frequently wore massive bracelets and anklets of gold or silver, and statuettes of divinities in gold and silver were met with in the households. It was the British intruder who broke up the Indian hand-loom and destroyed the spinning-wheel. England began with driving the Indian cottons from the European market; it then introduced twist into Hindostan, and in the end inundated the very mother country of cotton with cottons. From 1818 to 1836 the export of twist from Great Britain to India rose in the proportion of 1 to 5,200. In 1824 the export of British muslins to India hardly amounted to 1,000,000 yards, while in 1837 it surpassed 64,000,000 of yards. But at the same time the population of Dacca decreased from 150,000 inhabitants to 20,000. This decline of Indian towns celebrated for their fabrics was by no means the worst consequence. British steam and science uprooted, over the whole surface of Hindostan, the union between agriculture and manufacturing industry.

These two circumstances—the Hindoo, on the one hand, leaving, like all Oriental peoples, to the Central Government the care of the great public works, the prime condition of his agriculture and commerce, dispersed, on the other hand, over the surface of the country, and agglomerated in small centers by the domestic union of agricultural and manufacturing pursuits—these two circumstances had brought about, since the remotest times, a social system of particular features—the so-called *village system*, which gave to each of these small unions their independent organization and distinct life. The peculiar character of this system may be judged from the following description, contained in an old official report of the British House of Commons on Indian affairs:

French Princess married King Leopold. It seems that Napoleon is eager to pick a quarrel with King Leopold, who has thrown himself under the protection of Russia and Austria, instead of being peace at Paris, as the Kings of Holland and Sardinia, and the Swiss Republic have done. Spain, too, is not looked at favorably by the Emperor; her royal house is too much allied with the Orleans family, not to be disliked by a Bonaparte. A rising, therefore, would not be suppressed by French intervention, and such a rising is not altogether impossible in Spain, where royalty has lost its dignity by the personal behaviour of the Queen-Mother and of the Queen.

The British Rule in India.
Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.
LONDON, Friday, June 16, 1883.
Telegraphic dispatches from Vienna announce that the pacific solution of the Turkish, Sardinian and Swiss questions, is regarded there as a certainty.

Last night the debate on India was continued in the House of Commons, in the usual dull manner. Mr. Blackett charged the statements of Sir Charles Wood and Sir J. Hogg with bearing the stamp of optimistic falsehood. A lot of Ministerial and Directorial advocates rebuked the charge as well as they could, and the inevitable Mr. Hume summed up by calling on Ministers to withdraw their bill. Debate adjourned.

Hindustani is an Italy of Asiatic dimensions, the Himalayas for the Alps, the Plains of Bengal for the Plains of Lombardy, the Deccan for the Apennines, and the Isle of Ceylon for the Island of Sicily. The same rich variety in the products of the soil, and the same dismemberment in the political configuration, just as Italy has, from time to time, been compressed by the conqueror's sword into different national masses, so we find Hindostan, when not under the pressure of the Mohammedan, or the Mogul, or the British, dissolved into as many independent and conflicting States as it numbered towns, or even villages. Yet, in a social point of view, Hindostan is not the Italy, but the Ireland of the East, and the strange combination of Italy and of Ireland, of a world of voluptuousness and of a world of woe, is anticipated in the ancient traditions of the religion of Hindostan. The religion is at once a religion of sensualist exuberance, and a religion of self-torturing asceticism; a religion of the Lingam and of the Juggernaut; the religion of the Monk, and of the Bayader.

I share not the opinion of those who believe in a golden age of Hindostan, without recurring, however, like Sir Charles Wood, for the confirmation of my view, to the authority of Khul-Khan. But take, for example, the times of Auring-Zeb; or the epoch, when the Mogul appeared in the North, and the Portuguese in the South, or the age of Mohammedan invasion, and of the Hierarchy in Southern India; or, if you will, go still more back to antiquity, take the mythological chronology of the Brahman himself, who places the commencement of Indian misery in an epoch even more remote than the Christian era of the world.

There cannot, however, remain any doubt but that the misery inflicted by the British on Hindostan is of an essentially different and infinitely more intensive kind than all Hindostan had to suffer before. I do not allude to European despotism, planted upon Asiatic despotism, by the British East India Company, forming a more monstrous combination than any of the divine monsters starting in the Temple of Salicette. This is a distinctive feature of British Colonial rule, but only an imitation of the Dutch, and so much so that in order to characterise the working of the British East India Company, it is sufficient to literally repeat what Sir Stamford Raffles, the English Governor of Java, said of the old Dutch East India Company:

"The Dutch Company, actuated solely by the spirit of gain, and viewing their subjects, with less regard or consideration than a West India planter formerly viewed a gang upon his estate, because the latter had paid the purchase money of human property, which the other had not, employed all the existing machinery of despotism to squeeze from the people their utmost mite of contribution, the last drops of their labor, and thus aggravated the evils of a capricious and cruel barbaric Government, by investing it with all the practiced ingenuity of politicians, and all the monopolizing selfishness of traders."

All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid, and destructive as the successive invasion in Hindostan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the entire framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstitution yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of the Hindoo, and separates Hindostan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history.

There have been in Asia, generally, from immemorial times, but three departments of Government; that of Plunder, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and, finally, the department of Public Works. Climate and territorial conditions, especially the vast tracts of desert, extending from the

personal influence and private acquaintance with the situation and concerns of the people render him the best qualified for this charge. The *Aravac* keeps the accounts of cultivation, and registers everything connected with it. The *Sailler* and the *Saier*, the duty of the former of which consists in gaining information of crimes and offenses, and in escorting and protecting persons traveling from one village to another; the province of the latter appearing to be more immediately confined to the village consisting, among other duties, in guarding the crops and assisting in rearing them. The *Bowdary man*, who preserves the limits of the village, or gives evidence respecting them in case of dispute. The Superintendent of Tanks and Watercourses distributes the water for the purposes of agriculture. The Brahmin, who performs the village worship. The schoolmaster, who is seen teaching the children in a village to read and write in the sand. The calendar brahmin, or astrologer, &c. These officers and servants generally constitute the establishment of a village; but in some parts of the country it is of less extent, some of the duties and functions above described being united in the same person; in others it exceeds the above-named number of individuals. Under this simple form of municipal government, the inhabitants of the country have lived from time immemorial. The boundaries of the villages have been seldom altered, and though the villages themselves have been sometimes merged, and even dissolved by war, famine or disease, the same name, the same limits, the same interests, and even the same families have continued for ages. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and divisions of kingdoms; while the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred, or to what sovereign it devolves; its internal economy remains unchanged. The *patel* is still the best inhabitant, and still acts as the petty judge or magistrate, and collector or rentor of the village.

These small stereotyped forms of social organization have been to the greater part dissolved, and are disappearing, not so much through the brutal interference of the British tax-gatherer and the British soldier, as to the working of English steam and English free trade. Those family-communities were based on domestic industry, in that peculiar combination of hand-weaving, hand-spinning and hand-stitching, which gave them self-supporting power. English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindoo spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semi-barbaric, semi-civilized communities, by blowing up their economical basis, and thus produced the greatest, and to speak the truth, the only social revolution ever heard of in Asia.

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness these myriads of industrious patriarchal and offensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units thrown into a sea of woe, and their individual members, losing at the same time their ancient form of civilization, and their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these ill-fated village communities, insignificant though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. We must not forget the barbarian egotism which, concentrating on some miserable patch of land, and quietly witnessed the ruin of empires, the perpetration of unnumberable cruelties, the massacre of the population of large towns, with no other consideration bestowed upon them than on natural events, itself the helpless prey of any aggressor who deigned to notice it at all. We must not forget that this undignified, stagnatory, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked from the other part, in contradiction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction and rendered void itself a religious rite in Hindostan. We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjected man to external circumstances instead of elevating man the sovereign of circumstances, that they transformed a self-developing social state into never changing natural destiny, and thus brought about a brutalizing worship of nature, exhibiting its degradation in the fact that man, the sovereign of nature, fell down on his knees in adoration of Kausman, the monkey, and Salsala, the cow.

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindostan, was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

Die Welt dreht sich
Da sind wir nicht verborgen,
Das nicht unsere Freiheit,
Denn wir sind auch angetrieben."

KARL MARX.

TURKEY AND RUSSIA

Part of a page of the *New-York Daily Tribune* with Marx's article "The British Rule in India"

“A village, geographically considered, is a tract of country comprising some hundred or thousand acres of arable and waste lands; politically viewed it resembles a corporation or township. Its proper establishment of officers and servants consists of the following descriptions: The *potail*, or head inhabitant, who has generally the superintendence of the affairs of the village, settles the disputes of the inhabitants, attends to the police, and performs the duty of collecting the revenue within his village, a duty which his personal influence and minute acquaintance with the situation and concerns of the people render him the best qualified for this charge. The *kurnum* keeps the accounts of cultivation, and registers everything connected with it. The *tallier* and the *totie*, the duty of the former of which consists [...] in gaining information of crimes and offenses, and in escorting and protecting persons traveling from one village to another; the province of the latter appearing to be more immediately confined to the village, consisting, among other duties, in guarding the crops and assisting in measuring them. The *boundary-man*, who preserves the limits of the village, or gives evidence respecting them in cases of dispute. The Superintendent of Tanks and Watercourses distributes the water [...] for the purposes of agriculture. The Brahmin, who performs the village worship. The schoolmaster, who is seen teaching the children in a village to read and write in the sand. The calendar-brahmin, or astrologer, &c. These officers and servants generally constitute the establishment of a village; but in some parts of the country it is of less extent, some of the duties and functions above described being united in the same person; in others it exceeds the above-named number of individuals. [...] Under this simple form of municipal government, the inhabitants of the country have lived from time immemorial. The boundaries of the villages [...] have been but seldom altered; and though the villages themselves have been sometimes injured, and even desolated by war, famine or disease, the same name, the same limits, the same interests, and even the same families have continued for ages. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and divisions of kingdoms; while the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred, or to what sovereign it devolves; its internal economy remains unchanged. The *potail* is still the head inhabitant, and still acts as the petty judge or magistrate, and collector or reuter of the village.”^a

These small stereotype forms of social organism have been to the greater part dissolved, and are disappearing, not so much through the brutal interference of the British tax-gatherer and the British soldier, as to the working of English steam and English free trade. Those family-communities were based on domestic industry, in that peculiar combination of hand-weaving, hand-spinning and hand-tilling agriculture which gave them self-supporting power. English interference having placed the spinner in Lancashire and the weaver in Bengal, or sweeping away both Hindoo spinner and weaver, dissolved these small semi-barbarian, semi-civilized communities, by blowing up their economical basis,

^a “Report of the Committee of the House of Commons” published in 1812; quoted from Th. S. Raffles’ *The History of Java*, Vol. 1, p. 285.—Ed.

and thus produced the greatest, and to speak the truth, the only *social* revolution ever heard of in Asia.

Now, sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious patriarchal and inoffensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members losing at the same time their ancient form of civilization, and their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these idyllic village-communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. We must not forget the barbarian egotism which, concentrating on some miserable patch of land, had quietly witnessed the ruin of empires, the perpetration of unspeakable cruelties, the massacre of the population of large towns, with no other consideration bestowed upon them than on natural events, itself the helpless prey of any aggressor who deigned to notice it at all. We must not forget that this undignified, stagnatory, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked on the other part, in contradistinction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction and rendered murder itself a religious rite in Hindostan. We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjugated man to external circumstances instead of elevating man the sovereign of circumstances, that they transformed a self-developing social state into never changing natural destiny, and thus brought about a brutalizing worship of nature, exhibiting its degradation in the fact that man, the sovereign of nature, fell down on his knees in adoration of Kanuman, the monkey, and Sabbala, the cow.

England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindostan, was actuated only by the vilest interests, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution.

Then, whatever bitterness the spectacle of the crumbling of an ancient world may have for our personal feelings, we have the right, in point of history, to exclaim with Goethe:

“Sollte diese Qual uns quälen
Da sie unsre Lust vermehrt,
Hat nicht myriaden Seelen
Timur's Herrschaft aufgezehrt?”^a

Written on June 10, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3804, June 25, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 844, June 28, and the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 616, July 2, 1853
Signed: *Karl Marx*

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

^a “Should this torture then torment us
Since it brings us greater pleasure?
Were not through the rule of Timur
Souls devoured without measure?”

From Goethe's “An Suleika”, *Westöstlicher Diwan*.—Ed.

Karl Marx

ENGLISH PROSPERITY.—STRIKES.—
THE TURKISH QUESTION.—INDIA¹⁰⁸

London, Friday, June 17, 1853

The declared value of British exports for the month of

April, 1853, amounts to	£7,578,910
Against, for April, 1852	5,268,915
For four months ending April 30 [1853]	27,970,633
Against the same months of 1852	21,844,663

Showing an increase, in the former instance, of £2,309,995, or upward of 40 per cent.; and in the latter of £6,125,970, or nearly 28 per cent. Supposing the increase to continue at the same rate, the total exports of Great Britain would amount, at the close of 1853, to more than £100,000,000.

The Times, in communicating these startling items to its readers, indulged in a kind of dithyrambics, concluding with the words: "We are all happy, and all united."^a This agreeable discovery had no sooner been trumpeted forth, than an almost general system of strikes burst over the whole surface of England, particularly in the industrial North, giving a strange echo to the song of harmony tuned by *The Times*. These strikes are the necessary consequence of a comparative decrease in the labor-surplus, coinciding with a general rise in the prices of the first necessaries. 5,000 hands struck at Liverpool, 35,000 at Stockport, and so on, until at length the very police force was seized by the epidemic, and 250

^a *The Times*, No. 21449, June 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

constables at Manchester offered their resignation. On this occasion the middle-class press, for instance *The Globe*, lost all countenance, and foreswore its usual philanthropic effusions. It calumniated, injured, threatened, and called loudly upon the magistrates for interference, a thing which has actually been done at Liverpool in all cases where the remotest legal pretext could be invoked. These magistrates, when not themselves manufacturers or traders, as is commonly the case in Lancashire and Yorkshire, are at least intimately connected with, and dependant on, the commercial interest. They have permitted manufacturers to escape from the Ten-Hours Act, to evade the Truck Act,¹⁰⁹ and to infringe with impunity all other acts passed expressly against the "unadorned" rapacity of the manufacturer, while they interpret the Combination Act¹¹⁰ always in the most prejudiced and most unfavorable manner for the workingman. These same "gallant" free-traders, renowned for their indefatigability in denouncing government interference, these apostles of the bourgeois doctrine of *laissez-faire*, who profess to leave everything and everybody to the struggles of individual interest, are always the first to appeal to the interference of Government as soon as the individual interests of the workingman come into conflict with their own class interests. In such moments of collision they look with open admiration at the Continental States, where despotic governments, though, indeed, not allowing the bourgeoisie to rule, at least prevent the workingmen from resisting. In what manner the revolutionary party propose to make use of the present great conflict between masters and men, I have no better means of explaining than by communicating to you the following letter, addressed to me by Ernest Jones, the Chartist leader, on the eve of his departure for Lancashire, where the campaign is to be opened:

"*My Dear Marx*: ... To-morrow, I start for Blackstone-Edge, where a camp-meeting of the Chartists of Yorkshire and Lancashire is to take place, and I am happy to inform you that the most extensive preparations for the same are making in the North. It is now seven years since a really national gathering¹¹¹ took place on that spot sacred to the traditions of the Chartist movement, and the object of the present gathering is as follows: Through the treacheries and divisions of 1848, the disruption of the organization then existing, by the incarceration and banishment of 500 of its leading men—through the thinning of its ranks by emigration—through the deadening of political energy by the influences of brisk trade—the national movement of Chartism had converted itself into isolated action, and the organization dwindled at the very time that social knowledge spread. Meanwhile, a labor movement rose on the ruins of the political one—a labor movement emanating from the first blind gropings of social knowledge. This labor movement showed itself at first in isolated cooperative attempts: then, when these were found

to fail, in an energetic action for a ten-hour's bill, a restriction of the moving power, an abolition of the stoppage system in wages, and a fresh interpretation of the Combination Bill. To these measures, good in themselves, the whole power and attention of the working classes was directed. The failure of the attempts to obtain legislative guaranties for these measures has thrown a more revolutionary tendency in the labor-mind of Britain. The opportunity is thus afforded for rallying the masses around the standard of real Social Reform; for it must be evident to all, that however good the measures above alluded to may be, to meet the passing exigencies of the moment, they offer no guaranties for the future, and embody no fundamental principle of social right. The opportunity thus given for a movement, the power for successfully carrying it out, is also afforded by the circumstances of the present time—the discontent of the people being accompanied by an amount of popular power which the comparative scarcity of workmen affords in relation to the briskness of trade. Strikes are prevalent everywhere and generally successful. But it is lamentable to behold that the power which might be directed to a fundamental remedy, should be wasted on a temporary palliative. I am, therefore, attempting, in reorganizing with numerous friends, to seize this great opportunity for uniting the scattered ranks of Chartism on the sound principles of social revolution. For this purpose I have succeeded in reorganizing the dormant and extinct localities, and arranging for what I trust will be a general and imposing demonstration throughout England. The new campaign begins by the camp-meeting on Blackstone-Edge, to be followed by mass meetings in all the manufacturing Counties, while our agents are at work in the agricultural districts, so as to unite the agricultural mind with the rest of the industrial body, a point which has hitherto been neglected in our movement. The first step will be a demand for the Charter,¹¹² emanating from these mass meetings of the people, and an attempt to press a motion on our corrupt Parliament for the enactment of that measure, expressly and explicitly as the only means for Social Reform—a phase under which it has not yet been presented to the House. If the working classes support this movement, as I anticipate, from their response to my appeal, the result must be important; for, in case of refusal on the part of Parliament, the hollow professions of sham-liberals and philanthropic Tories will be exposed, and their last hold on popular credulity will be destroyed. In case of their consenting to entertain and discuss the motion, a torrent will be loosened which it will not be in the power of temporising expediency to stop. For you must be aware, from your close study of English politics, that there is no longer any pith or any strength in aristocracy or moneyocracy to resist any serious movement of the people. The governing powers consist only of a confused jumble of worn-out factions, that have run together like a ship's crew that have quarreled among themselves, join all hands at the pump to save the leaky vessel. There is no strength in them, and the throwing of a few drops of bilge water into the democratic ocean will be utterly powerless to allay the raging of its waves. Such, my friend, is the opportunity I now behold—such is the power wherewith I hope to see it used, and such is the first immediate object to which that power shall be directed. On the result of the first demonstration I shall again write to you.

"Yours truly, *Ernest Jones.*"

That there is no prospect at all of the intended Chartist petition being taken into consideration by Parliament, needs not to be proved by argument. Whatever illusions may have been entertained on this point, they must now vanish before the fact, that

Parliament has just rejected, by a majority of 60 votes, the proposition for the ballot introduced by Mr. Berkeley, and advocated by Messrs. Phillimore, Cobden, Bright, Sir Robert Peel, etc. And this is done by the very Parliament which went to the utmost in protesting against the intimidation and bribery employed at its own election, and neglected for months all serious business, for the whim of decimating itself in election inquiries. The only remedy, purity Johnny^a has yet found out against bribery, intimidation and corrupt practices, has been the disfranchisement, or rather the narrowing of constituencies. And there is no doubt that, if he had succeeded in making the constituencies of the same small size as himself, the Oligarchy would be able to get their votes without the trouble and expense of buying them. Mr. Berkeley's resolution was rejected by the combined Tories and Whigs, their common interest being at stake: the preservation of their territorial influence over the tenants at will, the petty shopkeepers and other retainers of the land-owner. "Who has to pay his rent, has to pay his vote," is an old adage of the glorious British Constitution.

Last Saturday *The Press*, a new weekly paper under the influence of Mr. Disraeli, made a curious disclosure to the public of England, as follows:

"Early in the spring Baron Brunnow communicated to Lord Clarendon the demand which the Emperor of Russia^b was about to make on the Porte, that he did so with a statement that the object of the communication was to ascertain the feeling of England on the subject—that Lord Clarendon made no objection, nor in any way discouraged the intended course, and that the Muscovite diplomatist communicated to his imperial master that England was not indisposed to connive at his designs on the Golden Horn."^c

Now, *The Times* of yesterday had an elaborate and official article emanating from the Foreign Office, in answer to the grave charge of Mr. Disraeli, but which, in my opinion, tends rather to strengthen than to refute that charge. *The Times* asserts that, early in the spring, before the arrival of Prince Menchikoff at Constantinople, Baron Brunnow made a complaint to Lord John Russell, that the Porte had revoked the privileges conferred on the Greek clergy by treaty, and that Lord John Russell, conceiving the matter only to concern the Holy Places, gave his assent to the designs of the Czar. But *The Times* is compelled at the same time to concede that after Prince Menchikoff's arrival at Constan-

^a Allusion to John Russell.—*Ed.*

^b Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^c Rendering of a passage from a report in *The Press*, No. 6, June 11, 1853.—*Ed.*

tinople, and when Lord John Russell had been replaced by Lord Clarendon at the Foreign Office, Baron Brunnow made a further communication to Lord Clarendon "purporting to convey the sense of his instructions, and some of the expressions used in the letter of credentials of which Prince Menchikoff was the bearer from the Emperor of Russia to the Sultan.^a" Simultaneously, *The Times* admits that "Lord Clarendon gave his assent to the demands communicated by Baron Brunnow." Evidently this second communication must have contained something more than what had been communicated to Lord John Russell. The matter, therefore, cannot stop with this declaration. Either Baron Brunnow must turn out a diplomatical cheat, or my Lords Clarendon and Aberdeen are traitors. We shall see.

It may be of interest to your readers to become acquainted with a document concerning the Eastern question, which was recently published in a London newspaper.^b It is a proclamation issued by the Prince of Armenia, now residing in London, and distributed among the Armenians in Turkey:

"Leo, by the grace of God, sovereign Prince of Armenia, &c., to the Armenians in Turkey:

"Beloved brothers and faithful countrymen.—Our will and our ardent wish is that you should defend to the last drop of your blood your country and the Sultan against the tyrant of the North. Remember, my brothers, that in Turkey there are no knouts, they do not tear your nostrils and your women are not flogged, secretly or in public. Under the reign of the Sultan, there is humanity, while under that of the tyrant of the North there are nothing but atrocities. Therefore place yourselves under the direction of God, and fight bravely for the liberty of your country and your present sovereign. Pull down your houses to make barricades, and if you have no arms, break your furniture and defend yourselves with it. May Heaven guide you on your path to glory. My only happiness will be to fight in the midst of you against the oppressor of your country, and your creed. May God incline the Sultan's heart to sanction my demand, because under his reign, our religion remains in its pure form, while, under the Northern tyrant, it will be altered. Remember, at least, brothers, that the blood that runs in the veins of him who now addresses you, is the blood of twenty kings, it is the blood of heroes—Lusignans—and defenders of our faith; and we say to you, let us defend our creed and its pure form, until our last drop of blood."

On the 13th inst. Lord Stanley gave notice to the House of Commons that on the second reading of the India Bill (23d inst.) he would bring in the following resolution:

"That in the opinion of this House further information is necessary to enable Parliament to legislate with advantage for the permanent government of India, and

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b *The Daily News*, No. 2207, June 17, 1853.—*Ed.*

that at this late period of the session, it is inexpedient to proceed into a measure, which, while it disturbs existing arrangements, cannot be regarded as a final settlement."^a

But in April, 1854, the Charter of the East India Company will expire, and something accordingly must be done in one way or the other. The Government wanted to legislate permanently; that is, to renew the Charter for twenty years more. The Manchester School wanted to postpone all legislation, by prolonging the Charter at the utmost for one year.—The Government said that permanent legislation was necessary for the “best” of India. The Manchester men replied that it was impossible for want of information. The “best” of India, and the want of information, are alike false pretences. The governing oligarchy desired, before a Reformed House should meet, to secure at the cost of India, their own “best” for twenty years to come. The Manchester men desired no legislation at all in the unreformed Parliament, where their views had no chance of success. Now, the Coalition Cabinet, through Sir Charles Wood, has, in contradiction to its former statements, but in conformity with its habitual system of shifting difficulties, brought in something that looked like legislation; but it dared not, on the other hand, to propose the renewal of the Charter for any definite period, but presented a “settlement,” which it left to Parliament to unsettle whenever that body should determine to do so. If the Ministerial propositions were adopted, the East India Company would obtain no renewal, but only a suspension of life. In all other respects, the Ministerial project but apparently alters the Constitution of the India Government, the only serious novelty to be introduced being the addition of some new Governors, although a long experience has proved that the parts of East India administered by simple Commissioners, go on much better than those blessed with the costly luxury of Governors and Councils. The Whig invention of alleviating exhausted countries by burdening them with new sinecures for the paupers of aristocracy, reminds one of the old Russell administration, when the Whigs were suddenly struck with the state of spiritual destitution, in which the Indians and Mahommedans of the East were living, and determined upon relieving them by the importation of some *new Bishops*, the Tories, in the plenitude of their power, having never thought more than one to be necessary. That resolution having been agreed upon, Sir John Hobhouse, the then Whig President of the Board of Control, discovered

^a Quoted from a report in *The Times*, No. 21454, June 14, 1853.—*Ed.*

immediately afterwards, that he had a relative admirably suited for a Bishopric, who was forthwith appointed to one of the new sees. "In cases of this kind," remarks an English writer, "where the fit is so exact, it is really hardly possible to say, whether the shoe was made for the foot, or the foot for the shoe." Thus with regard to the Charles Wood's invention; it would be very difficult to say, whether the new Governors are made for Indian provinces, or Indian provinces for the new Governors.

Be this as it may, the Coalition Cabinet believed it had met all clamors by leaving to Parliament the power of altering its proposed act at all times. Unfortunately in steps Lord Stanley, the Tory, with his resolution which was loudly cheered by the "Radical" Opposition, when it was announced. Lord Stanley's resolution is nevertheless self-contradictory. On one hand, he rejects the Ministerial proposition, because the House requires more information for permanent legislation. On the other hand, he rejects it, because it is no permanent legislation, but alters existing arrangements, without pretending to finality. The Conservative view is, of course, opposed to the bill, because it involves a change of some kind. The Radical view is opposed to it, because it involves no real change at all. Lord Stanley, in these coalescent times has found a formula in which the opposite views are combined together against the Ministerial view of the subject. The Coalition Ministry affects a virtuous indignation against such tactics, and *The Chronicle*, its organ, exclaims:

"Viewed as a party-move the proposed motion for delay is in a high degree factious and discreditable.... This motion is brought forward solely because some supporters of the Ministry are pledged to separate in this particular question from those with whom they usually act."^a

The anxiety of Ministers seems indeed to be serious. *The Chronicle* of to-day, again recurring to the subject, says:

"The division on Lord Stanley's motion will probably be decisive of the fate of the India Bill; it is therefore of the *utmost importance* that those who feel the *importance* of early legislation, should use every exertion to strengthen the Government."^b

On the other hand, we read in *The Times* of to-day:

"The fate of the Government India Bill has been more respectively delineated.... The danger of the Government lies in the entire conforming of Lord

^a *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 26981, June 15, 1853.—Ed.

^b *The Morning Chronicle*, No. 26983, June 17, 1853.—Ed.

Stanley's objections with the conclusions of public opinion. Every syllable of this amendment tells with deadly effect against the ministry."^a

I shall expose in a subsequent letter,^b the bearing of the Indian Question on the different parties in Great Britain, and the benefit the poor Hindoo may reap from this quarreling of the aristocracy, the moneyocracy and the millocracy about his amelioration.

Written on June 17, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3809, and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 845, July 1, 1853; reprinted without the last two subsections in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 617, July 9, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a *The Times*, No. 21457, June 17, 1853.—*Ed*

^b See this volume, pp. 148-56.—*Ed*

Karl Marx

TURKEY AND RUSSIA.—
 CONNIVANCE OF THE ABERDEEN MINISTRY
 WITH RUSSIA.—THE BUDGET.—
 TAX ON NEWSPAPER SUPPLEMENTS.—
 PARLIAMENTARY CORRUPTION¹¹³

London, Tuesday, June 21, 1853

In the year 1828, when Russia was permitted to overrun Turkey with war, and to terminate that war by the Treaty of Adrianople, which surrendered to her the whole of the Eastern coast of the Black Sea, from Anapa in the North to Poti in the South (except Circassia), and delivered into her possession the islands at the mouth of the Danube, virtually separated Moldavia and Wallachia from Turkey, and placed them under Russian supremacy—at that epoch Lord Aberdeen happened to be Minister of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. In 1853 we find the very same Aberdeen as the chief of the “composite ministry” in the same country. This simple fact goes far to explain the overbearing attitude assumed by Russia in her present conflict with Turkey and with Europe.

I told you in my last letter that the storm aroused by the revelations of *The Press* respecting the secret transactions between Aberdeen, Clarendon and Baron Brunnow,^a was not likely to subside under the hair-splitting, tortuous and disingenuous pleading of Thursday’s^b *Times*. *The Times* was even then forced to admit in a semi-official article, that Lord Clarendon had indeed given his assent to the demands about to be made by Russia on the Porte, but said that the demands as represented in London, and those actually proposed at Constantinople, had turned out to be of quite a different tenor, although the papers communicated by Baron Brunnow to the British Minister purported to be “*literal extracts*” from the instructions forwarded to Prince Menchikoff. On

^a See this volume, pp. 137-38.—*Ed.*

^b June 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

the following Saturday, however, *The Times*^a retracted its assertions—undoubtedly in consequence of remonstrances made on the part of the Russian Embassy—and gave Baron Brunnow a testimonial of perfect “candor and faith.” *The Morning Herald* of yesterday puts the question “whether Russia had not perhaps given false instructions to Baron Brunnow himself, in order to deceive the British Minister?”^b In the meantime, fresh disclosures, studiously concealed from the public by a corrupt daily press, have been made, which exclude any such interpretation, throwing the whole blame on the shoulders of the “composite ministry,” and quite sufficient to warrant the impeachment of Lords Aberdeen and Clarendon before any other Parliament than the present, which is but a paralytic produce of dead constituencies artificially stimulated into life by unexampled bribery and intimidation.

It is stated that a communication was made to Lord Clarendon, wherein he was informed that the affair of the Shrines was *not* the *sole object* of the Russian Prince.^c In that communication the general question was entered into, the question of the Greek Christians of Turkey, and of the position of the Emperor of Russia with respect to them under certain treaties. All these points were canvassed, and the course about to be adopted by Russia explicitly stated—the same as detailed in the projected convention of the 6th of May.¹¹⁴ Lord Clarendon, with the assent of Lord Aberdeen, in no wise either disapproved or discouraged that course. While matters stood thus in London, Bonaparte sent his fleet to Salamis, public opinion pressed from without, Ministers were interpellated in both Houses, Russell pledged himself to the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Turkey, and Prince Menchikoff threw off the mask at Constantinople. It now became necessary for Lords Aberdeen and Clarendon to initiate the other Ministers in what had been done, and the Coalition was on the eve of being broken up, as Lord Palmerston, forced by his antecedents, urged a directly opposite line of policy. In order to prevent the dissolution of his Cabinet, Lord Aberdeen finally yielded to Lord Palmerston, and consented to the combined action of the English and French fleets in the Dardanelles. But at the same time, in order to fulfill his engagements toward Russia, Lord Aberdeen intimated through a private dispatch to St. Petersburg

^a Clauses of the Balta-Liman Convention and the *Times* commentaries to them are quoted from Issue No. 21458, June 18, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b *The Morning Herald*, No. 22189, June 20, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c A. S. Menshikov.—*Ed.*

that he would not look upon the occupation of the Danubian Principalities by the Russians as a *casus belli*, and *The Times* received orders to prepare public opinion for this new interpretation of international treaties. It would be unjust to withhold the testimonial that it has labored hard enough to prove that black is white. This same journal, which had all along contended that the Russian *protectorate* over the Greek Christians of Turkey would not be of any political consequence at all, asserted at once that Moldavia and Wallachia were placed under a divided allegiance, and formed in reality no integral portions of the Turkish Empire; that their occupation would not be an invasion of the Turkish Empire in the "strict sense of the word," inasmuch as the treaties of Bucharest and Adrianople had given to the Czar a Protectorate over his co-religionists in the Danubian Provinces.¹¹⁵ The Convention of Balta-Liman, concluded on May 1, 1849,¹¹⁶ distinctly stipulates:

"1. That the occupation of those provinces, if it occurs, shall only be by a joint one of Russian and Turkish forces.

"2. That the sole plea for it shall be in grave events taking place in the principalities."

Now as no events at all have taken place in those Principalities, and moreover, as Russia has no intention to enter them in common with the Turks, but precisely against Turkey, *The Times* is of opinion, that Turkey ought to suffer quietly the occupation by Russia alone, and afterward enter into negotiations with her. But if Turkey should be of a less sedate temper and consider the occupation as a *casus belli*, *The Times* argues that England and France must not do so; and if, nevertheless, England [and] France should do so, *The Times* recommends that it should be done in a gentle manner, by no means as belligerents against Russia, but only as defensive allies of Turkey.

This cowardly and tortuous system of *The Times*, I cannot more appropriately stigmatise than by quoting the following passage from its leading article of to-day. It is an incredible combination of all the contradictions, subterfuges, false pretences, anxieties and lâchetés^a of Lord Aberdeen's policy:

"Before proceeding to the last extremities the Porte may, if it think fit, protest against the occupation of the principalities, and with the support of all the Powers of Europe, may still negotiate. It will remain with the Turkish government, acting in concert with the ambassadors of the four Powers, to determine this momentous point, and especially to decide whether the state of hostilities is such as to cause the

^a Baseness.—Ed.

Dardanelles to be opened to foreign ships of war, under the Convention of 1841.¹¹⁷ Should that question be decided in the affirmative, and the fleets be ordered to enter the Straits, it will then remain to be seen whether we come there as mediating Powers or as belligerents; for supposing Turkey and Russia to be at war, and foreign vessels of war to be admitted, *casus foederis* (!) they do not necessarily acquire a belligerent character, and they have a far greater interest in maintaining that of mediating Powers, inasmuch as they are sent not to make war but to prevent it. Such a measure does not of necessity make us principals in the contest."

All the leaders of *The Times* have been to no purpose. No other paper would follow in its track—none would bite at its bait, and even the Ministerial papers, *The Morning Chronicle*, *Morning Post*, *Globe*, and *Observer* take an entirely different stand, finding a loud echo on the other side of the channel, where only the legitimist *Assemblée nationale* presumes to see no *casus belli* in the occupation of the Danubian Principalities.

The dissension in the camp of the Coalition Ministry has thus been betrayed to the public by the clamorous dissension in their organs. Palmerston urged upon the Cabinet to hold the occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia as a declaration of war, and he was backed up by the Whig and Sham-Radical members of the composite ministry. Lord Aberdeen, having only consented to the common action of the French and English fleets upon the understanding that Russia would not act at the Dardanelles but in the Danubian Provinces, was now quite "outwinded." The existence of the Government was again at stake. At last, at the pressing instances of Lord Aberdeen, Palmerston was prepared to give a sullen assent to the unchallenged occupation of the Principalities by Russia, when suddenly a dispatch arrived from Paris announcing that Bonaparte had resolved to view the same act as a *casus belli*. The confusion has now reached its highest point.

Now, if this statement be correct, and from our knowledge of Lord Aberdeen's past, there is every reason to consider it as such—the whole mystery of that Russo-Turkish tragi-comedy that has occupied Europe for months together, is laid bare. We understand at once, why Lord Aberdeen would not move the British fleet from Malta. We understand the rebuke given to Colonel Rose for his resolute conduct at Constantinople,¹¹⁸ the bullying behavior of Prince Menchikoff, and the heroic firmness of the Czar who, conceiving the warlike movements of England as a mere farce, would have been glad to be allowed, by the uncontroverted occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia, not only to withdraw from the stage as the "master," but to hold his annual

grand maneuvers at the cost and expense of the subjects of the Sultan. We believe that, if war should break out, it will be because Russia had gone too far to withdraw with impunity to her honor; and above all, we believe her courage to be up to this notch simply because she has all the while counted on England's connivance.

On this head the following passage is in point from the last letter from *The Englishman*^a on the Coalition Ministry:

"The coalition is shaking at every breeze that flows from the Dardanelles. The fears of the good Aberdeen and the miserable incompetence of Clarendon, encouraged Russia, and have produced the crisis."

The latest news from Turkey is as follows: The Turkish Ambassador at Paris has received by telegraph, via Semlin, a dispatch from Constantinople, informing him that the Porte has rejected the last ultimatum of Russia,¹¹⁹ taking its stand on the memorandum forwarded to the Great Powers. The *Sémaphore*, of Marseilles, states that news had been received at Smyrna of the capture of two Turkish trading vessels on the Black Sea by the Russians; but that, on the other hand, the Caucasian tribes had opened a general campaign against the Russians, in which Shamyl had achieved a most brilliant victory, taking no less than 23 cannons.

Mr. Gladstone has now announced his altered proposals, with regard to the Advertisement Duty. He had proposed, in order to secure the support of *The Times*, to strike the duty off supplements containing advertisements only. He now proposes, intimidated by public opinion, to let all single supplements go free, and to tax each double supplement $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Imagine the fury of *The Times*, which, by this altered proposition, will only gain £20,000, instead of £40,000 a year, besides seeing the market thrown open to its competitors. This consistent journal which defends to the utmost the taxes upon knowledge, and the duty on advertisements, now opposes any tax on supplements. But it may console itself. If the Ministry, after having carried the greater part of the budget, feel no longer any necessity for cajoling *The Times*, the Manchester men, as soon as they have secured their share of the budget, will no longer want the Ministry. This is what the latter apprehend, and that very apprehension accounts for the fact of the budget discussion extending over the whole period of the session. It is characteristic of the compensating justice of Mr. Gladstone, that while he reduces the newspaper advertisement

^a The pen-name of A. Richards.—*Ed.*

duty from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 3d., he proposes to tax the literary advertisements inserted at the end of most books and reviews, 6 pence each.

To-night the House of Commons will be occupied on two cases of bribery. During the present session 47 Election-Committees have been sitting, out of which, 4 are yet sitting, 43 having concluded their investigations, by finding the majority of the unseated members guilty of bribery. To show the respect in which this Parliament, the offspring of corruption and the parent of Coalitions, is held by public opinion, it is sufficient to quote the following words of to-day's *Morning Herald*:

"If want of clear aim and object, and still more, the tottering and quavering attack, be symptomatic of imbecility, then it must be confessed that this Parliament, the child of six months, has fallen already into second childishness. [...] It is already subsiding and curdling away into small knots of spiritless and purposeless coteries."

Written on June 21, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3814 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 847, July 8, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

THE EAST INDIA COMPANY—
ITS HISTORY AND RESULTS

London, Friday, June 24,^a 1853

The debate on Lord Stanley's motion to postpone legislation for India, has been deferred until this evening. For the first time since 1783 the India question has become a ministerial one in England. Why is this?

The true commencement of the East India Company cannot be dated from a more remote epoch than the year 1702, when the different societies, claiming the monopoly of the East India trade, united together in one single Company. Till then the very existence of the original East India Company was repeatedly endangered, once suspended for years under the protectorate of Cromwell, and once threatened with utter dissolution by Parliamentary interference under the reign of William III. It was under the ascendancy of that Dutch Prince when the Whigs became the farmers of the revenues of the British Empire, when the Bank of England¹²⁰ sprung into life, when the protective system was firmly established in England, and the balance of power in Europe was definitively settled, that the existence of an East India Company was recognized by Parliament. That era of apparent liberty was in reality the era of monopolies not created by Royal grants, as in the times of Elizabeth and Charles I, but authorized and nationalized by the sanction of Parliament. This epoch in the history of England bears, in fact, an extreme likeness to the epoch of Louis Philippe in France, the old landed

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* gave an erroneous dateline: "Saturday, June 21" (June 21 was a Tuesday). Here it is corrected according to Marx's notebook, in which mailing of the article is dated June 24.—*Ed.*

aristocracy having been defeated, and the bourgeoisie not being able to take its place except under the banner of moneyocracy, or the "*haute finance*." The East India Company excluded the common people from the commerce with India, at the same time that the House of Commons excluded them from Parliamentary representation. In this as well as in other instances, we find the first decisive victory of the *bourgeoisie* over the feudal aristocracy coinciding with the most pronounced reaction against the people, a phenomenon which has driven more than one popular writer, like Cobbett, to look for popular liberty rather in the past than in the future.

The union between the Constitutional Monarchy and the monopolizing monied interest, between the Company of East India and the "glorious" revolution of 1688¹²¹ was fostered by the same force by which the liberal interests and a liberal dynasty have at all times and in all countries met and combined, by the force of corruption, that first and last moving power of Constitutional Monarchy, the guardian angel of William III and the fatal demon of Louis Philippe. So early as 1693, it appeared from Parliamentary inquiries, that the annual expenditure of the East India Company, under the head of "gifts" to men in power, which had rarely amounted to above £1,200 before the revolution, reached the sum of £90,000. The Duke of Leeds was impeached for a bribe of £5,000, and the virtuous King himself convicted of having received £10,000. Besides these direct briberies, rival Companies were thrown out by tempting Government with loans of enormous sums at the lowest interest, and by buying off rival Directors.

The power the East India Company had obtained by bribing the Government, as did also the Bank of England, it was forced to maintain by bribing again, as did the Bank of England. At every epoch when its monopoly was expiring, it could only effect a renewal of its Charter by offering fresh loans and by fresh presents made to the Government.

The events of the Seven-Years-War transformed the East India Company from a commercial into a military and territorial power.¹²² It was then that the foundation was laid of the present British Empire in the East. Then East India stock rose to £263, and dividends were then paid at the rate of 12½ per cent. But then there appeared a new enemy to the Company, no longer in the shape of rival societies, but in the shape of rival ministers and of a rival people. It was alleged that the Company's territory had been conquered by the aid of British fleets and British armies, and that no British subjects could hold territorial sovereignties

independent of the Crown. The ministers of the day and the people of the day claimed their share in the "wonderful treasures" imagined to have been won by the last conquests. The Company only saved its existence by an agreement made in 1767 that it should annually pay £400,000 into the National Exchequer.

But the East India Company, instead of fulfilling its agreement, got into financial difficulties, and, instead of paying a tribute to the English people, appealed to Parliament for pecuniary aid. Serious alterations in the Charter were the consequence of this step. The Company's affairs failing to improve, notwithstanding their new condition, and the English nation having simultaneously lost their colonies in North America, the necessity of elsewhere regaining some great Colonial Empire became more and more universally felt. The illustrious Fox thought the opportune moment had arrived, in 1783, for bringing forward his famous India bill, which proposed to abolish the Courts of Directors and Proprietors, and to vest the whole Indian government in the hands of seven Commissioners appointed by Parliament. By the personal influence of the imbecile King^a over the House of Lords, the bill of Mr. Fox was defeated, and made the instrument of breaking down the then Coalition Government of Fox and Lord North, and of placing the famous Pitt at the head of the Government. Pitt carried in 1784 a bill through both Houses, which directed the establishment of the Board of Control, consisting of six members of the Privy Council, who were

"to check, superintend and control all acts, operations and concerns which in any wise related to the civil and military Government, or revenues of the territories and possessions of the East India Company."

On this head, Mill, the historian, says^b:

"In passing that law two objects were pursued. To avoid the imputation of what was represented as the heinous object of Mr. Fox's bill, it was necessary that the principal part of the power should *appear* to remain in the hand of the Directors. For ministerial advantage it was necessary that it should in *reality* be all taken away. Mr. Pitt's bill professed to differ from that of his rival, chiefly in this very point, that while the one destroyed the power of the Directors, the other left it almost entire. Under the act of Mr. Fox the powers of the ministers would have been avowedly held. Under the act of Mr. Pitt, they were held in secret and by fraud. The bill of Fox transferred the powers of the Company to Commissioners appointed by Parliament. The bill of Mr. Pitt transferred them to Commissioners appointed by the King."

^a George III.—*Ed.*

^b J. Mill, *The History of the British India*; the passage above is also quoted from this book.—*Ed.*

The years of 1783 and 1784 were thus the first, and till now the only years, for the India question to become a ministerial one. The bill of Mr. Pitt having been carried, the Charter of the East India Company was renewed, and the Indian question set aside for twenty years. But in 1813 the Anti-Jacobin war, and in 1833 the newly introduced Reform Bill¹²³ superseded all other political questions.

This, then, is the first reason of the India question's having failed to become a great political question, since and before 1784; that before that time the East India Company had first to conquer existence and importance; that after that time the Oligarchy absorbed all of its power which it could assume without incurring responsibility; and that afterwards the English people in general were at the very epochs of the renewal of the Charter, in 1813 and 1833, absorbed by other questions of overbearing interest.

We will now take a different view. The East India Company commenced by attempting merely to establish factories for their agents, and places of deposit for their goods. In order to protect them they erected several forts. Although they had, even as early as 1689, conceived the establishment of a dominion in India, and of making territorial revenue one of their sources of emolument, yet, down to 1744, they had acquired but a few unimportant districts around Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. The war which subsequently broke out in the Carnatic had the effect of rendering them after various struggles, virtual sovereigns of that part of India. Much more considerable results arose from the war in Bengal and the victories of Clive. These results were the real occupation of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa.¹²⁴ At the end of the Eighteenth Century, and in the first years of the present one, there supervened the wars with Tippoo Saib, and in consequence of them a great advance of power, and an immense extension of the subsidiary system.¹²⁵ In the second decennium of the Nineteenth Century the first convenient frontier, that of India within the desert, had at length been conquered. It was not till then that the British Empire in the East reached those parts of Asia, which had been, at all times, the seat of every great central power in India. But the most vulnerable point of the Empire, from which it had been overrun as often as old conquerors were expelled by new ones, the barriers of the Western frontier, were not in the hands of the British. During the period from 1838 to 1849, in the Sikh and Afghan wars, British rule subjected to definitive possession the ethnographical, political, and military

frontiers of the East Indian Continent, by the compulsory annexation of the Punjab and of Scinde.¹²⁶ These were possessions indispensable to repulse any invading force issuing from Central Asia, and indispensable against Russia advancing to the frontiers of Persia. During this last decennium there have been added to the British Indian territory 167,000 square miles, with a population of 8,572,630 souls. As to the interior, all the native States now became surrounded by British possessions, subjected to British *suzeraineté* under various forms, and cut off from the sea-coast, with the sole exception of Guzerat and Scinde. As to its exterior, India was now finished. It is only since 1849, that the one great Anglo-Indian Empire has existed.

Thus the British Government has been fighting, under the Company's name, for two centuries, till at last the natural limits of India were reached. We understand now, why during all this time all parties in England have connived in silence, even those which had resolved to become the loudest with their hypocritical peace-cant, after the *arrondissement* of the one Indian Empire should have been completed. Firstly, of course, they had to get it, in order to subject it afterward to their sharp philanthropy. From this view we understand the altered position of the Indian question in the present year, 1853, compared with all former periods of Charter renewal.

Again, let us take a different view. We shall still better understand the peculiar crisis in Indian legislation, on reviewing the course of British commercial intercourse with India through its different phases.

At the commencement of the East India Company's operations, under the reign of Elizabeth, the Company was permitted for the purpose of profitably carrying on its trade with India, to export an annual value of £30,000 in silver, gold, and foreign coin. This was an infraction against all the prejudices of the age, and Thomas Mun was forced to lay down in *A Discourse on Trade from England to the East Indies*, the foundation of the "mercantile system," admitting that the precious metals were the only real wealth a country could possess, but contending at the same time that their exportation might be safely allowed, provided the *balance of payments* was in favor of the exporting nation. In this sense, he contended that the commodities imported from East India were chiefly re-exported to other countries, from which a much greater quantity of bullion was obtained than had been required to pay for them in India. In the same spirit, Sir Josiah Child wrote *A Treatise Wherein It Is Demonstrated That the East India Trade Is the*

Most National Trade of All Trades. By-and-by the partisans of the East India Company grew more audacious, and it may be noticed as a curiosity, in this strange Indian history, that the Indian monopolists were the first preachers of free trade in England.

Parliamentary intervention, with regard to the East India Company, was again claimed, not by the commercial, but by the industrial class, at the latter end of the 17th century, and during the greater part of the 18th, when the importation of East Indian cotton and silk stuffs was declared to ruin the poor British manufacturers, an opinion put forward in John Pollexfen: *England and India Inconsistent in Their Manufactures*, London, 1697,¹²⁷ a title strangely verified a century and a half later, but in a very different sense. Parliament did then interfere. By the Act 11 and 12 William III, cap. 10, it was enacted that the wearing of wrought silks and of printed or dyed calicoes from India, Persia and China should be prohibited, and a penalty of £200 imposed on all persons having or selling the same. Similar laws were enacted under George I, II and III, in consequence of the repeated lamentations of the afterward so "enlightened" British manufacturers. And thus, during the greater part of the 18th century, Indian manufactures were generally imported into England in order to be sold on the Continent, and to remain excluded from the English market itself.

Besides this Parliamentary interference with East India, solicited by the greedy home manufacturer, efforts were made at every epoch of the renewal of the Charter, by the merchants of London, Liverpool and Bristol, to break down the commercial monopoly of the Company, and to participate in that commerce, estimated to be a true mine of gold. In consequence of these efforts, a provision was made in the Act of 1773 prolonging the Company's Charter till March 1, 1814, by which private British individuals were authorized to export from, and the Company's Indian servants permitted to import into England, almost all sorts of commodities. But this concession was surrounded with conditions annihilating its effects, in respect to the exports to British India by private merchants. In 1813 the Company was unable to further withstand the pressure of general commerce, and except the monopoly of the Chinese trade, the trade to India was opened, under certain conditions, to private competition. At the renewal of the Charter in 1833, these last restrictions were at length superseded, the Company forbidden to carry on any trade at all—their commercial character destroyed, and their privilege of excluding British subjects from the Indian territories withdrawn.

Meanwhile the East India trade had undergone very serious revolutions, altogether altering the position of the different class interests in England with regard to it. During the whole course of the 18th century the treasures transported from India to England were gained much less by comparatively insignificant commerce, than by the direct exploitation of that country, and by the colossal fortunes there extorted and transmitted to England. After the opening of the trade in 1813 the commerce with India more than trebled in a very short time. But this was not all. The whole character of the trade was changed. Till 1813 India had been chiefly an exporting country, while it now became an importing one; and in such a quick progression, that already in 1823 the rate of exchange, which had generally been 2/6 per rupee, sunk down to 2/ per rupee. India, the great workshop of cotton manufacture for the world, since immemorial times, became now inundated with English twists and cotton stuffs. After its own produce had been excluded from England, or only admitted on the most cruel terms, British manufactures were poured into it at a small and merely nominal duty, to the ruin of the native cotton fabrics once so celebrated. In 1780 the value of British produce and manufactures amounted only to £386,152, the bullion exported during the same year to £15,041, the total value of exports during 1780 being £12,648,616, so that the India trade amounted to only 1-32 of the entire foreign trade. In 1850 the total exports to India from Great Britain and Ireland were £8,024,000, of which cotton goods alone amounted to £5,220,000, so that it reached more than $\frac{1}{8}$ of the whole export, and more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the foreign cotton trade. But, the cotton manufacture also employed now $\frac{1}{8}$ of the population of Britain, and contributed 1-12th of the whole national revenue. After each commercial crisis the East Indian trade grew of more paramount importance for the British cotton manufacturers, and the East India Continent became actually their best market. At the same rate at which the cotton manufactures became of vital interest for the whole social frame of Great Britain, East India became of vital interest for the British cotton manufacture.

Till then the interests of the moneyocracy which had converted India into its landed estates, of the oligarchy who had conquered it by their armies, and of the millocracy who had inundated it with their fabrics, had gone hand in hand. But the more the industrial interest became dependent on the Indian market, the more it felt the necessity of creating fresh productive powers in India, after having ruined her native industry. You cannot continue to

inundate a country with your manufactures, unless you enable it to give you some produce in return. The industrial interest found that their trade declined instead of increasing. For the four years ending with 1846, the imports to India from Great Britain were to the amount of 261 million rupees; for the four years ending 1850 they were only 253 millions, while the exports for the former period 274 millions of rupees, and for the latter period 254 millions. They found out that the power of consuming their goods was contracted in India to the lowest possible point, that the consumption of their manufactures by the British West Indies, was of the value of about 14s. per head of the population per annum, by Chile, of 9s. 3d., by Brazil, of 6s. 5d., by Cuba, of 6s. 2d., by Peru, of 5s. 7d., by Central America, of 10d., while it amounted in India only to about 9d. Then came the short cotton crop in the United States, which caused them a loss of £11,000,000 in 1850, and they were exasperated at depending on America, instead of deriving a sufficiency of raw cotton from the East Indies. Besides, they found that in all attempts to apply capital to India they met with impediments and chicanery on the part of the India authorities. Thus India became the battle-field in the contest of the industrial interest on the one side, and of the moneyocracy and oligarchy on the other. The manufacturers, conscious of their ascendancy in England, ask now for the annihilation of these antagonistic powers in India, for the destruction of the whole ancient fabric of Indian government, and for the final eclipse of the East India Company.

And now to the fourth and last point of view, from which the Indian question must be judged. Since 1784 Indian finances have got more and more deeply into difficulty. There exists now a national debt of 50 million pounds, a continual decrease in the resources of the revenue, and a corresponding increase in the expenditure, dubiously balanced by the gambling income of the opium tax, now threatened with extinction by the Chinese beginning themselves to cultivate the poppy, and aggravated by the expenses to be anticipated from the senseless Burmese war.¹²⁸

“As the case stands,” says Mr. Dickinson, “as it would ruin England to lose her Empire in India, it is threatening our own finances with ruin, to be obliged to keep it.”^a

^a J. Dickinson, *The Government of India under a Bureaucracy*, p. 50.—*Ed.*

I have shown thus, how the Indian question has become for the first time since 1783, an English question, and a ministerial question.

Written on June 24, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3816, July 11, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 848, July 12, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

THE INDIAN QUESTION.—IRISH TENANT RIGHT

London, June 28, 1853

The debate on Lord Stanley's motion with respect to India commenced on the 23d, continued on the 24th, and adjourned to the 27th inst., has not been brought to a close. When that shall at length have arrived, I intend to resume my observations on the India question.

As the Coalition Ministry depends on the support of the Irish party, and as all the other parties composing the House of Commons so nicely balance each other that the Irish may at any moment turn the scales which way they please, some concessions are at last about to be made to the Irish tenants. The "Leasing Powers (Ireland) Bill," which passed the House of Commons on Friday last, contains a provision that for the improvements made on the soil and separable from the soil, the tenant shall have at the termination of his lease, a compensation in money, the incoming tenant being at liberty to take them at the valuation, while with respect to improvements in the soil, compensation for them shall be arranged by contract between the landlord and the tenant.¹²⁹

A tenant having incorporated his capital, in one form or another, in the land, and having thus effected an improvement of the soil, either directly by irrigation, drainage, manure, or indirectly by construction of buildings for agricultural purposes, in steps the landlord with demand for increased rent. If the tenant concede, he has to pay the interest for his own money to the landlord. If he resist, he will be very unceremoniously ejected, and supplanted by a new tenant, the latter being enabled to pay a higher rent by the very expenses incurred by his predecessors, until he also, in his turn, has become an improver of the land, and

is replaced in the same way, or put on worse terms. In this easy way a class of absentee landlords has been enabled to pocket, not merely the labor, but also the capital, of whole generations, each generation of Irish peasants sinking a grade lower in the social scale, exactly in proportion to the exertions and sacrifices made for the raising of their condition and that of their families. If the tenant was industrious and enterprising, he became taxed in consequence of his very industry and enterprise. If, on the contrary, he grew inert and negligent, he was reproached with the “aboriginal faults of the Celtic race.” He had, accordingly, no other alternative left but to become a pauper—to pauperise himself by industry, or to pauperise by negligence. In order to oppose this state of things, “Tenant Right” was proclaimed in Ireland—a right of the tenant, not in the soil but in the improvements of the soil effected at his cost and charges. Let us see in what manner *The Times*, in its Saturday’s leader, attempts to break down this Irish “Tenant Right:”

“There are two general systems of farm occupation. Either a tenant may take a lease of the land for a fixed number of years, or his holding may be terminable at any time upon certain notice. In the first of these events, it would be obviously his course to adjust and apportion his outlay so that all, or nearly all, the benefit would find its way to him before the expiration of his term. In the second case it seems equally obvious that he should not run the risk of the investment without a proper assurance of return.”^a

Where the landlords have to deal with a class of large capitalists who may, as they please, invest their stock in commerce, in manufactures or in farming, there can be no doubt but that these capitalist farmers, whether they take long leases or no time leases at all, know how to secure the “proper” return of their outlays. But with regard to Ireland the supposition is quite fictitious. On the one side you have there a small class of land monopolists, on the other, a very large class of tenants with very petty fortunes, which they have no chance to invest in different ways, no other field of production opening to them, except the soil. They are, therefore, forced to become tenants-at-will.¹³⁰ Being once tenants-at-will, they naturally run the risk of losing their revenue, provided they do not invest their small capital. Investing it, in order to secure their revenue, they run the risk of losing their capital, also.

“Perhaps,” continues *The Times*, “it may be said, that in any case a tenantry could hardly expire without something being left upon the ground, in some shape

^a *The Times*, No. 21464, June 25, 1853.—*Ed.*

or another, representing the tenant's own property, and that for this compensation should be forthcoming. There is some truth in the remark, but the demand thus created [...] ought, under proper conditions of society, to be easily adjusted between landlord and tenant, as it might, at any rate, be provided for in the original contract. We say that the conditions of society should regulate these arrangements, because we believe that no Parliamentary enactment can be effectually substituted for such an agency."

Indeed, under "proper conditions of society," we should want no more Parliamentary interference with the Irish land-tenant, as we should not want, under "proper conditions of society," the interference of the soldier, of the policeman, and of the hangman. Legislature, magistracy, and armed force, are all of them but the offspring of improper conditions of society, preventing those arrangements among men which would make useless the compulsory intervention of a third supreme power. Has, perhaps, *The Times* been converted into a social revolutionist? Does it want a social revolution, reorganizing the "conditions of society," and the "arrangements" emanating from them, instead of "Parliamentary enactments?" England has subverted the conditions of Irish society. At first it confiscated the land, then it suppressed the industry by "Parliamentary enactments,"¹³¹ and lastly, it broke the active energy by armed force. And thus England created those abominable "conditions of society" which enable a small *caste* of rapacious lordlings to dictate to the Irish people the terms on which they shall be allowed to hold the land and to live upon it. Too weak yet for revolutionizing those "social conditions," the people appeal to Parliament, demanding at least their mitigation and regulation. But "No," says *The Times*; if you don't live under proper conditions of society, Parliament can't mend that. And if the Irish people, on the advice of *The Times*, tried to-morrow to mend their conditions of society, *The Times* would be the first to appeal to bayonets, and to pour out sanguinary denunciations of "the aboriginal faults of the Celtic race," wanting the Anglo-Saxon taste for pacific progress and legal amelioration.

"If a landlord," says *The Times*, "deliberately injures one tenant, he will find it so much the harder to get another, and whereas his occupation consists in letting land, he will find his land all the more difficult to let."

The case stands rather differently in Ireland. The more a landlord injures one tenant, the easier he will find it to oppress another. The tenant who comes in, is the means of injuring the ejected one, and the ejected one is the means of keeping down the new occupant. That, in due course of time, the landlord, beside

injuring the tenant, will injure himself and ruin himself, is not only a probability, but the very fact, in Ireland—a fact affording, however, a very precarious source of comfort to the ruined tenant.

“The relations between the landlord and tenant are those between two traders,” says *The Times*.

This is precisely the *petitio principii* which pervades the whole leader of *The Times*. The needy Irish tenant belongs to the soil, while the soil belongs to the English Lord. As well you might call the relation between the robber who presents his pistol, and the traveler who presents his purse, a relation between two traders.

“But,” says *The Times*, “in point of fact, the relation between Irish landlords and tenants will soon be reformed by an agency more potent than that of legislation. [...] The property of Ireland is fast passing into new hands, and, if the present rate of emigration continues, its cultivation must undergo the same transfer.”

Here, at least, *The Times* has the truth. British Parliament does not interfere at a moment when the worked-out old system is terminating in the common ruin, both of the thrifty landlord and the needy tenant, the former being knocked down by the hammer of the *Encumbered Estates Commission*, and the latter expelled by compulsory emigration. This reminds us of the old Sultan of Morocco. Whenever there was a case pending between two parties, he knew of no more “potent agency” for settling their controversy, than by killing both parties.

“Nothing could tend,” concludes *The Times* with regard to Tenant Right, “to greater confusion than such a *communistic distribution of ownership*. [...] The only person with any right in the land, is the landlord.”

The Times seems to have been the sleeping Epimenides of the past half century, and never to have heard of the hot controversy going on during all that time upon the claims of the landlord, not among social reformers and Communists, but among the very political economists of the British middle-class. Ricardo, the creator of modern political economy in Great Britain, did not controvert the “right” of the landlords, as he was quite convinced that their claims were based upon fact, and not on right, and that political economy in general had nothing to do with questions of right; but he attacked the land-monopoly in a more unassuming, yet more scientific, and therefore more dangerous manner. He proved that private proprietorship in land, as distinguished from the respective claims of the laborer, and of the farmer, was a

relation quite superfluous in, and incoherent with the whole frame-work of modern production; that the economical expression of that relationship, the rent of land, might, with great advantage, be appropriated by the State; and finally that the interest of the landlord was opposed to the interest of all other classes of modern society. It would be tedious to enumerate all the conclusions drawn from these premises by the Ricardo School against the landed monopoly. For my end, it will suffice to quote three of the most recent economical authorities of Great Britain.

The London *Economist*, whose chief editor, Mr. J. Wilson, is not only a Free Trade oracle, but a Whig one, too, and not only a Whig, but also an inevitable Treasury-appendage in every Whig or composite ministry, has contended in different articles that exactly speaking there can exist no title authorizing any individual, or any number of individuals, to claim the exclusive proprietorship in the soil of a nation.

Mr. Newman, in his *Lectures on Political Economy*, London, 1851, professedly written for the purpose of refuting Socialism, tells us:

“No man has, or can have, a natural right to *land*, except so long as he occupies it in person. His right is to the use, and to the use only. All other right is the creation of artificial law (or parliamentary enactments as *The Times* would call it).... If, at any time, land becomes needed to *live upon*, the right of private possessors to withhold it comes to an end.” [Pp. 137, 141.]

This is exactly the case in Ireland, and Mr. Newman expressly confirms the claims of the Irish tenantry, and in lectures held before the most select audiences of the British aristocracy.

In conclusion let me quote some passages from Mr. Herbert Spencer's work, *Social Statics*, London, 1851, also, purporting to be a complete refutation of Communism, and acknowledged as the most elaborate development of the Free Trade doctrines of modern England.

“No one [...] may use the earth in such a way as to prevent the rest from similarly using it. [...] Equity, therefore, does not permit property in land, or the rest would live on the earth by sufferance only. The landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether.... It can never be pretended, that the existing titles to such property are legitimate. Should any one think so let him look in the Chronicles. [...] The original deeds were written with the sword, rather than with the pen. Not lawyers but soldiers were the conveyancers: blows were the current coin given in payment; and for seals blood was used in preference to wax. Could valid claims be thus constituted? Hardly. And if not, what becomes of the pretensions of all subsequent holders of estates so obtained? Does sale or bequest generate a right where it did not previously exist?... If one act of transfer can give no title, can many?... At what rate per annum do invalid claims become valid?... The right of mankind at large to the earth's surface is still valid, all deeds, customs

and laws notwithstanding. [...] It is impossible to discover any mode in which land can become private property.... We daily deny landlordism by our legislation. Is a canal, a railway, or a turnpike road to be made? We do not scruple to seize just as many acres as may be requisite. [...] We do not wait for consent.... The change required would simply be a change of landlords.... Instead of being in the possession of individuals, the country would be held by the great corporate body—society. Instead of leasing his acres from an isolated proprietor, the farmer would lease them from the nation. Instead of paying his rent to the agent of Sir John, or His Grace, he will pay to an agent, or deputy-agent of the community. Stewards would be public officials, instead of private ones, and tenantry the only land tenure.... Pushed to its ultimate consequences, a claim to exclusive possession of the soil involves land-owning despotism." [Pp. 114-16, 122-23, 125.]¹³²

Thus, from the very point of view of modern English political economists, it is not the usurping English landlord, but the Irish tenants and laborers, who have the only right in the soil of their native country, and *The Times*, in opposing the demands of the Irish people, places itself into direct antagonism to British middle-class science.

Written on June 28, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3816, July 11, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 848, July 12, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

RUSSIAN POLICY AGAINST TURKEY.—
CHARTISM¹³³

London, Friday, July 1, 1853

Since the year 1815 the Great Powers of Europe have feared nothing so much as an infraction of the *status quo*. But any war between any two of those powers implies subversion of that *status quo*. That is the reason why Russia's encroachments in the East have been tolerated, and why she has never been asked for anything in return but to afford some pretext, however absurd, to the Western powers, for remaining neutral, and for being saved the necessity of interfering with Russian aggressions. Russia has all along been glorified for the forbearance and generosity of her "august master," who has not only condescended to cover the naked and shameful subserviency of Western Cabinets, but has displayed the magnanimity of devouring Turkey piece after piece, instead of swallowing it at a mouthful. Russian diplomacy has thus rested on the timidity of Western statesmen, and her diplomatic art has gradually sunk into so complete a *mannerism*, that you may trace the history of the present transactions almost literally in the annals of the past.

The hollowness of the new pretexts of Russia is apparent, after the Sultan^a has granted, in his new firman to the Patriarch of Constantinople,^b more than the Czar himself had asked for—so far as religion goes. Now was, perhaps, the "pacification of Greece"¹³⁴ a more solid pretext? When M. de Villèle, in order to tranquilize the apprehensions of the Sultan,^c and to give a proof of the pure intentions of the Great Powers, proposed "that the

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b Germanos.—*Ed.*

^c Mahmud II.—*Ed.*

allies ought above all things to conclude a Treaty by which the actual *status quo* of the Ottoman Empire should be guaranteed to it," the Russian Ambassador at Paris^a opposed this proposition to the utmost, affirming

"that Russia, in displaying *generosity in her relations with the Porte*, and in showing *inappreciable respect* for the wishes of her allies, [...] had been obliged, nevertheless, to reserve exclusively to herself to determine her own differences with the Divan; [...] that a general guarantee of the Ottoman Empire, independently of its being unusual and surprising, would wound the *feelings of his master* and the *rights* acquired by Russia, and the principles upon which they were founded."^b

Russia pretends now to occupy the Danubian principalities, without giving to the Porte the right of considering this step as a *casus belli*.

Russia pretended, in 1827, "to occupy Moldavia and Wallachia in the name of the three Powers."

While Russia proclaimed the following in her declaration of war of April 26, 1828:

"Her allies would always find her ready to concert her march with them, in execution of the Treaty of London,¹³⁵ and ever anxious to aid in a work, which her *religion* and all the sentiments honorable to humanity recommended to her active solicitude, always disposed to profit by her actual position *only* for the purpose of accelerating the accomplishment of the Treaty of July 6th,"^c

while Russia announced in her manifesto, A. D. 1st October, 1829:

"Russia has remained constantly a stranger to every desire of conquest—to every view of aggrandizement."

Her Ambassador at Paris was writing to Count Nesselrode.

"When the Imperial Cabinet examined the question, whether it had become expedient to take up arms against the Porte, [...] there might have existed some doubt about the urgency of this measure in the eyes of those who had not sufficiently reflected upon the *effects of the sanguinary reforms*, which the Chief of the Ottoman Empire has just executed with such tremendous violence. [...]

"The Emperor has put the Turkish system to the proof, and his Majesty has found it to possess a commencement of physical and moral organization which it hitherto had not. If this Sultan had been enabled to offer us a more determined and regular resistance, while he had scarcely assembled together the elements of his new plan of reform and ameliorations, how formidable should we have found him had he had time to give it more solidity. [...] Things being in this state, we must congratulate ourselves upon having attacked them before they became more dangerous for us, for delay

^a K. O. Pozzo di Borgo.—Ed.

^b "Copy of a Despatch from Count Pozzo di Borgo, dated Paris, 22nd Dec. 1826", *The Portfolio*, 1843, No. II, p. 130.—Ed.

^c *The Portfolio*, 1836, No. VII, pp. 347-50.—Ed.

would only have made our relative situation worse, and prepared us greater obstacles than those with which we meet."

Russia proposes now to make an aggressive step and then to talk about it. In 1829 Prince Lieven wrote to Count Nesselrode:

"We shall confine ourselves to generalities, for every circumstantial communication on a subject so delicate would draw down real dangers, and if once we discuss with our allies the articles of treaty with the Porte, we shall only content them when they will *imagine* that they have imposed upon us irreparable sacrifices. It is in the midst of our camp that peace must be signed and it is when it shall have been concluded that Europe must know its conditions. Remonstrances will then be too late and it will then patiently suffer what it can no longer prevent."^a

Russia has now for several months been delaying action under one pretence or another, in order to maintain a state of things, which, being neither war nor peace, is tolerable to herself, but ruinous to the Turks. She acted in precisely the same manner in the period we have alluded to. As Pozzo di Borgo said:

"It is our policy to see that nothing new happens during the next four months and I hope we shall accomplish it, *because men in general prefer waiting*; but the fifth must be fruitful in events."^b

The Czar, after having inflicted the greatest indignities on the Turkish Government, and notwithstanding that he now threatens to extort by force the most humiliating concessions, nevertheless raises a great cry about his "friendship for the Sultan Abdül Mejid" and his solicitude "for the preservation of the Ottoman Empire." On the Sultan he throws the "responsibility" of opposing his "just demands," of continuing to "wound his friendship and his feelings," of rejecting his "note," and of declining his "protectorate."

In 1828, when Pozzo di Borgo was interpellated by Charles X about the bad success of the Russian arms in the campaign of that year, he replied, that, not wishing to push the war *à outrance* without absolute necessity, the Emperor had hoped that the Sultan would have profited by his *generosity*, which *experiment* had now failed.

Shortly before commencing her present quarrel with the Porte Russia sought to bring about a general coalition of the Continental Powers against England, on the Refugee question, and having failed in that experiment, she attempted to bring about a coalition with England against France. Similarly, from 1826 to 1828, she

^a *The Portfolio*, 1843, Vol. I, No. I, p. 24.—*Ed.*

^b *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. I, Nos. VIII-IX, p. 473.—*Ed.*

intimidated Austria by the “ambitious projects of Prussia,” doing simultaneously all that was in her power to swell the power and pretensions of Prussia, in order to enable her to balance Austria. In her present circular note she indicts Bonaparte as the only disturber of peace by his pretensions respecting the Holy Places¹³⁶; but, at that time, in the language of Pozzo di Borgo, she attributed

“all the agitation that pervaded Europe to the agency of Prince Metternich, and tried to make the Duke of Wellington himself perceive that the deference which he would have to the Cabinet of Vienna would be a drawback to his influence with all the others, and to give such a turn to things that it would be no longer Russia that sought to compromise France with Great Britain, but Great Britain who had repudiated France, in order to join the Cabinet of Vienna.”^a

Russia would now submit to a great humiliation if she retreated. That was identically her situation after the first unsuccessful campaign of 1828. What was then her supreme object? We answer in the words of her diplomatist:

“A second campaign is indispensable in order to acquire the superiority requisite for the success of the negotiation. [...] When this negotiation shall take place we must be in a state to dictate the conditions of it in a prompt and rapid manner.... *With the power of doing more* His Majesty would consent to *demand less*. [...] To obtain this superiority appears to me what ought to be the aim of all our efforts. *This superiority has now become a condition of our political existence*, such as we must establish [...] and maintain in the eyes of the world.”^b

But does Russia not fear the common action of England and France? Certainly. In the Secret Memoirs on the Means possessed by Russia for breaking up the alliance between France and England, revealed during the reign of Louis Philippe, we are told:

“In the event of a war, in which England should coalesce with France, Russia indulges in no hope of success, unless that union [...] be broken up; so that at the least England should consent to remain neutral during the continental conflict.”^c

The question is: Does Russia believe in a common action of England and France? We quote again from Pozzo di Borgo’s dispatches:

“From the moment that the idea of the ruin of the Turkish Empire ceases to prevail, it is not probable that the British Government would risk a general war for the sake of exempting the Sultan from acceding to such or such condition, above all in the state in which things will be at the commencement of the approaching campaign, when everything will be as yet uncertain and undecided. These

^a *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. II, pp. 210-11.—*Ed.*

^b *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. I, pp. 364, 361.—*Ed.*

^c *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. II, pp. 294-95.—*Ed.*

considerations would authorize the belief that we have no cause to fear an open rupture on the part of Great Britain; and that she will content herself with counseling the Porte to beg peace, and with lending the aid of the good offices in her power during the negotiation if it takes place, without going further, should the Sultan refuse or we persist."^a

And as to Nesselrode's opinion of the "good" Aberdeen, the Minister of 1828, and the Minister of 1853, it may be well to quote the following from a dispatch by Prince Lieven:

"Lord Aberdeen reiterated in his interview with me the assurance that at no period it had entered into the intentions of England to seek a quarrel with Russia—that he feared that the position of the English Ministry was not well understood at St. Petersburg—that he found himself in a delicate situation. Public opinion was always ready to burst forth against Russia. The British Government could not constantly *brave* it; and it would be dangerous to excite it on questions [...] that touched so nearly the national prejudices. On the other side we could reckon with entire confidence upon the [...] friendly dispositions of the English Ministry which struggled against them."^b

The only thing astonishing in the note of M. de Nesselrode, of June 11, is not "The insolent mélange of professions refuted by acts, and threats veiled in declaimers," but the reception Russian diplomatical notes meet with for the first time in Europe, calling forth, instead of the habitual awe and admiration, blushes of shame at the past and disdainful laughter from the Western world at this insolent amalgamation of pretensions, finesse and real barbarism. Yet Nesselrode's circular note, and the "ultimatisimum" of June 16, are not a bit worse than the so much admired master-pieces of Pozzo di Borgo and Prince Lieven. Count Nesselrode was at their time, what he is now, the diplomatical head of Russia.

There is a facetious story told of two Persian naturalists who were examining a bear; the one who had never seen such an animal before, inquired whether that animal dropped its cubs alive or laid eggs; to which the other, who was better informed, replied: "That animal is capable of anything." The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing.

En passant, I may mention the signal victory Russia has just won in Denmark, the Royal message having passed with a majority of 119 against 28, in the following terms:

"In agreement with the 4th paragraph of the Constitution d. d. June 5, 1849, the United Parliament, for its part, gives its consent to the arrangement by His

^a *The Portfolio*, 1836, Nos. VIII-IX, pp. 444-45.—*Ed.*

^b *The Portfolio*, 1843, No. I, pp. 17-19.—*Ed.*

Majesty of the succession to the whole Danish Monarchy in accordance with the Royal message respecting the succession of Oct. 4, 1852, renewed June 13, 1853."

Strikes and combinations of workmen are proceeding rapidly, and to an unprecedented extent. I have now before me reports on the strikes of the factory hands of all descriptions at Stockport, of smiths, spinners, weavers, etc., at Manchester, of carpet-weavers at Kidderminster, of colliers at the Ringwood Collieries, near Bristol, of weavers and loomers at Blackburn, of loomers at Darwen, of the cabinet-makers at Boston, of the bleachers, finishers, dyers and power-loom weavers of Bolton and neighborhood, of the weavers of Barnsley, of the Spitalfields broad-silk weavers, of the lace makers of Nottingham, of all descriptions of workmen throughout the Birmingham district, and in various other localities. Each mail brings new reports of strikes; the turn-out grows epidemic. Every one of the larger strikes, like those at Stockport, Liverpool, etc., necessarily generates a whole series of minor strikes, through great numbers of people being unable to carry out their resistance to the masters, unless they appeal to the support of their fellow-workmen in the Kingdom, and the latter, in order to assist them, asking in their turn for higher wages. Besides it becomes alike a point of honor and of interest for each locality not to isolate the efforts of their fellow-workmen by submitting to worse terms, and thus strikes in one locality are echoed by strikes in the remotest other localities. In some instances the demands for higher wages are only a settlement of long-standing arrears with the masters. So with the great Stockport strike.

In January, 1848, the mill-owners of the town made a general reduction of 10 per cent. from all descriptions of factory-workers' wages. This reduction was submitted to upon the condition that when trade revived the 10 per cent. was to be restored. Accordingly the work-people memorialized their employers, early in March, 1853, for the promised advance of 10 per cent.; and as they would not come to arrangements with them, upward of 30,000 hands struck. In the majority of instances, the factory-workmen affirmed distinctly their *right* to *share* in the prosperity of the country, and especially in the prosperity of their employers.

The distinctive feature of the present strikes is this, that they began in the lower ranks of unskilled labor (not factory labor), actually trained by the direct influence of emigration, according to various strata of artizans, till they reached at last the factory people of the great industrial centers of Great Britain; while at all

former periods strikes originated regularly from the heads of the factory-workers, mechanics, spinners, &c., spreading thence to the lower classes of this great industrial hive, and reaching only in the last instance, to the artizans. This phenomenon is to be ascribed solely to emigration.

There exists a class of philanthropists, and even of socialists, who consider strikes as very mischievous to the interests of the "workingman himself," and whose great aim consists in finding out a method of securing permanent average wages. Besides, the fact of the industrial cyclus, with its various phases, putting every such average wages out of the question. I am, on the very contrary, convinced that the alternative rise and fall of wages, and the continual conflicts between masters and men resulting therefrom, are, in the present organization of industry, the indispensable means of holding up the spirit of the laboring classes, of combining them into one great association against the encroachments of the ruling class, and of preventing them from becoming apathetic, thoughtless, more or less well-fed instruments of production. In a state of society founded upon the antagonism of classes, if we want to prevent Slavery in fact as well as in name, we must accept war. In order to rightly appreciate the value of strikes and combinations, we must not allow ourselves to be blinded by the apparent insignificance of their economical results, but hold, above all things, in view their moral and political consequences. Without the great alternative phases of dullness, prosperity, over-excitement, crisis and distress, which modern industry traverses in periodically recurring cycles, with the up and down of wages resulting from them, as with the constant warfare between masters and men closely corresponding with those variations in wages and profits, the working-classes of Great Britain, and of all Europe, would be a heart-broken, a weak-minded, a worn-out, unresisting mass, whose self-emancipation would prove as impossible as that of the slaves of Ancient Greece and Rome. We must not forget that strikes and combinations among the serfs were the hot-beds of the mediaeval communes, and that those communes have been in their turn, the source of life of the now ruling bourgeoisie.

I observed in one of my last letters, of what importance the present labor-crisis must turn out to the Chartist movement in England,^a which anticipation I now find realized by the results obtained in the first two weeks of the reopened campaign by

^a See this volume, pp. 134-37.—*Ed.*

Ernest Jones, the Chartist leader. The first great open-air meeting was, as you know, to be held on the mountain of Blackstone-Edge. On the 19th ult., the Lancashire and Yorkshire delegates of the respective Chartist localities congregated there, constituting themselves as Delegate-Council. Ernest Jones's petition for the Charter was unanimously adopted as that proposed to emanate from the meetings in the two counties, and the presentation of the Lancashire and Yorkshire petitions was voted to be entrusted to Mr. Apsley Pellatt, M. P. for Southwark, who had agreed to undertake the presentation of all Chartist petitions. As to the general meeting, the most sanguine minds did not anticipate its possibility, the weather being terrific, the storm increasing hourly in violence and the rain pouring without intermission. At first there appeared only a few scattered groups climbing up the hill, but soon larger bodies came into sight, and from an eminence that overlooked the surrounding valleys, thin but steady streams of people could be viewed as far as the eye could carry, through the base pelting of the rain, coming upward along the roads and footpaths leading from the surrounding country. By the time at which the meeting was announced to commence, upward of 3,000 people had met on the spot, far removed from any village or habitation, and during the long speeches, the meeting, notwithstanding the most violent deluge of rain, remained steadfast on the ground.

Mr. Edward Hooson's resolution: "That the social grievances of the working classes of the country are the result of class-legislation, and that the only remedy for such class-legislation is the adoption of the people's Charter," was supported by Mr. Gammage, of the Chartist Executive,¹³⁷ and Mr. Ernest Jones, from whose speche: I give some extracts.^a

"The resolution which has been moved attributed the people's [...] grievances to class-legislation. He thought that no man who had watched the course of events could disagree with that statement. The House of Commons, so called, had turned a deaf ear to all their complaints, and when the wail of misery had arisen from the people, it had been mocked and derided by the men who assumed to be the representatives of the nation, and if by any singular chance the voice of the people found an echo in that House, it was always drowned in the clamor of the murderous majority of our class-legislators. [Loud applause.] The House of Commons not only refused to do justice to the people, but it even refused to inquire into their social condition. They would all recollect that sometime ago, Mr. Slaney had introduced into the House a motion for the appointment of a standing

^a Here and below Marx quotes from a report entitled "Glorious Revival of Chartism", *The People's Paper*, No. 60, June 25, 1853.—Ed.

commission, whose business it should be to inquire into that condition and suggest measures of relief—but such was the determination of the House to evade the question, that on the introduction of the motion, only twenty-six members were present, and the House was counted out. [Loud cries of shame, shame.] And on the reintroduction of that motion, so far from Mr. Slaney being successful, he (Mr. Gammage) believed that out of 656 honorable men, but 19 were present even to enter on a discussion of the question. [...] When he told them what was the actual condition of the people, he thought they would agree with him, that there existed abundant reasons for inquiry. They were told by political economists that the annual production of this country was £820,000,000. Assuming that there were in the United Kingdom 5,000,000 of working families, and that such families received an average income of fifteen shillings per week, which he believed was a very high average compared with what they actually received [cries of “a great deal too high”], supposing them, however, to average this amount, they received out of their enormous annual production a miserable one hundred and ninety-five millions,—[cries of shame].—and all the rest went into the pockets of idle landlords, usurers and the capitalist class generally.... Did they require a proof that these men were robbers? [...] They were not the worst of thieves who were confined within the walls of our prisons; the greatest and cleverest of thieves were those who robbed by the power of laws made by themselves, and these large robberies were the cause of all the smaller ones that were transacted throughout the country.... Mr. Gammage then entered into an analysis of the House of Commons, proving [...] that from the classes to which the members of that House belonged, and the classes which they represented, it was impossible that there should exist the smallest sympathy between them and the working millions. In conclusion, said the speaker, the people must become acquainted with their Social Rights.”

Mr. Ernest Jones said:

“To-day we proclaim that the Charter shall be law. [Loud cheers.] I ask you now to reengage in this great movement, because I know that the time has arrived for so doing, and that the game is in your hand, and because I am anxious that you should not let the opportunity go by. Brisk trade and emigration have given you a momentary power, and upon how you use that power depends your future position. If you use it only for the objects of the present, you will break down when the circumstances of the present cease. But if you use it, not only to strengthen your present position, but to secure your future one, you will triumph over all your enemies. If brisk trade and emigration give you power, that power must cease when brisk trade and emigration cease, and unless you secure yourself in the interval, you will be more slaves than ever. [Hear, hear.] But the very sources that cause your strength now will cause your weakness before long. The emigration that makes your labor scarce, will make soon your employment scarcer.... The commercial reaction will set in, and now I ask you, how are you preparing to meet it? [...] You are engaged in a noble labor movement for short time and high wages, and you are practically carrying it through to some extent, [...] but mark! you are not carrying it through Parliament. Mark! the game of the employer is this—amuse them with some concessions, but yield to them no law. Don't pass a Wages bill in Parliament, but concede some of its provisions in the factory. [Hear.] The wages slave will then say, “Never mind a political organization for a Ten Hours bill or a Wages measure—we've got it, ay, ourselves without Parliament.” Yes, but can you keep it without Parliament? What gave it you? Brisk trade. What will take it from you? Dull trade. [...] Your employers know this. [...] Therefore, they shorten your hours of work or raise your wages, or remit their stoppages, in hopes that you

will forego the political organization for these measures. [Cheers.] They shorten the hours of work, well knowing that soon they will run their mills short time—they raise your wages, well knowing that soon they will give thousands of you no wages at all. But they tell you also—the midland manufacturers—that, even if the laws were passed, this would only force them to seek other means of robbing you—that was the plain meaning of their words. So that in the first place, you can't get the acts passed, because you have not got a People's Parliament. In the second place, if they were passed, they tell you that they would circumvent them. [Loud cries of "hear."] Now, I ask you, how are you preparing for the future? How are you using the vast strength you momentarily possess? [...] That [...] you will be powerless, unless you prepare now—you will lose all you may have gained; and we are here to-day to show you how to keep it and get more. [...] Some people fancy a Chartist organization would interfere with the Labor movement. Good Heaven! it is the very thing to make it successful.... The employed cannot do without the employer, unless he can employ himself. The employer can never employ himself, unless he can command the means of work—land, credit and machinery. He can never command these, unless he breaks down the landed, moneyed and mercantile monopolies, and these he cannot subvert except by wielding sovereign power. Why do you seek a Ten Hours bill? If political power is not necessary to secure labor-freedom why go to Parliament at all? Why not do in the factory at once? Why, because you know, you feel, you by that very act admit tacitly, that political power is needed to obtain social emancipation. [Loud cheers.] Then I point you to the foundation of political power—I point you to the suffrage—I point you to the Charter. [Enthusiastic applause.] ... It may be said: "Why do we not wait till the crisis comes, and the millions rally of their own accord." Because we want not a movement of excitement and danger, but one of calm reason and moral strength. We will not see you led away by excitement, but guided by judgment—and therefore we bid you now reorganize—that you may rule the storm, instead of being tossed by it. Again, continental revolution will accompany commercial reaction—and we need to raise a strong beacon of Chartism to light us through the chaos of tempest. [...] To-day, then, we reinaugurate our movement, and to obtain its official recognition, we go through the medium of Parliament—not that we expect them to grant the petition—but because we use them as the most fitting mouth-piece to announce our resurrection to the world. Yes, the very men that proclaimed our death, shall have the unsought pleasure to proclaim our resurrection, and this petition is merely the baptismal register announcing to the world our second birth." [Loud cheers.]

Mr. Hooson's resolution and the petition to Parliament were here, as well as at the subsequent meetings during the week, enthusiastically accepted by acclamation.

At the meeting of Blackstone-Edge, Ernest Jones had announced the death of Benjamin Ruston, a workingman who seven years before, had presided at the great Chartist meeting held at the same spot¹³⁸; and he proposed that his funeral should be made a great political demonstration, and be connected with the West Riding meeting for the adoption of the Charter, as the noblest obsequies to be given to that expired veteran. Never before in the annals of British Democracy, has such a demonstration been witnessed, as that which attended the revival of Chartism

in the West Riding, and the funeral of Benjamin Ruston, on Sunday last,^a when upward of 200,000 people were assembled at Halifax, a number unprecedented even in the most excited times. To those who know nothing of English society but its dull, apoplectic surface, it should be recommended to assist at these workingmen's meetings and to look into those depths where its destructive elements are at work.

The Coalition has gained the preliminary battle on the Indian question, Lord Stanley's motion for delay of legislation having been rejected by a majority of 182 votes.^b Pressure of matter obliges me to delay my comments upon that division.

Written on July 1, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3819, July 14, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 849, July 15, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*; the title is taken from the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*

^a June 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b In the House of Commons on June 30, 1853.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE TURKISH WAR QUESTION.—
THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE IN THE HOUSE
OF COMMONS.—THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA¹³⁹

London, Tuesday, 5th July, 1853

The courier bearing the rejection of the Russian *ultimatissimum*^a on the part of Reshid Pasha, reached St. Petersburg on the 24th ult., and, three days later, a messenger was dispatched with orders for Prince Gorchakoff to cross the Pruth, and to occupy the Principalities.

The Austrian Government has sent Count Gyulay on an extraordinary mission to the Czar, no doubt with a view of cautioning him against the danger of revolution lurking behind any general European war. We may infer the answer of the Russian Cabinet in the present instance from that which it returned to similar representations from the same power in 1829. It was as follows:—

“On this occasion the Austrian Cabinet has reproduced all the motives of alarm created by the fermentation which, according to its opinion and the information it possesses, reigns in more than one country, as well as the progress lately made by the revolutionary tendencies. These apprehensions are more particularly betrayed in the letter of the Emperor Francis to Nicholas. [...] We are far from denying the dangers which Austria points out to us. [...] Since [...] by means of foreign influence [...] the resistance of the Porte assumes a character of obstinacy which delays beyond our wishes and our hopes the term of this crisis, and even demands redoubled efforts to new sacrifices on our part, Russia will be found to devote more than ever her whole attention to interests which so immediately affect the power and the welfare of her subjects; from that moment the means which she could oppose to the breaking out of the revolutionary spirit in the rest of Europe must necessarily be paralyzed. No power, then, ought to be more interested than Austria in the conclusion of peace, but of a peace glorious to the Emperor and advantageous to his empire. For if the treaty we should sign did not bear this character, the political consideration and influence of Russia would experience through it a fatal blow, the *prestige* of her strength would

^a Of June 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

vanish, and the moral support which she might perhaps be called upon to lend in future contingencies to friendly and allied powers would be precarious and inefficacious." (Secret dispatch from Count Nesselrode to M. de Tatistcheff, dated St. Petersburg, 12th February, 1829.)^a

The Press, of last Saturday,^b stated that the Czar, in his disappointment at the conduct of England, and more especially of Lord Aberdeen, had instructed M. de Brunnow to communicate no longer with that "good," old man, but to restrict himself to his official intercourse with the Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

The Vienna *Lloyd*, the organ of the Austrian bankocracy, is very determinedly in favor of Austria siding with England and France for the purpose of discountenancing the aggressive policy of Russia.

You will remember that the Coalition Ministry suffered a defeat on the 14th of April, on the occasion of the proposed repeal of the Advertisement Duty.^c They have now experienced two more defeats, on the 1st inst., on the identical ground. Mr. Gladstone moved on that day to reduce the Advertisement Duty from 1s. 6d. to 6d., and to extend it to advertisements published with any magazine, pamphlet, or other literary work. Mr. Milner Gibson's amendment for the repeal of all duties now payable on advertisements was rejected by 109 against 99 votes. The retainers of Mr. Gladstone thinking that victory had been won, left the House for dinner and a court-ball, when Mr. Bright rose and made a very powerful speech against the taxes on knowledge in general, and the Stamp and Advertisement Duty in particular. From this speech I will quote a few passages^d which may be of interest to you:

"He (Mr. Bright) held in his hand a newspaper which was the same size as the London daily newspapers without a supplement, and it was as good a newspaper, he undertook to say, as any published in London. It was printed with a finer type than any London daily paper. The paper, the material, was exceedingly good—quite sufficient for all the purposes of a newspaper. The printing could not be possibly surpassed, and it contained more matter for its size than any daily paper printed in London. The first, second and third sides were composed of advertisements. There were a long article upon the American Art-Union investigation, a leading article giving a summary of all the latest news from Europe, a leading article on the Fisheries dispute, and a leading article, with which he entirely concurred, stating that public dinners were public nuisances. [Hear, and a

^a Quoted from *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. IV, No. XXVII, pp. 10-12.—*Ed.*

^b July 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 58 and 69.—*Ed.*

^d These passages, like the passage from Richard Cobden's speech, are quoted from *The Times*, No. 21470, July 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

laugh.] He had seen articles perhaps written with more style, but never any that had a better tone, or that were more likely to be useful. Then again there were 'Three days later from Europe,' the 'Arrival of the *Asia*,' and a condensation from all the news from Europe. From Great Britain there was an elaborate disquisition upon the Budget^a of the Rt. Honorable gentleman,^b which did him justice in some parts, but not in others, and which, so far as the Manchester schools were concerned, certainly did them no justice whatever. [Laughter.] Then there were an account of Mrs. Stowe's visit to Edinburgh, a long article from the *London Times* upon the wrongs of dressmakers, articles from Greece, Spain and other continental countries, the Athlone election, and the returns of Her Majesty's Solicitor General by exactly 189 votes—which would very much surprise an American to read—several columns of ordinary news in paragraphs, and most elaborate mercantile and market tables. It wrote steadily in favor of Temperance and Anti-Slavery, and he [Bright] ventured to say that there was not at this moment in London a better paper than that. The name of that paper was the *New-York Tribune*, and it was laid regularly every morning upon the table of every workingman of that city who chose to buy it at the sum of one penny. [Hear, hear.] What he wanted to ask the Government was this: How comes it, and for what good end, and by what contrivance of fiscal oppression was it that one of our workmen here should pay 5d. for a London morning paper, while his direct competitor in New York could buy a paper for 1d.? We were running a race in the face of all the world with the United States; but if our artisans were to be bound either to have no newspaper at all, or to pay 5d. for it, or were to be driven to the public houses to read it, [...] while the artisan in the United States could procure it for 1d., how was it possible that any fair rivalry could be maintained between the artisans of the two countries? As well say that a merchant in England, if he never saw a price-current, would carry on his business with the same facility as the merchant who had that advantage every day. [Hear, hear.] ... If the Chancellor of the Exchequer should oppose what he had stated, he should tell him at once and without hesitation that it was because he had a latent dread of the liberty of the press; and when the right honorable gentleman spoke about financial difficulties, he said it was but a cloak to conceal his lurking horror lest the people should have a free press and greater means of political information. [Hear.] It was the fear that the press would be free which made them keep the 6d. advertisement duty as the buttress to the stamp."

Mr. Craufurd then moved to substitute in lieu of the figure 6d. the cipher 0d. Mr. Cobden supported the motion, and in reply to Mr. Gladstone's statement, that the Advertisement Duty was no question of much importance with regard to the circulation of cheap newspapers, called his attention to the evidence given by Mr. Horace Greeley, who was examined before the Committee which had sat on this subject in 1851.

"This gentleman was one of the Commissioners of the great exhibition, and he was the proprietor of that very newspaper from which his honorable friend, Mr. Bright, had quoted. He was examined as to what the effect of the advertisement

^a The reference is to Marx's article, "Riot at Constantinople.—German Table Moving.—The Budget", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3761, May 6, 1853 (see this volume, pp. 67-74). It is this issue that John Bright analyses in his speech.—*Ed.*

^b William Gladstone.—*Ed.*

duty would be in America, and his reply was that its operation would be to destroy their new papers."

Lord John Russell now got up and said, in rather angry voice, that it was hardly fair to attempt to reverse, in a greatly thinned House, the decisions previously adopted. Of course, Lord John did not recollect that on the very Advertisement Duty his colleagues had been beaten before by a majority of 40, and had only had now a majority of 10. Notwithstanding Lord John's lecture on "constitutional" fairness, the motion of Mr. Gladstone for a duty of 6d. on each advertisement, was negatived by 68 against 63, and Mr. Craufurd's amendment carried by 70 against 61. Mr. Disraeli and his friends voted with the Manchester School.

The House of Commons, in order to do justice to the colossal dimensions of the subject, has been spinning out its Indian debate to an unusual length and breadth, although that debate has failed altogether in depth and greatness of interest. The division leaving Ministers a majority of 322 against 142, is in inverse ratio to the discussion. During the discussion all was thistles for the Ministry, and Sir Charles Wood was the ass officially put to the task of feeding upon them. In the division all is roses, and Sir Charles Wood receives the crown of another *Manu*. The same men who negatived the plan of the Ministry by their arguments, affirmed it by their votes. None of its supporters dared to apologize for the bill itself; on the contrary, all apologized for their supporting the bill, the one because it was an infinitesimal part of a measure in the right direction, the others because it was no measure at all. The former pretend that they will now mend it in Committee; the latter say that they will strip it of all the fancy Reform flowers it parades in.

The Ministry maintained the field by more than one half of the Tory opposition running away, and a great portion of the remainder deserting with Herries and Inglis into the Aberdeen camp, while of the 142 opposite votes 100 belonged to the Disraeli fraction, and 42 to the Manchester School, backed by some Irish discontents and some inexpressibles. The opposition within the opposition has once more saved the Ministry.

Mr. Halliday, one of the officials of the East India Company, when examined before a Committee of Inquiry, stated:

"That the Charter giving a twenty years lease to the East India Company was considered by the natives of India as *farming them out*."^a

^a Quoted from Richard Cobden's speech in the House of Commons on June 27, 1853, published in *The Times*, No. 21466, June 28, 1853.—*Ed.*

This time at least, the Charter has not been renewed for a definite period, but is revokable at will by Parliament. The Company, therefore, will come down from the respectable situation of hereditary farmers, to the precarious condition of tenants-at-will.¹⁴⁰ This is so much gain for the natives. The Coalition Ministry has succeeded in transforming the Indian Government, like all other questions, into an open question. The House of Commons, on the other hand, has given itself a new testimonial of poverty, in confessing by the same division, its impotency for legislating, and its unwillingness to delay legislating.

Since the days of Aristotle the world has been inundated with a frightful quantity of dissertations, ingenious or absurd, as it might happen, on that question: Who shall be the governing power? But for the first time in the annals of history, the Senate of a people ruling over another people numbering 156 millions of human beings and spreading over a surface of 1,368,113 square miles, have put their heads together in solemn and public congregation, in order to answer the irregular question: Who among us is the actual governing power over that foreign people of 150 millions of souls? There was no Oedipus in the British Senate capable of extricating this riddle. The whole debate exclusively twined around it, as although a division took place, no definition of the Indian Government was arrived at.

That there is in India a permanent financial deficit, a regular over-supply of wars, and no supply at all of public works, an abominable system of taxation, and a no less abominable state of justice and law, that these five items constitute, as it were, the five points of the East Indian Charter, was settled beyond all doubt in the debates of 1853, as it had been in the debates of 1833, and in the debates of 1813, and in all former debates on India. The only thing never found out, was the party responsible for all this.

There exists, unquestionably, a Governor-General of India, holding the supreme power, but that Governor is governed in his turn by a home government. Who is that home government? Is it the Indian Minister, disguised under the modest title of President of the Board of Control, or is it the twenty-four Directors of the East India Company? On the threshold of the Indian religion we find a divine trinity, and thus we find a profane trinity on the threshold of the Indian Government.

Leaving, for a while, the Governor-General altogether one side, the question at issue resolves itself into that of the *double Government*, in which form it is familiar to the English mind. The

Ministers in their bill, and the House in its division, cling to this dualism.

When the Company of English merchant adventurers, who conquered India to make money out of it, began to enlarge their factories into an empire, when their competition with the Dutch and French private merchants assumed the character of national rivalry, then, of course, the British Government commenced meddling with the affairs of the East India Company, and the double Government of India sprung up in fact if not in name. Pitt's act of 1784, by entering into a compromise with the Company, by subjecting it to the superintendence of the Board of Control, and by making the Board of Control an appendage to the Ministry, accepted, regulated and settled that double Government arisen from circumstances in name as well as in fact.

The act of 1833 strengthened the Board of Control, changed the proprietors of the East India Company into mere mortgagees of the East India revenues, ordered the Company to sell off its stock, dissolved its commercial existence, transformed it; as far as it existed politically, into a mere trustee of the Crown, and did thus with the East India Company, what the Company had been in the habit of doing with the East India Princes. After having superseded them, it continued, for a while, still to govern in their name. So far, the East India Company has, since 1833, no longer existed but in name and on sufferance. While thus on one hand, there seems to be no difficulty in getting rid of the Company altogether, it is, on the other hand, very indifferent whether the English nation rules over India under the personal name of Queen Victoria, or under the traditional firm of an anonymous society. The whole question, therefore, appears to turn about a technicality of very questionable importance. Still, the thing is not quite so plain.

It is to be remarked, in the first instance, that the Ministerial Board of Control, residing in Cannon-row, is as much a fiction as the East India Company, supposed to reside in Leadenhall-st. The members composing the Board of Control are a mere cloak for the supreme rule of the President of the Board. The President is himself but a subordinate though independent member of the Imperial Ministry. In India it seems to be assumed that if a man is fit for nothing it is best to make him a Judge, and get rid of him. In Great Britain, when a party comes into office and finds itself encumbered with a tenth-rate "statesman," it is considered best to make him President of the Board of Control, successor of the

Great Mogul, and in that way to get rid of him—*teste Carolo Wood*.^a

The letter of the law entrusts the Board of Control, which is but another name for its President, with

“full power and authority to superintend, direct, and control all acts, operations and concerns of the East India Company which in any wise relate to or concern the Government or revenues of the Indian territories.”^b

Directors are prohibited

“from issuing any orders, instructions, dispatches, official letters, or communications whatever relating to India, or to the Government thereof, until the same shall have been sanctioned by the Board.”

Directors are ordered to

“prepare instructions or orders upon any subject whatever at fourteen days’ notice from the Board, or else to transmit the orders of the Board on the subject of India.”

The Board is authorized to inspect all correspondence and dispatches to and from India, and the proceedings of the Courts of Proprietors and Directors. Lastly, the Court of Directors has to appoint a Secret Committee, consisting of their Chairman, their Deputy Chairman and their senior member, who are sworn to secrecy, and through whom, in all political and military matters, the President of the Board may transmit his personal orders to India, while the Committee acts as a mere channel of his communications. The orders respecting the Afghan and Burmese wars, and as to the occupation of Scinde were transmitted through this Secret Committee, without the Court of Directors being any more informed of them than the general public or Parliament. So far, therefore, the President of the Board of Control would appear to be the real Mogul, and, under all circumstances, he retains an unlimited power for doing mischief, as, for instance, for causing the most ruinous wars, all the while being hidden under the name of the irresponsible Court of Directors. On the other hand, the Court of Directors is not without real power. As they generally exercise the initiative in administrative measures, as they form, when compared with the Board of Control, a more permanent and steady body, with traditional rules for action and a certain knowledge of details, the whole of the ordinary internal administration necessarily falls to

^a This is demonstrated by Charles Wood.— *Ed.*

^b Here and below Marx quotes from J. Dickinson’s *The Government of India under a Bureaucracy*, p. 8.— *Ed.*

their share. They appoint, too, under sanction of the Crown, the Supreme Government of India, the Governor-General and his Councils; possessing, besides, the unrestricted power to recall the highest servants, and even the Governor-General, as they did under Sir Robert Peel, with Lord Ellenborough. But this is still not their most important privilege. Receiving only £300 per annum, they are really paid in patronage, distributing all the writerships and cadetships, from whose number the Governor-General of India and the Provincial Governors are obliged to fill up all the higher places withheld from the natives. When the number of appointments for the year is ascertained, the whole are divided into 28 equal parts—of which two are allotted to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, two to the President of the Board of Control, and one to each of the Directors. The annual value of each share of patronage seldom falls short of £14,000.

“All nominations,” says Mr. Campbell, “are now, as it were, the private property of individuals, being divided among the Directors, and each disposing of his share as he thinks fit.”^a

Now, it is evident that the spirit of the Court of Directors must pervade the whole of the Indian Upper Administration, trained, as it is, at schools of Addiscombe and Haileybury, and appointed, as it is, by their patronage. It is no less evident that this Court of Directors, who have to distribute, year after year, appointments of the value of nearly £400,000 among the upper classes of Great Britain, will find little or no check from the public opinion directed by those very classes. What the spirit of the Court of Directors is, I will show in a following letter on the actual state of India.^b For the present it may suffice to say that Mr. Macaulay, in the course of the pending debates, defended the Court by the particular plea, that it was impotent to effect all the evils it might intend, so much so, that all improvements had been effected in opposition to it, and against it by individual Governors who had acted on their own responsibility. Thus with regard to the suppression of the *Suttee*,¹⁴¹ the abolition of the abominable transit duties, and the emancipation of the East India press.

The President of the Board of Control accordingly involves India in ruinous wars under cover of the Court of Directors, while

^a Rendering of a passage from G. Campbell's *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, pp. 263-64.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 196-200 and 213-16.—*Ed.*

the Court of Directors corrupt the Indian Administration under the cloak of the Board of Control.

On looking deeper into the framework of this anomalous government we find at its bottom a third power, more supreme than either the Board or the Court, more irresponsible, and more concealed from and guarded against the superintendence of public opinion. The transient President of the Board depends on the permanent clerks of his establishment in Cannon-row, and for those clerks India exists not in India, but in Leadenhall-st. Now, who is the master at Leadenhall-st.?

Two thousand persons, elderly ladies and valetudinarian gentlemen, possessing Indian stock, having no other interest in India except to be paid their dividends out of Indian revenue, elect twenty-four Directors, whose only qualification is the holding of £1,000 stock. Merchants, bankers and directors of companies incur great trouble in order to get into the Court for the interest of their private concerns.

“A banker,” said Mr. Bright, “in the City of London commands 300 votes of the East India Company, whose word for the election of Directors is almost absolute law.”^a

Hence the Court of Directors is nothing but a *succursal* to the English moneyocracy. The so-elected Court forms, in its turn, besides the above-mentioned Secret Committee, three other Committees, which are 1. Political and Military. 2. Finance and Home. 3. Revenue, Judicial and Legislative. These Committees are every year appointed by rotation, so that a *financier* is one year on the Judicial and the next year on the Military Committee, and no one has any chance of a continued supervision over a particular department. The mode of election having brought in men utterly unfit for their duties, the system of rotation gives to whatever fitness they might perchance retain, the final blow. Who, then, govern in fact under the name of the Direction? A large stuff of irresponsible secretaries, examiners and clerks at the India House,^b of whom, as Mr. Campbell observes, in his *Scheme for the Government of India*, only one individual has ever been in India, and he only by accident. Apart from the trade in patronage, it is therefore a mere fiction to speak of the politics, the principles, and the system of the Court of Directors. The real Court of

^a John Bright's speech is quoted from *The Times*, No. 21466, June 28, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b The East India House was the residence of the Court of Directors of the East India Company in Leadenhall Street in London.—*Ed.*

Directors and the real Home Government, &c., of India are the permanent and irresponsible *bureaucracy*, “the creatures of the desk and the creatures of favor”^a residing in Leadenhall-st. We have thus a Corporation ruling over an immense Empire, not formed, as in Venice, by eminent patricians, but by old obstinate clerks, and the like odd fellows.

No wonder, then, that there exists no government by which so much is written and so little done, as the Government of India. When the East India Company was only a commercial association, they, of course, requested a most detailed report on every item from the managers of their Indian factories, as is done by every trading concern. When the factories grew into an Empire, the commercial items into ship loads of correspondence and documents, the Leadenhall clerks went on in their system, which made the Directors and the Board their dependents; and they succeeded in transforming the Indian Government into one immense writing-machine. Lord Broughton stated in his evidence before the Official Salaries Committee, that with one single dispatch 45,000 pages of collection were sent.

In order to give you some idea of the time-killing manner in which business is transacted at the India House, I will quote a passage from Mr. Dickinson:

“When a dispatch arrives from India, it is referred, in the first instance, to the Examiners’ Department, to which it belongs; after which the Chairs^b confer with the official in charge of that department, and settle with him the tenor of a reply, and transmit a draught of this reply to the Indian Minister,^c in what is technically called P.C., i.e. previous communication. [...] The Chairs, [...] in this preliminary state of P.C. depend mainly on the clerks. [...] Such is this dependence that even in a discussion in the Court of Proprietors, after previous notice, it is pitiable [...] to see the chairman referring to a secretary who sits by his side, and keeps on whispering and prompting and chaffing him as if he were a mere puppet, and [...] the Minister at the other end of the system is in the same predicament. [...] In this stage of P.C., if there is a difference of opinion on the draught it is discussed, and almost invariably settled in friendly communication between the Minister and the Chair; finally the draught is returned by the Minister, either adopted or altered; and then it is submitted to the Committee of Directors superintending the department to which it belongs, with all papers bearing on the case, to be considered and discussed, and adopted or altered, and afterward it is exposed to the same process in the aggregate Court, and then goes, for the first time,

^a These words by E. Burke are quoted from J. Dickinson’s *The Government of India under a Bureaucracy*, as also his statement and a passage from the text by the author below (see pp. 15-16).—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Court of Directors of the East India Company.—*Ed.*

^c Here the reference is to the President of the Board of Control, who was a member of the British Government.—*Ed.*

as an official communication to the Minister," after which it undergoes the same process in the opposite direction.

"When a measure is discussed in India," says Mr. Campbell, "the announcement that it has been referred to the Court of Directors, is [...] regarded as an indefinite postponement."^a

The close and abject spirit of this bureaucracy deserves to be stigmatised in the celebrated words of Burke:

"This tribe of vulgar politicians are the lowest of our species. There is no trade so vile and mechanical as Government in their hands. Virtue is not their habit. They are out of themselves in any course of conduct recommended only by conscience and glory. A large, liberal and prospective view of the interests of States passes with them for romance; and the principles that recommend it, for the wanderings of a disordered imagination. The calculators compute them out of their senses. The jesters and buffoons shame them out of everything grand and elevated. Littleness in object and in means to them appears soundness and sobriety."

The clerical establishments of Leadenhall-st. and Cannon-row cost the Indian people the trifle of £160,000 annually. The oligarchy involves India in wars, in order to find employment for their younger sons; the moneyocracy consigns it to the highest bidder; and a subordinate Bureaucracy paralyse its administration and perpetuate its abuses as the vital condition of their own perpetuation.

Sir Charles Wood's bill alters nothing in the existing system. It enlarges the power of the Ministry, without adding to its responsibility.

Written on July 5, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3824, July 20, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 851, July 22, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a G. Campbell, *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, p. 215.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[LAYARD'S MOTION.—
STRUGGLE OVER THE TEN HOURS' BILL]¹⁴²

London, Friday, July 8, 1853

With the actual occupation of the Danubian Principalities and the drawing near of the long-predicted crisis, the English Press has remarkably lowered its warlike language, and little opposition is made to the advice tendered in two consecutive leaders of *The Times*^a that, "as the Russians could not master their propensity for civilizing barbarian provinces, England had better let them do as they desired, and avoid a disturbance of the peace by vain obstinacy."

The anxiety of the Government to withhold all information on the pending Turkish question betrayed itself in a most ridiculous farce, acted at the same time in both Houses of Parliament. In the House of Commons Mr. Layard, the celebrated restorer of ancient Nineveh,¹⁴³ had given notice that he would move this evening that the fullest information with regard to Turkey and Russia should be laid before the House. On this notice having been given, the following scene occurred in the lower House^b:

Mr. *Layard*—The notice of my motion was given for to-morrow. I received a note yesterday afternoon asking me to put off the motion to Monday, 11th inst. I was not able to return an answer yesterday afternoon—in fact, not till this morning. To my surprise, I find that, without my knowledge, I was in the House yesterday; for I find from the notices of motions printed with the votes, that Mr. Layard postponed his motion from Friday the 8th to Monday 11th! [...] It seems scarcely fair that independent members should be treated in this way.

Mr. *Gladstone*—I do not know by whose direction or authority the notice of postponement was placed on the notes of the House. Of one thing I can assure the hon. member, that whatever was done, was done in perfect *bona fides*.

^a *The Times*, No. 21475, July 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Rendering of passages from debates in the two Houses on July 7 is according to the report in *The Times*, No. 21475, July 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

Mr. *Layard*—I should like to know who put that notice of postponement in the paper. What reason have you for deferring the motion to Monday?

Mr. *Gladstone*—An indisposition of Lord J. Russell.

Mr. *Layard* then withdrew his motion until Monday.

Mr. *Disraeli*—This appears to me an arrangement of business which requires explanation on the part of the Government—the more so as the India Bill, too, contrary to agreement, is placed on the notes for to-morrow.

After a pause,

Sir *C. Wood* humbly confesses to have been the double sinner, but, availing himself of Mr. Gladstone's suggestion, declared that he had acted with regard to Mr. Layard with the *best intentions in the world*.

The opposite side of the medal was exhibited in the House of Lords, where, at all events, the bodily disposition of poor little Russell had nothing to do with the motion of the Marquis of Clanricarde, similar to that of Mr. Layard, and likewise announced for Friday, after it had already several times been adjourned on the request of Ministers.

Lord *Brougham* rose, with the assurance that he had not communicated with any member of the Ministry, but that he found the motion of Lord Clanricarde, announced for to-morrow, most inconvenient in the present state of affairs. For this he would refer to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Lord *Clarendon* could certainly not say that there would be neither mischief nor inconvenience in a full discussion of the subject at present. Negotiations were going on; but after the various postponements, he felt that he ought not to ask again his noble friend to withdraw his motion. Yet he reserved to himself, in reply to him, to say nothing more than that which his sense of public duty allowed. Nevertheless, he would ask his noble friend whether he would object to at least postponing the motion until Monday next, it being convenient to have this discussion in both Houses at the same time, and Lord J. Russell being extremely unwell?

Earl of *Ellenborough*—The noble Marquis opposite would only exercise a sound discretion if he deferred not only to Monday, but generally, without fixing at present any day for the motion of which he has given notice for to-morrow.

Lord *Derby*—He had been taken by surprise on finding the noble Marquis bringing the question under consideration, and he concurred entirely with the views of the noble Earl (Ellenborough).

Earl *Grey*—After the declaration of Lord Clarendon the propriety of postponing discussion must be obvious to every one.

The Marquis of Clanricarde then withdrew his motion.

Earl *Fitzwilliam*—He would ask whether the Russian manifesto, the declaration of a *holy war* against Turkey, dated June 26, was authentic?

Earl *Clarendon*—He had received that document from Her Majesty's Minister at St. Petersburg.

Earl of *Malmesbury*—It was due to the dignity of their Lordships that they should be assured by Government of its intention to prevent, as far as it could, a similar discussion taking place on Monday in the other House.

Earl of *Aberdeen*—He and his colleagues would exercise any influence they possessed to do their utmost for preventing that discussion.

To resume: The House of Commons is first made to adjourn discussion by a fraud. Then, under the pretense that the House of Commons had adjourned discussion, the House of Lords is made to do the same. Then the "noble" Lords resolve to postpone the motion *ad infinitum*; and lastly, the dignity of the "noblest assembly on the face of the earth" requires that the Commons too should postpone the motion *ad infinitum*.

On an interpellation from Mr. Liddell, Lord Palmerston declared in the same sitting:

The recent obstruction of the navigation of the Sulina Canal of the Danube, had been caused by the accidental circumstance of the waters of the river having overflowed and spread over the banks, and so far diminished the force of the current as to increase the quantity of mud on the bar. [...] I am bound to say that, for many years past, the Government has had reason to complain of the neglect of the Government of Russia to perform its duties as the possessor of the territory of which the Delta of the Danube is composed, and to maintain the Canal of the Sulina [...] in efficient navigable state, although Russia always admitted that it was her duty to do so, by virtue of the treaty of Adrianople. [...] While these mouths of the Danube formed parts of the Turkish Territory, there was maintained a depth of 16 feet on the bar, whereas, by neglect of the Russian authorities the depth had diminished to 11 feet, and even these 11 feet were reduced to a small and narrow canal from obstructions on the sides, from sand-banks and from vessels wrecked and sunk, and allowed to remain there, so that it was difficult for any vessel to pass except in calm weather and with a skillful pilot. [...] There was rivalry on the part of Odessa, where existed a desire to obstruct the export of produce by the Danube, and to divert it, if possible by way of Odessa.

Probably the English Ministry hope that, in case of the Principalities becoming Russian, the mouths of the Danube will reopen according as the rivalry of Odessa will be shut.

A few months ago I took occasion to remark on the progress of the Ten Hours' agitation in the Factory districts.^a The movement has been going on all the while, and has at last found an echo in the Legislature. On the 5th inst., Mr. Cobbett, M. P. for Oldham, moved for leave to bring in a bill to restrict factory labor to ten hours on the first five days of the week, and to seven and a half hours on Saturday. Leave was given to bring in the bill. During the preliminary debate, Lord Palmerston, in the warmth of improvisation, allowed a distinct threat to escape him, that, if no other means for protecting the factory women and children existed, he would propose a restriction of the moving power. The sentence had scarcely fallen from his lips, when a general storm of indignation burst forth against the incautious statesman, not only from the direct representatives of millocracy, but particularly from

^a The reference is to the article "Parliamentary Debates.—The Clergy Against Socialism.—Starvation" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 522-27).—*Ed.*

their and his own Whig friends, such as Sir George Grey, Mr. Labouchere, &c. Lord J. Russell having taken Palmerston aside, and after half an hour's private *pourparler*, had to labor very hard to appease the storm, by assuring them that "it appeared to him that his honorable friend had been entirely misunderstood, and that in expressing himself *for* a restriction of the moving power, his friend had meant to express himself *against* it." Such absurd compromises are the daily bread of the Coalition. At all events *they* have the right to say one thing and to mean another. As to Lord Palmerston himself, be it not forgotten that that old dandy of Liberalism expelled a few years ago some hundred Irish families from his "estates," much in the same way as the Duchess of Sutherland did with the ancient clansmen.^a

Mr. Cobbett, who moved the bill, is the son of the renowned William Cobbett, and represents the same borough his father did. His politics, like his seat, are the inheritance of his father, and therefore independent indeed, but rather incoherent with the state of present parties. William Cobbett was the most able representative, or, rather, the creator of old English Radicalism. He was the first who revealed the mystery of the hereditary party warfare between Tories and Whigs, stripped the parasitic Whig Oligarchy of their sham liberalism, opposed landlordism in its every form, ridiculed the hypocritical rapacity of the Established Church, and attacked the moneyocracy in its two most eminent incarnations—the "Old Lady of Threadneedle-st." (Bank of England) and Mr. Muckworm & Co. (the national creditors). He proposed to cancel the national debt, to confiscate the Church estates, and to abolish all sorts of paper money. He watched step for step the encroachments of political centralization on local self-government, and denounced it as an infringement on the privileges and liberties of the English subject. He did not understand its being the necessary result of industrial centralization. He proclaimed all the political demands which have afterward been combined in the national charter; yet with him they were rather the political charter of the petty industrial middle class than of the industrial proletarian. A plebeian by instinct and by sympathy, his intellect rarely broke through the boundaries of middle-class reform. It was not until 1834, shortly before his death, after the establishment of the new Poor Law,¹⁴⁴ that William Cobbett began to suspect the existence of a millocracy as hostile to the mass of the

^a See Marx's article "Elections.—Financial Clouds.—The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery" (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 486-94).—*Ed.*

people, as landlords, banklords, public creditors, and the clergymen of the Established Church. If William Cobbett was thus, on one hand, an anticipated modern Chartist, he was, on the other hand, and much more, an inveterate John Bull. He was at once the most conservative and the most destructive man of Great Britain—the purest incarnation of Old England and the most audacious initiator of Young England. He dated the decline of England from the period of the Reformation, and the ulterior prostration of the English people from the so-called glorious Revolution of 1688. With him, therefore, revolution was not innovation, but restoration; not the creation of a new age, but the rehabilitation of the “good old times.” What he did not see, was that the epoch of the pretended decline of the English people coincided exactly with the beginning ascendancy of the middle class, with the development of modern commerce and industry, and that, at the same pace as the latter grew up, the material situation of the people declined, and local self-government disappeared before political centralization. The great changes attending the decomposition of the old English Society since the eighteenth century struck his eyes and made his heart bleed. But if he saw the effects, he did not understand the causes; the new social agencies at work. He did not see the modern *bourgeoisie*, but only that fraction of the aristocracy which held the hereditary monopoly of office, and which sanctioned by law all the changes necessitated by the new wants and pretensions of the middle class. He saw the machine, but not the hidden motive power. In his eyes, therefore, the Whigs were responsible for all the changes supervening since 1688. They were the prime motors of the decline of England and the degradation of its people. Hence his fanatical hatred against, and his ever recurring denunciation of the Whig oligarchy. Hence the curious phenomenon, that William Cobbett, who represented by instinct the mass of the people against the encroachments of the middle class, passed in the eyes of the world and in his own conviction for the representative of the industrial middle class against the hereditary aristocracy. As a writer he has not been surpassed.

The present Mr. Cobbett, by continuing under altered circumstances the politics of his father, has necessarily sunk into the class of liberal Tories.

The Times, anxious to make good for its humble attitude against the Russian Czar^a by increased insolence against the English

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed*

workingmen, brings a leader on Mr. Cobbett's motion that aims to be monstrous, but happens to turn out plainly absurd. It cannot deny that the restriction of the moving power is the only means for enforcing upon the factory lords a submission to the existing laws with regard to the hours of factory labor. But it fails to understand how any man of common sense who aims at attaining an end can propose the only adequate means to it. The existing *Ten-and-a-half-hours* act,¹⁴⁵ like all other factory laws, is but a fictitious concession made by the ruling classes to the working-people; and the workingmen, not satisfied with the mere appearance of a concession, dare insist upon its reality. *The Times* has never heard of a thing more ridiculous or more extravagant. If a master should be prevented by Parliament from working his hands during 12, 16, or any other number of hours, then, says *The Times*, "England is no longer a place for a freeman to live in."^a Thus the South Carolina gentleman who was placed before and condemned by a London Magistrate for having publicly whipped the Negro he had brought with him from the other side of the Atlantic, exclaimed in a most exasperated state of mind, "You don't call this a free country where a man is forbidden to whip his own nigger?" If a man becomes a factory hand, and enters into contract with a master, in virtue of which he sells himself for sixteen or eighteen hours, instead of taking his sleep as better-circumstanced mortals can do, you have to explain that, says *The Times*,

"by that natural impulse which perpetually adjusts the supply to the demand, and directs people to the occupation *most agreeable and most suited to themselves*."

Legislation, of course, must not interfere with this *travail attrayant*.^b If you restrict the moving power of machinery to a definite portion of the day, say from 6 o'clock, A. M. to 6 P. M., then, says *The Times*, you might as well suppress machinery altogether. If you stop the gas-light in the public thoroughfares as soon as the sun rises, you must stop it also during the night. *The Times* forbids legislative interference with private concerns, and therefore, perhaps, it defends the duty on paper, on advertisements, and the newspaper-stamp, in order to keep down the private concerns of its competitors, asking the Legislature to relieve its own concern of the supplement duty. It professes an utter abhorrence of parliamentary interference with the sacred

^a Here and below Marx quotes the second editorial of *The Times*, No. 21474, July 7, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Attractive labour.—*Ed.*

interest of mill-lords, where the lives and the morals of whole generations are at stake, while it has croaked its most determined interference with cabmen and hackney-coach proprietors, where nothing was at stake except the conveniences of some fat city-men, and perhaps the gentlemen of Printing-house-square.^a Till now the middle-class economists have told us that the principal use of machinery was its shortening and superseding bodily labor and drudgery. Now *The Times* confesses that, under present class-arrangements machinery does not shorten but prolong the hours of labor—that it firstly bereaves the individual labor of its quality, and then forces the laborer to make up for the loss in quality by quantity—thus adding hour to hour, night labor to day labor, in a process which only stops at the intervals of industrial crises, when the man is refused any labor at all—when the factory is shut before his nose, and when he may enjoy holidays or hang himself if he pleases.

Written on July 8, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3826, and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 851, July 22, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a The square in London where *The Times* had its main offices.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE RUSSO-TURKISH DIFFICULTY.—
DUCKING AND DODGING OF THE BRITISH
CABINET.—NESSELRODE'S LAST NOTE.—
THE EAST INDIA QUESTION¹⁴⁶

London, Tuesday, July 12, 1853

The Parliamentary farce of Thursday last was continued and brought to a close in the sitting of Friday, 8th inst. Lord Palmerston requested Mr. Layard not only to put off his motion to Monday, but never to make any mention of it again. "Monday was now to go the way of Friday." Mr. Bright took the opportunity of congratulating Lord Aberdeen on his cautious policy, and generally to assure him of his entire confidence.

"Were the Peace Society¹⁴⁷ itself the Cabinet," says *The Morning Advertiser*, "it could not have done more to encourage Russia, to discourage France, to endanger Turkey, and discredit England, than the very good Aberdeen. [...] Mr. Bright's speech was meant as a sort of Manchester manifesto in favor of the tremblers of the Cabinet."^a

The Ministerial efforts for burking the intended question of Mr. Layard originated in a well-founded fear that the internal dissensions in the Cabinet could have no longer been kept a secret to the public. Turkey must fall to pieces, that the Coalition may keep together. Next to Lord Aberdeen, the Ministers most favorable to the tricks of Russia, are the following: The Duke of Argyll, Lord Clarendon, Lord Granville, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Cardwell, and the "Radical" Sir William Molesworth. Lord Aberdeen is said to have threatened at one time to offer his resignation. The "vigorous" Palmerston (*civis Romanus sum*¹⁴⁸) party, of course, was but wanting such a pretext for yielding. They resolved that a common representation should be addressed

^a "The 'Interpellations' on 'Monday'", *The Morning Advertiser*, July 11, 1853.—*Ed.*

to the Courts of St. Petersburg and Constantinople, recommending that the "privileges demanded by the Czar for the Greek Christians should be secured to Christians of all denominations in the Turkish dominions, under a treaty of guaranty, to which the great powers should be parties." This identical proposition was, however, already made to Prince Menchikoff, on the eve of his departure from Constantinople, and was made, as everybody knows, to no purpose. It is, therefore, utterly ridiculous to expect any result from its repetition, the more so, as it is now a matter beyond all doubt that what Russia insists upon having is exactly a treaty which the great powers, viz.: Austria and Prussia, now no longer resist. Count Buol, the Austrian Premier, is brother-in-law to Count Pouilly Meyendorff, the Russian Minister, and acts in perfect agreement with Russia. On the same day on which the two Coalition parties, the slumbering and the "vigorous," came to the above resolution, the *Patrie* published the following:

"The new Internuncio of Austria, at Constantinople, M. de Bruck, commenced by calling upon the Porte to pay 5,000,000 piasters as an indemnity, and to consent to the delivery of the ports of Kleck and Sutturina. This demand was considered as a support given to Russia."^a

This is not the only support given by Austria to the Russian interests at Constantinople. In 1848, it will be remembered, that whenever the Princes wanted to shoot their people, they provided a "misunderstanding." The same stratagem is now being employed against Turkey. The Austrian Consul at Smyrna causes the kidnapping of a Hungarian^b from an English coffee house on board an Austrian vessel, and after the refugees have answered this attempt by the killing of an Austrian officer and the wounding [of] another one, M. de Bruck demands satisfaction from the Porte within 24 hours.¹⁴⁹ Simultaneously with this news, *The Morning Post* of Saturday reports a rumor that the Austrians had entered Bosnia. The Coalition, questioned as to the authenticity of this rumor, in yesterday's sitting of both Houses of Parliament, had, of course, received "no information;" Russell alone venturing the suggestion^c that the rumor had probably no other foundation than the fact that the Austrians collected troops at Peterwardein. Thus is fulfilled the prediction of M. de Tatistcheff, in 1828, that Austria, when things were come to a decisive turn, would eagerly make ready for sharing in the spoil.

^a *La Patrie*, No. 190, July 9, 1853.— *Ed.*

^b M. Koszta (arrested by order of Consul Weckbecker).— *Ed.*

^c In his House of Commons speech of July 11, 1853, published in *The Times*, No. 21478, July 12, 1853.— *Ed.*

A dispatch from Constantinople, dated 26th ult., states:

“The Sultan,^a in consequence of the rumors that the whole Russian fleet has left Sebastopol and is directing its course toward the Bosphorus, has inquired of the Ambassadors of England and France^b whether, in the event of the Russians making a demonstration before the Bosphorus, the combined fleets are ready to pass the Dardanelles. Both answered in the affirmative. A Turkish steamer, with French and English officers on board, has just been sent from the Bosphorus to the Black Sea, in order to *reconnoitre*.”^c

The first thing the Russians did after their entry into the Principalities, was to prohibit the publication of the Sultan’s firman confirming the privileges of all kinds of Christians, and to suppress a German paper edited at Bucharest, which had dared to publish an article on the Eastern question. At the same time, they pressed from the Turkish Government the first annuity stipulated for their former occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia, in 1848-49. Since 1828 the Protectorate of Russia has cost the Principalities 150,000,000 piasters, beside the immense losses caused through pillage and devastation. England defrayed the expenses of Russia’s wars against France, France that of her war against Persia, Persia that of her war against Turkey, Turkey and England that of her war against Poland; Hungary and the Principalities have now to pay her war against Turkey.

The most important event of the day is the new circular note of Count Nesselrode dated St. Petersburg, 20th June, 1853. It declares that the Russian armies will not evacuate the Principalities until the Sultan shall have yielded to all the demands of the Czar,^d and the French and English fleets shall have left the Turkish waters. The note in question reads like a direct scorn of England and France. Thus it says:

“The position taken by the two maritime Powers is a maritime occupation which gives us a reason for reestablishing the equilibrium of the reciprocal situations by taking up a military position.”^e

Be it remarked, that Besika Bay is at a distance of 150 miles from Constantinople. The Czar claims for himself the right of occupying Turkish territory, while he defies England and France to occupy neutral waters without his special permission. He extols

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b Stratford de Redcliffe and Edmond De la Cour.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from *The Morning Post*, No. 24821, July 11, 1853. Part of the passage is freely rendered.—*Ed.*

^d Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^e Here and below Marx quotes from *The Times*, No. 21478, July 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

his own magnanimous forbearance in having left the Porte complete mistress of choosing under what form She will abdicate her sovereignty—whether “convention, sened, or other synallagmatic act, or even under the form of signing a simple note.” He is persuaded that “impartial Europe” must understand that the treaty of Kainardji, which gives Russia the right of protecting a single Greek chapel at Stamboul,¹⁵⁰ proclaims her *eo ipso* the Rome of the Orient. He regrets that the West is ignorant of the inoffensive character of a Russian religious protectorate in foreign countries. He proves his solicitude for the integrity of the Turkish Empire by historical facts—“the very moderate use he made in 1829 of his victory of Adrianople,” when he was only prevented from being immoderate by the miserable condition of his army, and by the threat of the English admiral, that, authorized or not authorized, he would bombard every coast-place along the Black Sea; when all he obtained was due to the “forbearance” of the Western Cabinets, and the perfidious destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino.¹⁵¹

“In 1833, he alone in Europe saved Turkey from inevitable dismemberment.”

In 1833 the Czar concluded, through the famous treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, a *defensive alliance* with Turkey, by which foreign fleets were forbidden to approach Constantinople,¹⁵² by which Turkey was saved only from dismemberment, in order to be saved entire for Russia.

“In 1839 he took the initiative with the other Powers in the propositions which, executed in common, prevented the Sultan from seeing his throne give place to a new Arabian Empire.”

That is to say, in 1839 he made the other Powers take the initiative in the destruction of the Egyptian fleet, and in the reduction to impotence of the only man^a who might have converted Turkey into a vital danger to Russia, and replaced a “dressed up turban” by a real head.

“The fundamental principle of the policy of our august master has always been to maintain, as long as possible, the *status quo* of the East.”

Just so. He has carefully preserved the decomposition of the Turkish State, under the exclusive guardianship of Russia.

It must be granted that a more ironical document the East has never dared to throw in the face of the West. But its author is

^a Mohammed Ali.—*Ed.*

Nesselrode—a nettle, at once, and a rod.^a It is a document, indeed, of Europe's degradation under the rod of counter-revolution. Revolutionists may congratulate the Czar on this masterpiece. If Europe withdraws, she withdraws not with a simple defeat, but passes, as it were, under *furcae Caudinae*.¹⁵³

While the English Queen^b is, at this moment, feasting Russian Princesses; while an enlightened English aristocracy and bourgeoisie lie prostrate before the barbarian autocrat, the English proletariat alone protests against the impotency and degradation of the ruling classes. On the 7th July the Manchester School held a great Peace meeting in the Odd-Fellows Hall, at Halifax. Crossley, M. P. for Halifax, and all the other "great men" of the School had especially flocked to the meeting from "town."^c The hall was crowded, and many thousands could obtain no admittance. Ernest Jones (whose agitation in the factory districts is gloriously progressing, as you may infer from the number of Charter petitions presented to Parliament, and from the attacks of the middle-class provincial press), was, at the time, at Durham. The Chartists of Halifax, the place where he has twice been nominated and declared by show of hands¹⁵⁴ as a candidate for the House of Commons, summoned him by electric telegraph, and he appeared just in time for the meeting. Already the gentlemen of the Manchester School believed they would carry their resolution, and would be able to bring home the support of the manufacturing districts to their good Aberdeen, when Ernest Jones rose and put an amendment pledging the people to *war*, and declaring that before liberty was established peace was a crime. There ensued a most violent discussion, but the amendment of Ernest Jones was carried by an immense majority.

The clauses of the India Bill are passing one by one, the debate scarcely offering any remarkable features,^d except the inconsistency of the so-called India Reformers. There is, for instance, my Lord Jocelyn, M. P., who has made a kind of political livelihood by his periodical denunciation of Indian wrongs, and of the maladministration of the East India Company. What do you think his amendment amounted to? To give the East India Company a lease for 10 years. Happily, it compromised no one but himself. There is another professional "Reformer," Mr. Jos. Hume, who,

^a A pun: "Nessel" in German means "nettle" and "rode" reminds of "rod".—*Ed.*

^b Victoria.—*Ed.*

^c London.—*Ed.*

^d The debate in the House of Commons on July 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

during his long Parliamentary life, has succeeded in transforming opposition itself into a particular manner of supporting the ministry. He proposed not to reduce the number of East India Directors from 24 to 18. The only amendment of common sense, yet agreed to, was that of Mr. Bright, exempting Directors nominated by the Government from the qualification in East India Stock, imposed by the Directors elected by the Court of Proprietors. Go through the pamphlets published by the East Indian Reform Association,¹⁵⁵ and you will feel a similar sensation as when, hearing of one great act of accusation against Bonaparte, devised in common by Legitimists, Orleanists, Blue and Red Republicans, and even disappointed Bonapartists. Their only merit until now has been to draw public attention to Indian affairs in general, and further they cannot go in their present form of eclectic opposition. For instance, while they attack the doings of the English aristocracy in India, they protest against the destruction of the Indian aristocracy of native princes.

After the British intruders had once put their feet on India, and made up their mind to hold it, there remained no alternative but to break the power of the native princes by force or by intrigue. Placed with regard to them in similar circumstances as the ancient Romans with regard to their allies, they followed in the track of Roman politics. "It was," says an English writer, "a system of fattening allies, as we fatten oxen, till they were worthy of being devoured." After having won over their allies in the way of ancient Rome, the East India Company executed them in the modern manner of Change-Alley.¹⁵⁶ In order to discharge the engagements they had entered into with the Company, the native princes were forced to borrow enormous sums from Englishmen at usurious interest. When their embarrassment had reached the highest pitch, the creditor got inexorable, "the screw was turned" and the princes were compelled either to concede their territories amicably to the Company, or to begin war; to become pensioners on their usurpers in one case, or to be deposed as traitors in the other. At this moment the native States occupy an area of 699,961 square miles, with a population of 52,941,263 souls, being, however, no longer the allies, but only the dependents of the British Government, upon multifarious conditions, and under the various forms of the subsidiary¹⁵⁷ and of the protective systems. These systems have in common the relinquishment, by the native States of the right of self-defense, of maintaining diplomatic relations, and of settling the disputes among themselves without the interference of the Governor-General. All of them have to pay

a tribute, either in hard cash, or in a contingent of armed forces commanded by British officers. The final absorption or annexation of these native States is at present eagerly controverted between the Reformers who denounce it as a crime, and the men of business who excuse it as a necessity.

In my opinion the question itself is altogether improperly put. As to the native *States* they virtually ceased to exist from the moment they became subsidiary to or protected by the Company. If you divide the revenue of a country between two governments, you are sure to cripple the resources of the one and the administration of both. Under the present system the native States succumb under the double incubus of their native Administration and the tributes and inordinate military establishments imposed upon them by the Company. The conditions under which they are allowed to retain their apparent independence are at the same time the conditions of a permanent decay, and of an utter inability of improvement. Organic weakness is the constitutional law of their existence, as of all existences living upon sufferance. It is, therefore, not the native *States*, but the native *Princes* and Courts about whose maintenance the question revolves. Now, is it not a strange thing that the same men who denounce "the barbarous splendors of the Crown and Aristocracy of England" are shedding tears at the downfall of Indian Nabobs, Rajahs, and Jagheerdars,¹⁵⁸ the great majority of whom possess not even the prestige of antiquity, being generally usurpers of very recent date, set up by English intrigue! There exists in the whole world no despotism more ridiculous, absurd and childish than that of those *Schazenaïns* and *Schariars* of the *Arabian Nights*. The Duke of Wellington, Sir J. Malcolm, Sir Henry Russell, Lord Ellenborough, General Briggs, and other authorities, have pronounced in favor of the *status quo*; but on what grounds? Because the native troops under English rule want employment in the petty warfares with their own countrymen, in order to prevent them from turning their strength against their own European masters. Because the existence of independent States gives occasional employment to the English troops. Because the hereditary princes are the most servile tools of English despotism, and check the rise of those bold military adventurers with whom India has and ever will abound. Because the independent territories afford a refuge to all discontented and enterprising native spirits. Leaving aside all these arguments, which state in so many words that the native princes are the strongholds of the present abominable English system and the greatest obstacles to Indian progress, I come to Sir Thomas

Munro and Lord Elphinstone, who were at least men of superior genius, and of real sympathy for the Indian people. They think that without a native aristocracy there can be no energy in any other class of the community, and that the subversion of that aristocracy will not raise but debase a whole people. They may be right as long as the natives, under direct English rule, are systematically excluded from all superior offices, military and civil. Where there can be no great men by their own exertion, there must be great men by birth, to leave to a conquered people some greatness of their own. That exclusion, however, of the native people from the English territory, has been effected only by the maintenance of the hereditary princes in the so-called independent territories. And one of these two concessions had to be made to the native army, on whose strength all British rule in India depends. I think we may trust the assertion of Mr. Campbell, that the native Indian Aristocracy are the least enabled to fill higher offices; that for all fresh requirements it is necessary to create a fresh class; and that

“from the acuteness and aptness to learn of the inferior classes, this can be done in India as it can be done in no other country.”^a

The native princes themselves are fast disappearing by the extinction of their houses; but, since the commencement of this century, the British Government has observed the policy of allowing them to make *heirs by adoption*, or of filling up their vacant seats with puppets of English creation. The great Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, was the first to protest openly against this system. Were not the natural course of things artificially resisted, there would be wanted neither wars nor expenses to do away with the native princes.

As to the *pensioned princes*, the £2,468,969 assigned to them by the British Government on the Indian revenue is a most heavy charge upon a people living on rice, and deprived of the first necessaries of life. If they are good for any thing, it is for exhibiting Royalty in its lowest stage of degradation and ridicule. Take, for instance, the Great Mogul,^b the descendant of Timour Tamerlane¹⁵⁹: He is allowed £120,000 a year. His authority does not extend beyond the walls of his palace, within which the Royal idiotic race, left to itself, propagates as freely as rabbits. Even the police of Delhi is held by Englishmen above his control. There he

^a G. Campbell, *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, p. 64.—*Ed.*

^b Bahadur Shah II.—*Ed.*

sits on his throne, a little shriveled yellow old man, trimmed in a theatrical dress, embroidered with gold, much like that of the dancing girls of Hindostan. On certain State occasions, the tinsel-covered puppet issues forth to gladden the hearts of the loyal. On his days of reception strangers have to pay a fee, in the form of guineas, as to any other *saltimbanque* exhibiting himself in public; while he, in his turn, presents them with turbans, diamonds, etc. On looking nearer at them, they find that the Royal diamonds are, like so many pieces of ordinary glass, grossly painted and imitating as roughly as possible the precious stones, and jointed so wretchedly, that they break in the hand like gingerbread.

The English money-lenders, combined with the English Aristocracy, understand, we must own, the art of degrading Royalty, reducing it to the nullity of constitutionalism at home, and to the seclusion of etiquette abroad. And now, here are the Radicals, exasperated at this spectacle!^a

Written on July 12, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3828, July 25, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 852, July 26, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a This sentence was omitted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*.—Ed.

Karl Marx

WAR IN BURMA.—THE RUSSIAN QUESTION.—
CURIOUS DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENCE¹⁶⁰

London, Friday, July 15, 1853

By the latest overland mail from India, intelligence has been received that the Burmese ambassadors have rejected the treaty proposed by General Godwin. The General afforded them 24 hours more for reflection, but the Burmese departed within 10 hours. A third edition of the interminable Burmese war appears to be inevitable.¹⁶¹

Of all the warlike expeditions of the British in the East, none have ever been undertaken on less warranted grounds than those against Burma. There was no possible danger of invasion from that side, as there was from the North-West, Bengal being separated from Burma by a range of mountains, across which troops cannot be marched. To go to war with Burma the Indian Government is obliged to go to sea. To speak of maritime aggressions on the part of the Burmese is as ridiculous, as the idea of their coast-junks fronting the Company's war steamers would be preposterous. The pretension that the Yankees had strong annexation propensities applied to Pegu, is borne out by no facts. No argument, therefore, remains behind, but the want of employment for a needy aristocracy, the necessity of creating, as an English writer says, "a regular quality-workhouse, or Hampton Court^a in the East." The first Burmese war (1824-26), entered into under the Quixotic administration of Lord Amherst, although it lasted little more than two years, added thirteen millions to the Indian debt. The maintenance of the Eastern settlements at

^a A palace on the Thames near London, the residence of the English kings from the 16th to the 18th centuries; in Marx's time it was the home of royal pensioners.—*Ed.*

Singapore, Penang and Malacca, exclusive of the pay of troops, causes an annual excess of expenditure over income amounting to £100,000. The territory taken from the Burmese in 1826 costs as much more. The territory of Pegu is still more ruinous. Now, why is it that England shrinks from the most necessary war in Europe, as now against Russia, while she tumbles, year after year, into the most reckless wars in Asia? The national debt has made her a trembler in Europe—the charges of the Asiatic wars are thrown on the shoulders of the Hindoos. But we may expect from the now impending extinction of the Opium revenue of Bengal, combined with the expenses of another Burmese war, that they will produce such a crisis in the Indian exchequer, as will cause a more thorough reform of the Indian Empire than all the speeches and tracts of the Parliamentary Reformers in England.

Yesterday, in the House of Commons, Mr. Disraeli asked Ministers, whether, after the latest circular note of the Russian Cabinet, Mr. Layard might not very properly bring in his motion. Lord John Russell answered, that it appeared to him by far the best not to hear Mr. Layard at present, as, since the publication of that note, it was more important than ever to negotiate. “The notion of the honorable member, that negotiations had come now to a deadlock, was an erroneous notion.” Lord John, while actually confessing his Aberdeen *credo*, attempted to re-vindicate the dignity of the *civis Romanus sum*¹⁶² party in the following words:

“I naturally supposed that a person of the experience and sagacity of Count Nesselrode, would not have affixed his signature to a document declaring to all the world that the Russian Government made the removal of the combined fleets the condition of its evacuation of the Principalities.”^a

In the subsequent Indian debate Mr. Bright moved, that from the ninth clause which provides, “that six of the directors not elected by the Crown, shall be persons who have been ten years in India in the service of the Crown or the Company,” the words, “in the service of the Crown or the Company,” should be expunged. The amendment was agreed to. It is significant, that during the whole Indian debate no amendments are agreed to by the Ministry, and consequently carried by the House, except those of Mr. Bright. The Peace Ministry, at this moment does everything to secure its *entente cordiale*¹⁶³ with the Peace party, Manchester School,¹⁶⁴ who are opposed to any kind of warfare, except by cotton bales and price currents.

^a Quoted from *The Times*, No. 21481, July 15, 1853.—*Ed.*

M. Drouyn de Lhuys, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, once upper clerk at the Foreign Office under M. Guizot, and declared by his *chef*, to possess hardly the necessary qualifications for that place, is now indulging freely in the pleasure of exchanging notes and circulars with Count Nesselrode. The *Moniteur* of yesterday brings his reply to the last (2d) *circulaire* of the Russian Minister,¹⁶⁵ which concludes in the following terms:

“The moderation of France takes from her all responsibility, and gives her the right to hope that all the sacrifices which she has made to secure the tranquillity of the East will not have been in vain; that the Russian Government will at length discover some mode of reconciling its pretensions with the prerogatives of the Sultan’s sovereignty; and that an arrangement [...] be devised that shall settle, without a resort to force, a question, on the solution of which so many interests are dependent.”^a

I mentioned in a former letter the propositions once made by M. de Villèle to Russia, for the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, by a treaty of guarantee between all the Great Powers,^b propositions which called forth this reply from Count Pozzo di Borgo:

“That a general guarantec of the Ottoman Empire, independently of its being unusual and surprising, would wound the rights acquired by Russia and the principles upon which they are founded.”^c

Well, in 1841, Russia nevertheless agreed to become party to such an unusual treaty,¹⁶⁶ and Nesselrode himself, in his note of 20th June (2d July) refers to that treaty. Why did Russia assent to it, in contradiction to its traditional policy? Because that treaty was not one of “guarantee of the Ottoman Empire,” but rather of execution against its then only vital element, Egypt, under Mehemet Ali—because it was a coalition against France, at least in its original intention.

The Paris journal *La Presse* gives in its number of to-day, which has just come to my hands, a correspondence never before published between the late General Sébastiani, Ambassador in London, and Mme. Adélaïde, sister of Louis Philippe, a correspondence which reflects a remarkable light on the diplomatic transactions of that epoch. It contains clear proofs that the Treaty of 1841, far from having been originated by Russia, as Nesselrode affirms in his note, was, on the contrary, originated by France and England against Russia, and was only afterward turned by Russia

^a Quoted from *The Morning Post*, No. 24825, July 15, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 163-64.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from *The Portfolio*, Vol. I, No. II, pp. 130-31.—*Ed.*

into a weapon against France. I translate from this important correspondence as much as the pressure of time permits me to do:

I^a

London, April 21, 1836

In this country all parties are unanimous as to the necessity of closely watching Russia, and I believe that the Tory party is more decided than the Whigs, or at least it seems so, because it is not moderated by office.

II

London, June 12, 1838

I have had to-day a conference of two hours' duration with Lord Palmerston. I have been highly satisfied with him. I was not mistaken in assuring you that he was a friend of King Leopold, and above all a great partisan of the French Alliance. Lord Palmerston has conversed a great deal with me on Oriental affairs. He thinks that the Pasha of Egypt is decided as to his course of action. He wishes that England and France should make fresh efforts, supported by the presence of their fleets, in order to intimidate Mehemet, and that simultaneously our Ambassadors at Constantinople should inform the Sultan^b that they have received orders from their Courts to assure him of their support against the attempts of the Pasha of Egypt, under the condition that he would not take the initiative in hostilities. I believe this to be a prudent course, and advisable to be followed by England and France. We must maintain the Porte and not suffer the Provinces of Egypt, Syria and Celesyria to become detached from it. Russia only awaits for the moment for marching up her succours to the Sultan, and that *assistance would be the end of the Ottoman Empire.*

III

London, July 6, 1838

People in this country believe in the general understanding of Europe as to the Oriental question. The answer from Paris is impatiently looked for. I think not to have surpassed the line of conduct traced to me by the King in several conversations. As soon as the *entente* shall be established in principle, the manner of action and the position to be taken up by each of the Powers, will be regulated according to contingencies. The part Russia has to play must, of course, be maritime, like that of France and England, and in order to prevent any danger that might result from the action of the fleet in the Black Sea, she must be brought to the understanding that her squadron in the combined fleet is to be drawn from the Baltic.

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this document was published under No. II after the extract from H. Sébastiani's letter of June 12, 1838, which was erroneously datelined June 12, 1835. Here it is published as printed in *La Presse* of July 15, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Mahmud II.—*Ed.*

IV

London, October 3, 1839

England has not accepted the Russian propositions,¹⁶⁷ and Lord Palmerston informed me, on the part of the Government, that she had refused, in order to remain true to the French Alliance. Induced by the same feeling she consents that Mehemet Ali shall receive the hereditary possession of Egypt, and of that portion of Syria within a boundary to be demarked, which should go from St. Jean d'Acre, to the lake of Tabariye. We have, not without difficulty, obtained the assent of the English Government to these latter propositions. I do not think that such an arrangement would be rejected by either France or Mehemet Ali. The Oriental question simplifies itself; it will be terminated by the concurrence of the Powers, and under the guaranty of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. All the principles are maintained. The Sublime Porte is admitted to the law of nations of Europe. *The exclusive protectorate of Russia is annihilated.* I have asked myself why the Republican faction in France showed itself so favorable to Mehemet Ali, and why it has so warmly espoused his cause. I have not been able to find out any other motive, but the revolutionary principle, that of trying to support, to encourage all that is likely to subvert established governments. I believe we ought never to give in to such a snare.

V

London, November 30, 1839

I learn from an authentic source, that Lord Palmerston, in the last council of Ministers, in giving an account of the situation of Oriental affairs, and of the differences existing between the French and English policies, did so with a moderation and a regard for the alliance of both countries, that deserve our gratitude. He has even drawn the attention of his colleagues to a system similar to that mentioned by me. In conclusion he has yielded as to forms, and has renounced a policy of action and of inevitable complication.

VI

London, Dec. 12, 1839

I have seen Lord Palmerston, as I was anxious to know, whether he had to inform me of anything respecting the communication he recently made to me. He has read to me the letter of *M. de Nesselrode* to the Russian *Chargé d'Affaires*, which corresponded exactly to what he had told me. The arrival of *M. de Brunnow* will initiate us into the secret thoughts of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg. Lord Palmerston has been charming in forms and in matter. He views with pleasure the return of good feelings between the French and English Cabinets, and the continuation of the alliance. Believe me, I do not exaggerate in this. I told him with the confidence of truth, that the new situation was exactly such as France had ever wished it to be. He was forced to recognize it himself. The Prince of Esterházy has written to his *Chargé d'Affaires* that he had been extremely content with the Marshal,³ and that he was trying at this moment to bring back the French Cabinet to

³ N. Soult, Prime Minister of France.—*Ed.*

an *entente* with Austria, but that he had found the King *unmanageable*. I can well believe it. The King does not lend his mind to such impracticable divagations. This I write for you alone. Indeed, I believe with your Royal Highness that *Russia will be caught in her own nets*

VII

London, December 18th, 1839

I have received this morning a dispatch, more than usually strange, from the Marshal. It is an answer to the letter in which I reported to him on the communication I made to Lord Palmerston, in regard to the impression evoked at Paris on the announcement of the new mission of M. de Brunnow, and of its aim. I have read to Lord Palmerston *textuellement* the paragraph of the dispatch addressed to me by the Marshal. But in the statement I made to him about it, I made use of such terms as rendered the same ideas without being identical with those of the Marshal. Now the Marshal is kind enough to assure me that there was no difference between my words and his own expression; but he recommends me that I ought to double my circumspection and endeavor to reestablish in our negotiations the textual meaning of his own dispatches. I am much mistaken if this be not a *querelle allemande*,^a a subtlety worthy of a *Grec du Bas-Empire*^b.... The Marshal is a novice in the career of diplomacy, and I fear that he seeks ability in fineness. He can find it only in sincerity and straightforwardness.

VIII

London, Jan. 3, 1840

Yesterday Lord Palmerston dined with me, in common with the whole *Corps Diplomatique*.... He told me that Ministers were going to ask for a supplementary vote for their naval forces, but he stated that he would propose to his colleagues not to demand it on account of the reinforcements of the French fleet, in order to avoid wounding an ally by the least allusion. Lord Holland and Lord John Russell are admirable in their efforts for maintaining the alliance.

IX

London, Jan. 20, 1840

Lord Palmerston has communicated to me the project of a convention to be submitted to the Great Powers and to the Porte.... It is not a convention of the five Great Powers between themselves, but a convention of those same Powers with the Porte.... *M. de Brunnow objects to that form* (see Nesselrode's note, dated 2d July, inst., about the Russian initiative!).... This convention consists of a preamble and VIII articles: in the former it is stated in a positive manner, and almost textually, that the integrity of the Ottoman Empire being essentially necessary for the maintenance of the peace of Europe, the five Powers are disposed to lend it the requisite support and to make it enter into the international confidence of Europe. The articles regulate that support....

^a Literally: German quarrel; figuratively: groundless quarrel.—*Ed.*

^b A Byzantine of the Eastern Roman Empire.—*Ed.*

P.S.—I learn, at this moment, that *Brunnow and Neumann are utterly discontented with the convention of Lord Palmerston.*

X

London, January 21, 1840

The project of convention drawn up by Lord Palmerston appears to me to have been rejected by the Russian and Austrian negotiators. *M. de Neumann* distinguished himself by the violence, and, I venture to say, the stupidity of his complaints. He unveils the policy of his Court. Prince Metternich, who intended to sustain in his hands the balance of power, openly avows his hatred of Russia. He flattered himself to see the propositions of Brunnow received without restrictions, and both have been disappointed to find in Lord Palmerston a Minister who desires sincerely an alliance with France, and who is anxious to operate in understanding with her.

XI

London, Jan. 24, 1840

To-day I had a long conversation with Lord Melbourne, who is a thorough partisan of the alliance with our King. He repeatedly called upon me to show him some means by which a combination of the French and English propositions could be effected.

He judges in the same light as we do the intentions of Russia, and he told me, in a conference with regard to the *Vienna Cabinet*, that *it was not to be trusted, because it ever turned out in the end, to be the devoted partisan of Russia.*

XII

London, January 27, 1840

The turn now being taken by the Oriental affairs is alarming to me.... There is no doubt that Russia is pushing to war, and that Austria supports her with all her forces.... They have succeeded in frightening England with the "projects of France on the Mediterranean." Algiers and Mehemet Ali are the two means employed by them.... I make all possible efforts to obtain the rejection of the Brunnow propositions, and I had narrowly succeeded in it, when they heard of it, and Austria now presents the Brunnow propositions as her own. This is an evident trickery. But the Council has been convoked, in order to deliberate on the Austrian propositions. It is divided. On the one side, there are Lord Melbourne, Lord Holland and Mr. Labouchere; on the other, Lord Palmerston, Lord J. Russell, and Lord Minto. The other members are fluctuating between the two opinions.

XIII

London, January 28, 1840

The Council has hitherto only deliberated on one point of the project of Lord Palmerston. It has decided that the Convention should be contracted between six,

and not between five (powers), as proposed by *M. de Brunnow*, who was not wanting in zeal for his particular interests (solicitude for the Ottoman Empire). The Porte would not consent to a Convention discussed and settled without its cooperation. *By signing a Treaty with the five Great Powers she would come in consequence of this fact itself under the European law of nations.*

XIV

London, 28th January, 1840

Are the politics and the interest of the King given up to the caprices of M. Thiers and his newspaper^a? The system founded with so great pains, with such efforts, and maintained, notwithstanding so many difficulties, for more than ten years, is doomed to destruction.

Written on July 15, 1853

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3833, July 30, 1853; re-printed in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 854, August 2, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a *Le Constitutionnel*.—Ed.

Karl Marx

THE WAR QUESTION.—
DOINGS OF PARLIAMENT.—INDIA¹⁶⁸

London, Tuesday, July 19, 1853

The Czar^a has not only commenced war, he has already terminated his first campaign. The line of operations is no longer behind the Pruth, but along the Danube. Meanwhile, what are the Western Powers about? They counsel, i.e. compel the Sultan^b to consider the war as peace. Their answers to the acts of the autocrat are not cannons, but notes. The Emperor is assailed, not by the two fleets, but by no less than four projects of negotiation. One emanating from the English Cabinet, the other from the French, the third presented by Austria, and the fourth improvised by the "brother-in-law" of Potsdam.^c The Czar, it is hoped, will consent to select from this *embarras de richesses* that which is most suitable to his purposes. The (second) reply of M. Drouyn de Lhuys to the (second) note of M. de Nesselrode¹⁶⁹ takes infinite pains to prove that "it was not England and France who made the first demonstration."^d Russia only throws out so many notes to the western diplomats, like bones to dogs, in order to set them at an innocent amusement, while she reaps the advantage of further gaining time. England and France, of course, catch the bait. As if the receipt of such a note were not a sufficient degradation, it [the note] received a most pacific comment in the *Journal de l'Empire* in an article signed by M. de La Guéronnière, but written from notes given by the Emperor and revised by him. That article "would permit to Russia the caprice of negotiating on the right bank rather

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^c Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

^d Quoted from *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 198, July 17, 1853.—*Ed.*

than on the left bank of the Pruth.” It actually converts the second note of Count Nesselrode into an “attempt at reconciliation.” This is done in the following style:

“Count Nesselrode now speaks only of a moral guarantee, and he announces that, for it, is substituted provisionally a material guarantee *thus making a direct appeal to negotiation*. That being the case it is impossible to consider the action of diplomatists exhausted.”^a

The *Assemblée nationale*, the Russian *Moniteur* at Paris, ironically congratulates the *Journal de l'Empire* for its discovery, however late it had come to it, and regrets only that so much noise should have been made to no purpose.^b

The English press has lost all countenance.

“The Czar cannot comprehend the courtesy which the Western Powers have shown to him.... He is incapable of courteous demeanor in his transactions with other powers.”

So says *The Morning Advertiser*.^c *The Morning Post* is exasperated because the Czar takes so little note of the internal *embarras* of his opponents:

“To have put forward, in the mere wantonness of insolence, a claim that possessed no character of immediate urgency, and to have done so without any reference to the inflammable state of Europe, was an indiscretion almost incredible.”^d

The writer of the Money Market article in *The Economist* finds out

“that men discover now to their cost, how inconvenient it is that all the most secret interests of the world [i.e., of the Exchange], are dependent upon the vagaries of one man.”^e

Yet in 1848 and '49 you could see the bust of the Emperor of Russia side by side with the *veau d'or*^f itself.

Meanwhile the position of the Sultan is becoming every hour more difficult and complicated. His financial embarrassments increase the more, as he bears all the burdens, without reaping any of the good chances of war. Popular enthusiasm turns round

^a *Le Pays*, No. 197, July 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See A. Letellier's article in *L'Assemblée nationale*, No. 198, July 17, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c *The Morning Advertiser*, July 18, 1853.—*Ed.*

^d “The Question Between Russia and Turkey...”, *The Morning Post*, No. 24827, July 18, 1853.—*Ed.*

^e *The Economist*, No. 516, July 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

^f Golden calf.—*Ed.*

upon him for want of being directed against the Czar. The fanaticism of the Mussulman threatens him with palace revolutions, while the fanaticism of the Greek menaces him with popular insurrections. The papers of to-day contain reports of a conspiracy directed against the Sultan's life by Mussulman students belonging to the old Turkish party, who wanted to place Abdul Aziz on the throne.¹⁷⁰

In the House of Lords, yesterday, Lord Clarendon was asked by Lords Beaumont and Malmesbury to state his intentions, now that the Emperor of France had not hesitated to pronounce his. Lord Clarendon, however, beside a brief avowal that England had indorsed the note of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, concealed himself behind his entrenchment of promises that he would certainly very soon give full information to the House. On the question whether it was true that the Russians had also seized the Civil Government and the Post-Offices of the Principalities, which they had placed under military occupation, Lord Clarendon remained "silent," of course! "He would not believe it, after the proclamation of Prince Gorchakoff."¹⁷¹ Lord Beaumont replied, he seemed to be very sanguine indeed.

To a question concerning the late Smyrna affray,^a put by Sir J. Walmsley in the House of Commons, Lord John Russell replied that he had heard indeed of the kidnapping of one Hungarian refugee^b by the Consul of Austria^c; but as to Austria having demanded the extradition of all Hungarian and Italian refugees, he had certainly heard nothing of that. Lord John manages interpellations in a style altogether pleasant and not without convenience to himself. Official information he never receives; and in the newspapers he never reads anything that you want him, or expect him to have read.

The *Kölnische Zeitung* in a letter dated Vienna, July 11, contains the following report on the Smyrna affair:

"Chekib Effendi has been sent to Smyrna in order to commence an instruction against the authors of the sedition in which M. de Hackelberg perished. Chekib has also received orders to deliver to Austria the refugees of Austrian or Tuscan origin. Mr. Brown, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States, has had communications on this subject with Reshid Pasha, the result of which was not yet known. I hear at this moment that the assassin of Baron Hackelberg has received from the American Consul at Smyrna a passport that places him out of the reach of the Turkish authorities. *This fact proves that the United States intend intervening in European affairs.* It is also sure that three American men-of-war are with the

^a See this volume, p. 193.—*Ed.*

^b M. Koszta.—*Ed.*

^c Weckbecker.—*Ed.*

Turkish fleet in the Bosphorus, and further, that the American frigate *Cumberland* has brought 80,000,000 of piasters to the Turkish Government.”^a

Whatever truth there be in this and like reports, they prove one thing, viz.: that American intervention is expected everywhere, and is even looked upon with favor by portions of the English public. The behavior of the American Captain^b and Consul are loudly praised in popular meetings, and the “Englishman”^c in *The Advertiser* of yesterday called the Stars and Stripes to appear in the Mediterranean and to shame the “muddy old Union Jack” into activity.

To sum up the Eastern question in a few words: The Czar, vexed and dissatisfied at seeing his immense Empire confined to one sole port of export, and that even situated in a sea innavigable through one half of the year, and assailable by Englishmen through the other half, is pushing the design of his ancestors, to get access to the Mediterranean; he is separating, one after another, the remotest members of the Ottoman Empire from its main body, till at last Constantinople, the heart, must cease to beat. He repeats his periodical invasions as often as he thinks his designs on Turkey endangered by the apparent consolidation of the Turkish Government, or by the more dangerous symptoms of self-emancipation manifest amongst the Slavonians. Counting on the cowardice and apprehensions of the Western Powers, he bullies Europe, and pushes his demands as far as possible, in order to appear magnanimous afterward, by contenting himself with what he immediately wanted.

The Western Powers, on the other hand, inconsistent, pusillanimous, suspecting each other, commence by encouraging the Sultan to resist the Czar, from fear of the encroachments of Russia, and terminate by compelling the former to yield, from fear of a general war giving rise to a general revolution. Too impotent and too timid to undertake the reconstruction of the Ottoman Empire by the establishment of a Greek Empire, or of a Federal Republic of Slavonic States, all they aim at, is to maintain the *status quo*, i.e., the state of putrefaction which forbids the Sultan to emancipate himself from the Czar, and the Slavonians to emancipate themselves from the Sultan.

The revolutionary party can only congratulate itself on this state of things. The humiliation of the reactionary western governments, and their manifest impotency to guard the interests of

^a *Kölnische Zeitung*, No. 193, July 14, 1853.— *Ed.*

^b D. N. Ingraham.— *Ed.*

^c A. Richards.— *Ed.*

European civilization against Russian encroachment cannot fail to work out a wholesome indignation in the people who have suffered themselves, since 1849, to be subjected to the rule of counter-revolution. The approaching industrial crisis, also, is affected and accelerated quite as much by this semi-Eastern complication, as by the completely Eastern complication of China. While the prices of corn are rising, business in general is suspended, at the same time that the rate of Exchange is setting against England, and gold is beginning to flow to the Continent. The stock of bullion in the Bank of France has fallen off between the 9th of June and the 14th of July, the sum of £2,220,000, which is more than the entire augmentation which had taken place during the preceding three months.

The progress of the India bill through the Committee has little interest. It is significant, that all amendments are thrown out now by the Coalition coalescing with the Tories against their own allies of the Manchester School.

The actual state of India may be illustrated by a few facts. The Home Establishment absorbs 3 per cent. of the net revenue, and the annual interest for Home Debt and Dividends 14 per cent.—together 17 per cent. If we deduct these annual remittances from India to England, the *military charges* amount to about two-thirds of the whole expenditure available for India, or to 66 per cent., while the charges for *Public Works* do not amount to more than $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. of the general revenue, or for Bengal 1 per cent., Agra $7\frac{3}{4}$, Punjab $\frac{1}{8}$, Madras $\frac{1}{2}$, and Bombay 1 per cent. of their respective revenues. These figures are the official ones of the Company itself.

On the other hand nearly three-fifths of the whole net revenue are derived from the *land*, about one-seventh from *opium*, and upward of one-ninth from *salt*. These resources together yield 85 per cent. of the whole receipts.

As to minor items of receipts and charges, it may suffice to state that the *Moturpha* revenue maintained in the Presidency of Madras, and levied on shops, looms, sheep, cattle, sundry professions, &c., yields somewhat about £50,000, while the yearly dinners of the East India House^a cost about the same sum.

The great bulk of the revenue is derived from the land. As the various kinds of Indian land-tenure have recently been described in so many places, and in popular style, too, I propose to limit my

^a Residence of the Court of Directors of the East India Company in Leadenhall Street in London.—*Ed.*

observations on the subject to a few general remarks on the Zemindari and Ryotwar systems.¹⁷²

The Zemindari and the Ryotwar were both of them agrarian revolutions, effected by British ukases, and opposed to each other, the one aristocratic, the other democratic; the one a caricature of English landlordism, the other of French peasant-proprietorship; but pernicious, both combining the most contradictory character—both made not for the people, who cultivate the soil, nor for the holder, who owns it, but for the Government that taxes it.

By the Zemindari system, the people of the Presidency of Bengal were depossessed at once of their hereditary claims to the soil, in favor of the native tax gatherers called *Zemindars*. By the Ryotwar system introduced into the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, the native nobility, with their territorial claims, *meras-sees*, *jagheers*, &c., were reduced with the common people to the holding of minute fields, cultivated by themselves in favor of the Collector of the East India Company.¹⁷³ But a curious sort of English landlord was the Zemindar, receiving only one-tenth of the rent, while he had to make over nine-tenths of it to the Government. A curious sort of French peasant was the Ryot, without any permanent title in the soil, and with the taxation changing every year in proportion to his harvest. The original class of *Zemindars*, notwithstanding their unmitigated and uncontrolled rapacity against the depossessed mass of the ex-hereditary landholders, soon melted away under the pressure of the Company, in order to be replaced by mercantile speculators who now hold all the land of Bengal, with exception of the estates returned under the direct management of the Government. These speculators have introduced a variety of the Zemindari tenure called *patnee*. Not content to be placed with regard to the British Government in the situation of middlemen, they have created in their turn a class of “hereditary” middlemen called *patnetas*, who created again their sub-*patnetas*, &c., so that a perfect scale of hierarchy of middlemen has sprung up, which presses with its entire weight on the unfortunate cultivator. As to the Ryots in Madras and Bombay, the system soon degenerated into one of forced cultivation, and the land lost all its value.

“The land,” says Mr. Campbell, “would be sold for balances by the Collector, as in Bengal, but generally is not, for a very good reason, viz.: that nobody will buy it.”^a

^a G. Campbell, *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, p. 359.—*Ed.*

Thus, in Bengal, we have a combination of English landlordism, of the Irish middlemen system, of the Austrian system, transforming the landlord into the tax-gatherer, and of the Asiatic system making the State the real landlord. In Madras and Bombay we have a French peasant proprietor who is at the same time a serf, and a *métayer* of the State. The drawbacks of all these various systems accumulate upon him without his enjoying any of their redeeming features. The Ryot is subject, like the French peasant, to the extortion of the private usurer; but he has no hereditary, no permanent title in his land, like the French peasant. Like the serf he is forced to cultivation, but he is not secured against want like the serf. Like the *métayer* he has to divide his produce with the State, but the State is not obliged, with regard to him, to advance the funds and the stock, as it is obliged to do with regard to the *métayer*. In Bengal, as in Madras and Bombay, under the *Zemindari* as under the *Ryotwar*, the Ryots—and they form 11-12ths of the whole Indian population—have been wretchedly pauperized; and if they are, morally speaking, not sunk as low as the Irish cottiers, they owe it to their climate, the men of the South being possessed of less wants, and of more imagination than the men of the North.

Conjointly with the land-tax we have to consider the salt-tax. Notoriously the Company retain the monopoly of that article which they sell at three times its mercantile value—and this in a country where it is furnished by the sea, by the lakes, by the mountains and the earth itself. The practical working of this monopoly was described by the Earl of Albemarle in the following words:

“A great proportion of the salt for inland consumption throughout the country is purchased from the Company by large wholesale merchants at less than 4 rupees per *maund*^a; these mix a fixed proportion of sand, chiefly got a few miles to the south-east of Dacca, and send the mixture to a second, or, counting the Government as the first, to a third monopolist at about 5 or 6 rupees. This dealer adds more earth or ashes, and thus passing through more hands, from the large towns to villages, the price is still raised from 8 to 10 rupees and the proportion of adulteration from 25 to 40 per cent. [...] It appears then that the people [...] pay from £21, 17s. 2d. to £27, 6s. 2d. for their salt, or in other words, from 30 to 36 times as much as the wealthy people of Great Britain.”^b

As an instance of English bourgeois morals, I may allege, that Mr. Campbell defends the Opium monopoly because it prevents

^a Asiatic measure of weight of varying value (Indian standard $\approx 82\frac{2}{7}$ lb.).—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives a rendering of George Albemarle's speech in the House of Lords on July 1, 1853, published in *The Times*, No. 21470, July 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

the Chinese from consuming too much of the drug, and that he defends the Brandy monopoly (licenses for spirit-selling in India) because it has wonderfully increased the consumption of Brandy in India.

The Zemindar tenure, the Ryotwar, and the salt tax, combined with the Indian climate, were the hotbeds of the cholera—India's ravages upon the Western World—a striking and severe example of the solidarity of human woes and wrongs.

Written on July 19, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3838, August 5, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

THE FUTURE RESULTS OF BRITISH RULE
IN INDIA

London, Friday, July 22, 1853

I propose in this letter to conclude my observations on India.

How came it that English supremacy was established in India? The paramount power of the Great Mogul was broken by the Mogul Viceroys. The power of the Viceroys was broken by the Mahrattas.¹⁷⁴ The power of the Mahrattas was broken by the Afghans, and while all were struggling against all, the Briton rushed in and was enabled to subdue them all. A country not only divided between Mahommedan and Hindoo, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindostan, would there not be the one great and incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thralldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India? India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered, and the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is the history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.

England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating—the annihilation of old Asiatic society,

and the laying the material foundations of Western society in Asia.

Arabs, Turks, Tartars, Moguls, who had successively overrun India, soon became *Hindooized*, the barbarian conquerors being, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilization of their subjects. The British were the first conquerors superior, and therefore, inaccessible to Hindoo civilization. They destroyed it by breaking up the native communities, by uprooting the native industry, and by levelling all that was great and elevated in the native society. The historic pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond that destruction. The work of regeneration hardly transpires through a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun.

The political unity of India, more consolidated, and extending farther than it ever did under the Great Moguls, was the first condition of its regeneration. That unity, imposed by the British sword, will now be strengthened and perpetuated by the electric telegraph. The native army, organized and trained by the British drill-sergeant, was the *sine qua non* of Indian self-emancipation, and of India ceasing to be the prey of the first foreign intruder. The free press, introduced for the first time into Asiatic society, and managed principally by the common offspring of Hindoos and Europeans, is a new and powerful agent of reconstruction. The *Zemindari* and *Ryotwar*¹⁷⁵ themselves, abominable as they are, involve two distinct forms of private property in land—the great desideratum of Asiatic society. From the Indian natives, reluctantly and sparingly educated at Calcutta, under English superintendence, a fresh class is springing up, endowed with the requirements for government and imbued with European science. Steam has brought India into regular and rapid communication with Europe, has connected its chief ports with those of the whole south-eastern ocean, and has revindicated it from the isolated position which was the prime law of its stagnation. The day is not far distant when, by a combination of railways and steam-vessels, the distance between England and India, measured by time, will be shortened to eight days, and when that once fabulous country will thus be actually annexed to the Western world.

The ruling classes of Great Britain have had, till now, but an accidental, transitory and exceptional interest in the progress of India. The aristocracy wanted to conquer it, the moneyocracy to plunder it, and the millocracy to undersell it. But now the tables are turned. The millocracy have discovered that the transformation of India into a reproductive country has become of vital importance to them, and that, to that end, it is necessary, above

all, to gift her with means of irrigation and of internal communication. They intend now drawing a net of railroads over India. And they will do it. The results must be inappreciable.

It is notorious that the productive powers of India are paralyzed by the utter want of means for conveying and exchanging its various produce. Nowhere, more than in India, do we meet with social destitution in the midst of natural plenty, for want of the means of exchange. It was proved before a Committee of the British House of Commons, which sat in 1848, that

“when grain was selling from 6/ to 8/ a quarter at Khandesh, it was sold at 64/ to 70/ at Poona, where the people were dying in the streets of famine, without the possibility of gaining supplies from Khandesh, because the clay-roads were impracticable.”^a

The introduction of railroads may be easily made to subserve agricultural purposes by the formation of tanks, where ground is required for embankment, and by the conveyance of water along the different lines. Thus irrigation, the *sine qua non* of farming in the East, might be greatly extended, and the frequently recurring local famines, arising from the want of water, would be averted. The general importance of railways, viewed under this head, must become evident, when we remember that irrigated lands, even in the districts near Ghauts, pay three times as much in taxes, afford ten or twelve times as much employment, and yield twelve or fifteen times as much profit, as the same area without irrigation.

Railways will afford the means of diminishing the amount and the cost of the military establishments. Col. Warren, Town Major of the Fort St. William, stated before a Select Committee of the House of Commons:

“The practicability of receiving intelligence from distant parts of the country, in as many hours as at present it requires days and even weeks, and of sending instructions, with troops and stores, in the more brief period, are considerations which cannot be too highly estimated. Troops could be kept at more distant and healthier stations than at present, and much loss of life from sickness would by this means be spared. Stores could not to the same extent be required at the various dépôts, and the loss by decay, and the destruction incidental to the climate, would also be avoided. The number of troops might be diminished in direct proportion to their effectiveness.”

We know that the municipal organization and the economical basis of the village communities has been broken up, but their worst feature, the dissolution of society into stereotype and

^a Quoted from J. Dickinson's *The Government of India under a Bureaucracy*, pp. 81-82.—Ed.

disconnected atoms, has survived their vitality. The village isolation produced the absence of roads in India, and the absence of roads perpetuated the village isolation. On this plan a community existed with a given scale of low conveniences, almost without intercourse with other villages, without the desires and efforts indispensable to social advance. The British having broken up this self-sufficient *inertia* of the villages, railways will provide the new want of communication and intercourse. Besides,

“one of the effects of the railway system will be to bring into every village affected by it such knowledge of the contrivances and appliances of other countries, and such means of obtaining them, as will first put the hereditary and stipendiary village artisanship of India to full proof of its capabilities, and then supply its defects.” (Chapman, *The Cotton and Commerce of India* [pp. 95-97].)

I know that the English millocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coals, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion, and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with railways. The railway-system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry. This is the more certain as the Hindoos are allowed by British authorities themselves to possess particular aptitude for accommodating themselves to entirely new labor, and acquiring the requisite knowledge of machinery. Ample proof of this fact is afforded by the capacities and expertness of the native engineers in the Calcutta mint, where they have been for years employed in working the steam machinery, by the natives attached to the several steam engines in the Burdwan^a coal districts, and by other instances. Mr. Campbell himself, greatly influenced as he is by the prejudices of the East India Company, is obliged to avow

“that the great mass of the Indian people possesses a great *industrial energy*, is well fitted to accumulate capital, and remarkable for a mathematical clearness of head, and talent for figures and exact sciences.” “Their intellects,” he says, “are excellent.”^b

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* erroneously has “Hurdwar”.—*Ed.*

^b G. Campbell, *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government*, pp. 59-60.—*Ed.*

Modern industry, resulting from the railway system, will dissolve the hereditary divisions of labor, upon which rest the Indian castes, those decisive impediments to Indian progress and Indian power.

All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people. But what they will not fail to do is to lay down the material premises for both. Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever effected a progress without dragging individuals and people through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation?

The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether. At all events, we may safely expect to see, at a more or less remote period, the regeneration of that great and interesting country, whose gentle natives are, to use the expression of Prince Soltykov, even in the most inferior classes, "*plus fins et plus adroits que les Italiens*,"^a whose submission even is counterbalanced by a certain calm nobility, who, notwithstanding their natural langor, have astonished the British officers by their bravery, whose country has been the source of our languages, our religions, and who represent the type of the ancient German in the Jat,¹⁷⁶ and the type of the ancient Greek in the Brahmin.¹⁷⁷

I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked. They are the defenders of property, but did any revolutionary party ever originate agrarian revolutions like those in Bengal, in Madras, and in Bombay? Did they not, in India, to borrow an expression of that great robber, Lord Clive himself, resort to atrocious extortion, when simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity? While they prated in Europe about the inviolable sanctity of the national debt, did they not confiscate in India the dividends of the rajahs,¹⁷⁸ who had invested their

^a "More subtle and adroit than the Italians." See A. D. Soltykov's *Lettres sur l'Inde*, p. 61.—Ed.

private savings in the Company's own funds? While they combatted the French revolution under the pretext of defending "our holy religion," did they not forbid, at the same time, Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples of Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut¹⁷⁹? These are the men of "Property, Order, Family, and Religion."

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe, and containing 150 millions of acres, are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. The centralization of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power. The destructive influence of that centralization upon the markets of the world does but reveal, in the most gigantic dimensions, the inherent organic laws of political economy now at work in every civilized town. The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous, pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

Written on July 22, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3840, August 8, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 856, August 9, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

FINANCIAL FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT.—
CABS.—IRELAND.—THE RUSSIAN QUESTION¹⁸⁰

London, Friday, July 29, 1853

Mr. Gladstone, in the sitting of the House of Commons of last night, brought forward a resolution that provision should be made out of the Consolidated Fund for paying off the South-Sea-Stock¹⁸¹ not commuted under his financial scheme. To bring forward such a resolution was to own the complete failure of his commutation plan. Beside this small defeat the Ministry has had to undergo a very heavy one concerning their India Bill. Sir John Pakington moved the insertion of a clause, by virtue of which the salt-monopoly should cease, and enacting that the manufacture and sale of salt in India shall be absolutely free, subject only to excise or other duty. The motion was carried by 117 against 107, notwithstanding the desperate exertions of Sir Charles Wood, Lord John Russell, Sir J. Hogg, Sir H. Maddock, and Mr. Lowe (of *The Times*). The oligarchy having succeeded in raising the salary of the President of the Board of Control to £5,000, propose now to raise the salaries of the immaculate East India Directors from £300 to £1,000, and those of the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman to £1,500. Evidently they suppose India to possess the same miraculous power as is attributed in Hindostan to the leaves of a fabulous tree on the extreme heights of the Himalaya, viz.: that it converts into gold everything that it touches—the only difference being that what the credulous Hindoo expects from the juice of the leaves, the enlightened Englishman expects from the blood of the natives.

The Chinese Sultan of the *Arabian Nights*, who rose one fine morning and went to his window to look at Aladdin's palace, was astonished to behold nothing but an empty place. He called his

Grand Vizier and asked him if he could see the palace. The Grand Vizier could see nothing, and was not less astonished than the Sultan, who flew into a passion and gave orders to his guards to arrest Aladdin. The public of London, when it rose on Wednesday morning, found itself much in the situation of that Chinese Sultan. London looked as if London had gone out-of-town. There were and there continued to be empty places where we were wont to see something. And as the eye was amazed at the emptiness of the places, so the ear was amazed at their tomb-like tranquillity. What was it that had happened to London? A *cab-revolution*; cabmen and cabs have disappeared, as though by miracle, from the streets, from their stands, from the railway stations. The cab-proprietors and the drivers are in rebellion against the new Cab-act, that great and almost "unique" act of the Ministry of all the talents. They have struck.

It has often been observed that the British public is seized with periodical fits of morality, and that once every six or seven years, its virtue becomes outrageous, and must make a stand against vice. The object of this moral and patriotic fit happened for the present to be *poor cabby*. His extortions from unprotected females and fat city men were to be put down, and his fare to be reduced from 1s. to 6d. per mile. The sixpenny morality grew epidemic. The Ministry, by the organ of Mr. Fitzroy, brought in a draconic law against Cabby, prescribing the terms of the contracts he had to fulfil with the public, and subjecting at the same time his fares and his "Hansoms," his horses and his morals to Parliamentary legislation. Cabby, it appears, was to be forcibly transformed into the type of British respectability. The present generation could not do without improvising at least one virtuous and disinterested class of citizens, and Cabby was selected to form it. So anxious was the Ministry of all the talents to perform its masterpiece of legislation, that the Cab-act, hardly carried through the House, was put into operation before any part of the machinery for working it was ready. Instead of authentic copies of the new regulations and tables of fares and distances, the *Cadis* of London having been provided beforehand, the police magistrates were advised to decide any conflict arising between Cabby and the public in the most summary way. Thus, we had during two weeks the various and elevating spectacle of a continuous fight before the magistrates between a real army of 6d. Hampdens¹⁸² and the "atrocious" cabmen, the one fighting for virtue, and the others for money. Day after day was Cabby moralized, sentenced, imprisoned. At last he made sure that he was unable to pay his

proprietor the old rent with the new tariff, and proprietor and driver seceded to their *Mons Sacer*,¹⁸³ to the National Hall, in Holborn, where they came to the terrible resolution which for three days has produced the cab-desolation of London. Two things they have already effected: firstly, that the Ministry through the organ of Mr. Fitzroy, have amended their own act so much as nearly to annihilate it; and secondly, that the Eastern Question, the Danish *coup d'état*, the bad harvest, and the approaching cholera have all disappeared before that one great struggle of public virtue, which persists in paying only 6d. per mile, and the private interest which persists in asking 12 pence.

“Strike” is the order of the day. During the present week 5,000 miners have struck in the northern coal district; 400 to 500 journeymen cork-cutters in London; about 2,000 laborers employed by the different wharfingers on the Thames; the police force at Hull, similar attempts being made by the City and general Metropolitan Police; and finally the bricklayers employed at St. Stephens, under the very nose of Parliament.

“The world is becoming a very paradise for laborers. Men are becoming valuable,” exclaims *The Times*. In the years 1849, '50, '51, '52, while commerce was progressively growing, industry extending to unheard-of dimensions, and profits continually augmenting, wages in general remained stationary, and were in most instances even maintained at the reduced scale occasioned by the crisis of 1847. Emigration having reduced the numbers, and the rise in the prices of the first necessities having sharpened the appetites of the people, strikes broke out, and wages rose in consequence of those strikes, and lo! the world becomes a paradise for laborers—in the eyes of *The Times*. In order to reduce that paradise to terrestrial dimensions, the mill-lords of Lancashire have formed an association, for mutually assisting and supporting each other against the demands of the people. But not content with opposing combination to combination, the bourgeoisie threaten to appeal to the interference of law—of law dictated by themselves. In what manner this is done may be inferred from the following exhortations of *The Morning Post*, the organ of the liberal and amiable Palmerston.

“If there be a piece of wickedness which preeminently deserves to be *punished with an iron hand*, it is the system of strikes.... What is wanted is some stringent and summary mode of punishing the leaders and chief men of these combinations. [...] It would be no interference with the freedom of the labor market *to treat these fellows to a flogging*.... It is idle to say that this would interfere with the labor market. As long as those who supply the labor market refrain from jeopardizing

the interests of the country, *they may be left* to make their own terms with the employers.”^a

Within a certain conventional limit, the laborers shall be allowed to imagine themselves to be free agents of production, and that their contracts with their masters are settled by mutual convention; but that limit passed, labor is to be openly enforced upon them on conditions prescribed by Parliament, that permanent Combination Committee of the ruling classes against the people. The deep and philosophical mind of the Palmerstonian organ is curiously disclosed in its yesterday’s discovery, on that “the hardest used of all classes in this country is the *poor of the higher ranks*,” the poor aristocrat who is forced to use a cab instead of a “brougham” of his own.^b

Like the world in general, we are assured, that Ireland in particular is becoming a paradise for the laborer, in consequence of famine¹⁸⁴ and exodus. Why then, if wages really are so high in Ireland, is it that Irish laborers are flocking in such masses over to England to settle permanently on this side of the “pond,”^c while they formerly used to return after every harvest? If the social amelioration of the Irish people is making such progress, how is it that, on the other hand, insanity has made such terrific progress among them since 1847, and especially since 1851? Look at the following data from “the Sixth Report on the District Criminal and Private Lunatic Asylums in Ireland”:

1851—Sum total of admissions in Lunatic Asylums	2,584
(1,301 males and 1,283 females.)	
1852	2,662
(1,276 males and 1,386 females.)	
March, 1853	2,870
(1,447 males and 1,423 females.)	

And this is the same country in which the celebrated Swift, the founder of the first Lunatic Asylum in Ireland,¹⁸⁵ doubted whether 90 madmen could be found.

The Chartist agitation reopened by Ernest Jones, is proceeding vigorously, and on the 30th inst., a great open-air meeting of the Chartists of London will be held on Kennington Common, the place where the great gathering of April 10, 1848, took place.¹⁸⁶

Mr. Cobbett has withdrawn his Factory Bill, intimating his intention of reintroducing it early in next session.

^a *The Morning Post*, No. 24835, July 27, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b *The Morning Post*, No. 24836, July 28, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c *The Irish Sea*.—*Ed.*

As to the financial and general prospects of England *The Manchester Guardian* of the 27th inst., entirely confirms my own previous predictions in the following passages of a leading article:—

“Seldom perhaps has there been a time when there were floating in our commercial atmosphere so many elements of uncertainty calculated to excite *uneasiness*—we use that mild word advisedly. At any former period before the repeal of the Corn Laws, and the general adaptation of the free trade policy, we should have used the stronger term of *serious alarm*. These elements are firstly the apprehended deficiency of the crops, secondly the continued abstraction of gold from the cellars of the bank, and thirdly the great probability of war.”

The last of the Constitutions of 1848, has now been overthrown by the *coup d'état* of the Danish King.^a A Russian Constitution has been conferred upon the country, which, by the abolition of the *Lex Regia*, was doomed to become a Russian Province.¹⁸⁷ In a subsequent letter I shall give an exposé of the affairs of that country.^b

“It is our policy to see that nothing new happens during the next four months, and I hope we shall accomplish it, because *men in general prefer waiting*, but the fifth must be fruitful in events.”

Thus wrote Count Pozzo di Borgo on the 28th Nov., 1828, to Count Nesselrode,^c and Count Nesselrode is now acting on the same maxim. While the military assumption of the Principalities was completed by the assumption of their Civil Government by the Russians, while troops after troops are pouring into Bessarabia and the Crimea, a hint has been given to Austria that her mediation might be accepted, and another to Bonaparte that his proposals were likely to be met with a favorable reception by the Czar. The Ministers at Paris and London were comforted with the prospect that Nicholas would condescend to definitively accept their excuses. All the Courts of Europe, transformed into so many Sultanas, were anxiously waiting which of them, the magnanimous commander of the faithful would throw his handkerchief to. Having kept them in this manner for weeks, nay for months, in suspense, Nicholas suddenly makes a declaration that neither England, nor France, nor Austria, nor Prussia, had any business in his quarrel with Turkey, and that with Turkey alone he could negotiate. It was probably in order to facilitate his negotiations with Turkey, that he recalled his embassy from Constantinople. But while

^a Frederick VII.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 237-38.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from *The Portfolio*, 1836, Vol. I, p. 473.—*Ed.*

he declares that the Powers are not to meddle in Russia's concerns, we are informed on the other hand that the representatives of France, England, Austria and Prussia kill their time in meeting at Vienna in conference, and in hatching projects for the arrangement of the Eastern Question, neither the Turkish nor Russian Ambassador participating in these mock-conferences. The Sultan^a had appointed, on the 8th inst. a warlike ministry, in order to escape from his armed suspension, but was compelled by Lord Redcliffe to dismiss it on the same evening. He has now been so much confused that he intends to send an Austrian courier to St. Petersburg with the mission of asking whether the Czar would re-enter into direct negotiations. On the return of that courier and the answer he brings, shall depend, whether Reshid Pasha is himself to go to St. Petersburg. From St. Petersburg he is to send new draft notes to Constantinople; the new draft notes are to be returned to St. Petersburg, and nothing will be settled before the last answer is again returned from St. Petersburg to Constantinople—and then the fifth month will have arrived, and no fleets can enter the Black Sea; and then the Czar will quietly remain during the winter in the Principalities, where he pays with the same promises that still circulate there from his former occupations, and as far back as 1820.

You know that the Serbian Minister Garašanin has been removed at the instance of Russia. Russia insists now, following up that first triumph, on all anti-Russian officers being expelled the service. This measure, in its turn, was intended to be followed by the reigning Prince Alexander being replaced by Prince Michel Obrenović, the absolute tool of Russia and Russian interests. Prince Alexander, to escape from this calamity, and likewise under the pressure of Austria, has struck against the Sultan, and declared his intention of observing a strict neutrality. The Russian intrigues in Serbia are thus described in the *Presse* of Paris:

“Every body knows that the Russian Consulate at Orsova—a miserable village where not a single Russian subject is to be found, but situated in the midst of a Servian population, is only a poor establishment, yet it is made the hotbed of Muscovite propaganda. The hand of Russia was judiciously seized and established in the affair of Ibraila in 1840, and of John Lutzo in 1850, in the affair of the recent arrest of 14 Russian officers, which arrest became the cause of the resignation of Garašanin's Ministry. It is likewise known that Prince Menchikoff, during his stay at Constantinople, fomented similar intrigues through his agents at Broussa, Smyrna, as in Thessalonica, Albania and Greece.”^b

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from J. Paradis' article in *La Presse*, July 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

There is no more striking feature in the politics of Russia than the traditional identity not only of her objects, but of her manner in pursuing them. There is no complication of the present Eastern Question, no transaction, no official note, which does not bear the stamp of quotation from known pages of history.

Russia has now no other pretext to urge against the Sultan, except the treaty of Kainardji,¹⁸⁸ although that treaty gave her, instead of a protectorate over her correligionists, only the right to build a chapel at Stamboul, and to implore the Sultan's clemency for his Christian subjects, as Reshid Pasha justly urged against the Czar in his note of the 14th inst. But already in 1774, when that treaty was signed, Russia intended to interpret it one day or the other in the sense of 1853. The then Austrian Internuncio at the Ottoman Porte, Baron Thugut, wrote in the year 1774 to his Court:

"Henceforth Russia will always be in a situation to effect, whenever she may deem the opportunity favorable, and without much preliminary arrangement, a descent upon Constantinople from her ports on the Black Sea. In that case a conspiracy concerted in advance with the chiefs of the Greek religion, would no doubt burst forth, and it would only remain for the Sultan to quit his palace at the first intelligence of this movement of the Russians, to fly into the depth of Asia, and abandon the throne of European Turkey to a more experienced possessor. When the capital shall have been conquered, terrorism and the faithful assistance of the Greek Christians will indubitably and easily reduce, beneath the scepter of Russia, the whole of the Archipelago, the coast of Asia Minor and all Greece, as far as the shore of the Adriatic. Then the possession of these countries, so much favored by nature, with which no other part of the world can be compared in respect to the fertility and richness of the soil, will elevate Russia to a degree of superiority surpassing all the fabulous wonders which history relates of the grandeurs of the monarchies of ancient times." [Pp. 579-80.]^a

In 1774, as now, Russia was tempting the ambition of Austria with the prospect of Bosnia, Servia and Albania being incorporated with her. The same Baron Thugut writes thus on this subject:

"Such aggrandizement of the Austrian territory would not excite the jealousy of Russia. The reason is that the requisition which Austria would make of Bosnia, Servia, etc., although of great importance under other circumstances, would not be of the least utility to Russia, the moment the remainder of the Ottoman Empire should have fallen into her hands. For these provinces are inhabited almost entirely by Mahommedans and Greek Christians: the former would not be tolerated as residents there; the latter, considering the close vicinity of the Oriental Russian Empire would not hesitate to emigrate thither; or if they remained, their faithlessness to Austria would occasion continuous troubles; and thus an extension of territory, without intrinsic strength, so far from augmenting the power of the Emperor of Austria, would only serve to weaken it."

^a Here and below, the quotations are from Joseph von Hammer's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, Vol. 8.—*Ed.*

Politicians are wont to refer to the testament of Peter I,¹⁸⁹ in order to show the traditional policy of Russia in general, and particularly with regard to her views on Constantinople. They might have gone back still further. More than eight centuries ago, Svyatoslav, the yet Pagan Grand Duke of Russia, declared in an assembly of his Boyars, that "not only Bulgaria, but the Greek Empire in Europe, together with Bohemia and Hungary, ought to undergo the rule of Russia." Svyatoslav conquered Silistria and threatened Constantinople, A.D. 968, as Nicholas did in 1828. The Rurik dynasty transferred, soon after the foundation of the Russian Empire, their capital from Novgorod to Kiev, in order to be nearer to Byzantium. In the eleventh century Kiev imitated in all things Constantinople, and was called the *second Constantinople*, thus expressing the everlasting aspirations of Russia. The religion and civilization of Russia are of Byzantine offspring, and that she should have aimed at subduing the Byzantine Empire, then in the same decay as the Ottoman Empire is now in, was more natural than that the German Emperors should have aimed at the conquest of Rome and Italy. The unity, then, in the objects of Russian policy, is given by her historical past, by her geographical conditions, and by her necessity of gaining open sea-ports in the Archipelago as in the Baltic, if she wants to maintain her supremacy in Europe. But the traditional manner in which Russia pursues those objects, is far from meriting that tribute of admiration paid to it by European politicians. If the success of her hereditary policy proves the weakness of the Western Powers, the stereotyped mannerism of that policy proves the intrinsic barbarism of Russia herself. Who would not laugh at the idea of French politics being conducted on the testament of Richelieu, or the capitularies of Charlemagne¹⁹⁰? Go through the most celebrated documents of Russian diplomacy, and you will find that shrewd, judicious, cunning, subtle as it is in discovering the weak points of European Kings, ministers and courts, its wisdom is at a complete dead-lock as often as the historical movements of the Western peoples themselves are concerned. Prince Lieven judged very accurately of the character of the good Aberdeen when he speculated on his connivance with the Czar, but he was grossly mistaken in his judgment of the English people when he predicted the continuance of Tory rule on the eve of the Reform move of 1831. Count Pozzo di Borgo judged very correctly of Charles X, but he made the greatest blunder with regard to the French people when he induced his "august master" to treat with that King of the partition of Europe on the eve of his expulsion from France. The Russian

policy, with its traditional craft, cheats and subterfuges, may impose upon the European Courts which are themselves but traditional things, but it will prove utterly powerless with the revolutionized peoples.

At Beirut, the Americans have abstracted another Hungarian refugee from the claws of the Austrian eagle. It is cheering to see the American intervention in Europe beginning just with the Eastern Question. Besides the commercial and military importance resulting from the situation of Constantinople, there are other historical considerations, making its possession the hotly-controverted and permanent subject of dispute between the East and the West—and America is the youngest but most vigorous representative of the West.

Constantinople is the eternal city—the Rome of the East. Under the ancient Greek Emperors, Western civilization amalgamated there so far with Eastern barbarism, and under the Turks, Eastern barbarism amalgamated so far with Western civilization, as to make this center of a theocratical Empire the effectual bar against European progress. When the Greek Emperors were turned out by the Sultans of Iconium,¹⁹¹ the genius of the ancient Byzantine Empire survived this change of dynasties, and if the Sultan were to be supplanted by the Czar, the *Bas-Empire* would be restored to life with more demoralizing influences than under the ancient Emperors, and with more aggressive power than under the Sultan. The Czar would be for Byzantine civilization what Russian adventurers were for centuries to the Emperors of the Lower Empire—the *corps de garde* of their soldiers. The struggle between Western Europe and Russia about the possession of Constantinople involves the question whether Byzantinism is to fall before Western civilization, or whether its antagonism shall revive in a more terrible and conquering form than ever before. Constantinople is the golden bridge thrown between the West and the East, and Western civilization cannot, like the sun, go around the world without passing that bridge; and it cannot pass it without a struggle with Russia. The Sultan holds Constantinople only in trust for the Revolution, and the present nominal dignitaries of Western Europe, themselves finding the last stronghold of their “order” on the shores of the Neva, can do nothing but keep the question in suspense until Russia has to meet her real antagonist, the Revolution. The Revolution which will break the Rome of the West will also overpower the demoniac influences of the Rome of the East.

Those of your readers who, having read my letters on German

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, written for *The Tribune* some two years ago,^a desire to have an immediate intuition of it, will do well to inspect the picture^b by Mr. *Hasenclever*, now being exhibited in the New-York Crystal Palace,¹⁹² representing the presentation of a workingmen's petition to the magistrates of Düsseldorf in 1848. What the writer could only analyze, the eminent painter has reproduced in its dramatic vitality.

Written on July 29, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3844 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 857, August 12, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a See present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 3-96. These articles were written by Engels at the request of Marx and appeared under the signature of Karl Marx as official correspondent of the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^b "Arbeiter und Stadtrath" (1849).—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—
THE PRESS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.—
THE CZAR'S MANIFESTO.—DENMARK]¹⁹³

London, Tuesday, Aug. 2, 1853

London has ceased to be cabbless. Cabby parted with his system of passive resistance on Saturday last. Meanwhile Parliament continues to break down its great act of the session, removing step by step every *casus belli* between Cabby and the House of Commons.

The India bill has passed on Friday through its last stage, after the Ministerial propositions for raising the Directors' and Chairmen's salaries had been rejected, and the latter reduced to £900 and £1,000 respectively. The Special Court of East India Proprietors which met on Friday last, offered a most lugubrious spectacle, the desponding cries and speeches clearly betraying the apprehensions of the worthy proprietors, that the Indian Empire might *have been* their property for the better time. One right honorable gentleman gave notice of his intention to move resolutions in the House of Commons rejecting the present bill, and on the part of the Proprietors and Directors declining to accept the part assigned to them by the Ministerial measure. A strike of the honorable East India Proprietors and Directors. Very striking, indeed! The Abolition of the Company's Salt-monopoly by the British House of Commons was the first step to bringing the finances of India under its direct management.

The Naval Coast-Volunteers' bill passed through Committee in yesterday's sitting. The object of this measure is to form a body of 10,000 men, to be trained during four weeks annually for the defense of the British Coasts. They are to receive a bounty of £6, as in the case of the militia. Their service is to be limited to five years in times of peace, and to six in time of danger. When called out, they will receive the pay of able seamen, with an additional

two-pence per day during the last year. The men are not to be taken more than fifty leagues from the coasts in time of peace, and 100 in time of danger.

The Irish Landlords' and Tenants' bill¹⁹⁴ likewise passed through the third reading yesterday night. One important amendment in favor of the Tenants was added, viz.: the prohibition of Landlords to seize and sell the standing crops of a Tenant.

Mr. Cobden has published a pamphlet on the origin of the Burmese war.

So great are the fears of a deficient harvest in France, that the Government of Louis Bonaparte has treated with the Syndicate of the Paris bakers for a slight reduction in the prices of bread during the first half of August, notwithstanding the steady rise in flour at the *Halle aux blés*.^a The bakers are to be indemnified by a subsequent augmentation of prices.

"This," says *The Economist*, "is a conspiracy on the part of the French Government to cheat the people into a belief that the crops are not short, when they are."^b

Day after day the columns of the Press are inundated with conflicting dispatches on the Eastern affairs, manufactured in Vienna and Berlin, partly by Russian agents, in order to deceive the French and British public as to the operations of Russia, and partly on orders sent expressly from Paris, for stockjobbing purposes. A declaration contained in to-day's *Morning Post* would command consideration were it not that the Palmerstonian organ had quite abused such threats, which it only proffered one day in order to take them in again the day after.

"By the 10th of August the whole matter will be terminated peaceably, or the combined fleets will be commanded to proceed to the Bosphorus, or perhaps to the Black Sea. Active measures will succeed patient negotiation, and the dread of danger will no longer prevent the strong means which may ensure safety. [...] If the Czar accept the proposal now made, [...] the first condition will be the *immediate* evacuation of the [...] Principalities."

The Morning Post then asserts, that on the 24th ult. the representatives of England, France, Austria and Prussia^c convened on the terms of an *ultimatum* immediately forwarded to St. Petersburg.¹⁹⁵ This assertion, however, is contradictory to the late

^a Corn market in Paris.—*Ed.*

^b "The Corn Trade Under Protection", *The Economist*, No. 518, July 30, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c J. Westmorland, F. Bourqueney, K. Buol-Schauenstein and H. Arnim.—*Ed.*

declarations of Lord Clarendon and Lord John Russell, who spoke only of a joint note of France and England, and is altogether ignored by the French Press. Yet, be this as it may, it indicates at least, that the Palmerston party in the Cabinet has handed an ultimatum to the good Aberdeen, which the latter is to answer on the 10th of August.

As though we had not yet enough of conferences at Vienna and Constantinople, we learn from the *National-Zeitung*, that other conferences are now to sit at Berlin too. The Emperor of Russia, to provide these conferences with the required "stuff," has complacently declared, that, with all his willingness, to renounce the occupation of the Principalities as the material guaranty for his religious associations, he would now be obliged to hold them as a guaranty for the indemnification for his present expenses of occupying them. While Prince Gorchakoff announced in his proclamations that Russia pledged herself to abstain from all interference with the constituted authorities of the Principalities, the Czar issues a decree forbidding the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia^a to pay any tribute to, or to hold any communication with, the Government of Turkey. In consequence of this notification the Hospodar of Wallachia informed the Russian Consul at Bucharest, that he had already sent his tribute money to the Sultan,^b to which the Consul replied: *c'est de l'argent perdu*,^c as the Hospodar would have to pay it again to Russia.

The *Patrie* of yesterday communicates the fact that three of the most influential Boyars of Moldavia had left Jassy for Petersburg, with the especial consent of the Hospodar, in order to remonstrate with the Czar on the conduct of the Russian soldiers, who, in violation of the solemn promise given to the Porte, treated the Danubian Provinces as a conquered country, and committed numberless extortions therein. The Russians can certainly not be accused of seeking to make propaganda by making themselves popular in the Principalities.

Russia continues its armaments with the same ostentation as before. The *Hamburger Nachrichten* publishes the following Imperial manifesto, dated Petersburg, 23d July:

"By the Grace of God, we, Nicholas I, by our manifesto of August 1st (13th), 1834, have ordered that every year levies shall take place in certain parts of our Empire: to-day we order:

^a G. Ghica and B. Stirbei.—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^c This is lost money.—*Ed.*

1. For completing our forces, maritime as well as land, the tenth partial *recrutement* shall take place in the Eastern part of our Empire, at the rate of 7 men in every 1,000, the same as the recruitment which took place in 1852 in the Western portion of the Empire.

2. Besides, a levy of 3 in every 1,000 shall take place in the Eastern Provinces of our Empire as completing the proportion of 6 in every 1,000, of which only one half had been levied by the previous recruitment.

3. To the Districts of Pskov, Vitebsk, and Mogilev, which had been exempted in virtue of our manifesto of 31st Oct., 1845, and of 26th Sept., 1846, on account of the bad harvest, the recruitment for 1853 shall be proceeded with at the rate of 3 in every 1,000. With regard to the Jews in the Districts of Vitebsk and Mogilev, the recruitment among them shall take place the same as in the other Districts, at the rate of 10 in every 1,000.

4. The levy shall begin on 1st November and be completed on 1st December.

Given at St. Petersburg.

Nicholas I."

The manifesto is followed by two ukases, regulating the details of this new and extraordinary levy. Beside the above-mentioned districts, there shall take place, according to a second ukase, a recruitment among the *odnodworzes*¹⁹⁶ and inhabitants of towns in the districts of Kiev, Podolia, Volhynia, Minsk, Grodno, Wilno and Kovno.

The *Hamburger* correspondent reports as follows:

"The armaments in the interior of the Empire continue without interruption. The reserve battalions of the 4th infantry corps are being concentrated near Tula. We learn from an order of the day that the guards and grenadiers still occupy their positions in the camps near Krasnoe Selo, and near Pudost, not far from Gatchina. The field-maneuvers of these two corps, amounting to 100,000 men, continue."^a

The *Post Zeitung* of Stockholm, of July 16, announces that the Emperor of Russia had given orders for the arming and fitting out of the Baltic fleet, composed of 20 vessels of the line, and of 15 frigates. The *Kölnische Zeitung* of 29th July, states:

"The return of the Danish-Swedish fleet before the term fixed for its evolutions has taken place, in consequence of an order received by the commander to immediately repair to the Baltic."^b

Both the French journals and *The Morning Chronicle*, of to-day, contain a telegraphic dispatch from Vienna of the 3d of July, stating that America had offered the Porte money and active assistance.

^a The *Hamburger Nachrichten* report and the Manifesto of Nicholas I are apparently quoted from *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 214, August 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b A quotation from the correspondence from Berlin of July 29, published in the *Kölnische Zeitung*, July 31, 1853.—*Ed.*

The impression produced on the Continental mind, by the threatening attitude of Russia, combined with the threatening prospect of the harvests, is most significantly reflected in the following words of *The Economist*:

"The Czar has awakened into life and hope the revolutionary spirit of Europe, and we read of plots in Austria, plots in Italy, and plots in France; and there begins to be more alarm lest there should be fresh revolutionary disturbances, than that governments should go to war."^a

A well informed Danish gentleman, who has very recently arrived here from fear of the cholera now raging in Copenhagen to such an extent that already 4,000 persons have been attacked with it, and that no less than 15,000 applications for passports to leave the Danish capital have been made, informs me that the Royal message concerning the succession was chiefly carried through the abstention from voting of a great number of Eydermen,¹⁹⁷ who had hoped to avoid a crisis by their passive attitude. The crisis which they apprehended, however, has come upon them in the shape of the octroyed Constitution, and that Constitution is aimed especially against the "peasant's friends"¹⁹⁸—party by whose support the Danish Crown has achieved its previous triumphs in the succession question. As I propose to recur to this subject in a special letter,^b I will merely observe here, that the Danish Government has laid before the United Diet (the Landsting and the Folketing together), the notes exchanged with the Great Powers on the subject of its propositions.

Of these documents the most interesting pieces are especially at this moment, the note of England and the note of Russia. The "silent" Clarendon not only approves of the Royal message, but distinctly hints to the Danish Government that it could not go on with the old Democratic Constitution, with Universal Suffrage, and with no House of Lords. The silent Clarendon therefore has taken the initiative, for the interests of Russia, to recommend and provoke the Danish coup d'état. The Russian note, addressed by Count Nesselrode to Baron Ungern-Sternberg, after having reviewed the articles of the Treaty of London, dated 8th of May, 1852,¹⁹⁹ concludes as follows:

"The treaty of the 8th of May does not formally prescribe that the *Lex Regia*²⁰⁰ should be canceled; because such a disposition would not have been opportune in a treaty concluded between independent States. It would have been contrary to diplomatic usage, and still more to the respect due to the sovereign dignity of the

^a "The Eastern Question", *The Economist*, No. 518, July 30, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 241-42.—*Ed.*

Danish crown. But the Powers in giving their assent to a retrocession destined to supplant the arrangements of the Lex Regia, where the necessity of employing it would occur, in promising their support, have naturally been obliged to leave to his Majesty the King of Denmark^a the choice of the means adequate toward realizing the object by way of legislating. His Majesty, by making use of his Royal prerogative, has manifested his intention of establishing an order of succession, for all the States subject to his rule, by which, in case of the male descendants of Frederick III becoming extinct, all claims arising from Articles 27 and 40 of the Lex Regia should be excluded, and Prince Christian of Glücksburg called upon the throne with a view of securing the Danish crown to him and his male descendants by his marriage with Princess Louise of Hesse. Such are the stipulations of the Royal Message of October 4, 1852. They express the views which, at least on the part of the Imperial Government, have served as the foundation of the present negotiations. They form in the eyes of the Imperial Cabinet, a whole and cannot be retrenched; for, it appears to us that the abrogation of Articles 27 and 40 of the Lex Regia is a necessary consequence and a condition *sine qua* not only of the stipulations which called Prince Christian of Glücksburg and his descendants to the throne, but also of the principle established in the preambulum of the treaty; that a contingency by which the male descendants should be called to the succession of the throne, in the totality of the States now subjected to the sovereignty of Denmark, was the safest means for securing the integrity of that monarchy.... They declare in Article II of the treaty that they recognize in a permanent manner the principle of the integrity of the Danish monarchy.... They have promptly made known their intention of preventing, combinedly, the return of the complications which have signaled in so unfortunate a manner the course of the last year.... The extinction of the male line of Prince Christian of Glücksburg would revive, without contradiction, the eventual claims which His Majesty the Emperor has renounced^b in favor of that Prince. The initiative, however, expressly reserved to the King of Denmark, as well as the cooperation of the three Great Powers, in the aforesaid contingencies, when they shall happen, offer henceforth a guarantee to the Danish patriots against the ambitious plans and designs existing nowhere except in their own imagination."

Thus Russia gives to understand, that the temporary suppression of the Lex Regia as agreed upon in the protocol of the 8th May must be interpreted as a permanent one, that the permanent resignation of the Emperor of Russia is only a temporary one, but that the Danish patriots may henceforth repose on the protection of their country's integrity by the European Powers. Do they not witness how the integrity of Turkey has been protected since the treaty of 1841?

Written on August 2, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3847, August 16, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Frederick VII.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: "reassumed", which seems to be a misprint.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

ADVERTISEMENT DUTY.—
RUSSIAN MOVEMENTS.—DENMARK.—
THE UNITED STATES IN EUROPE²⁰¹

London, Friday, Aug. 5, 1853

The act for the repeal of the Advertisement Duty received the Royal assent last night, and comes into operation this day. Several of the morning papers have already published their reduced terms for advertisements of all kinds.

The dock-laborers of London are on the strike. The Company endeavor to get fresh men. A battle between the old and new hands is apprehended.

The Emperor of Russia^a has discovered new reasons for holding the Principalities. He will hold them no longer as a material guarantee for his spiritual aspirations, or as an indemnity for the costs of occupying them, but he must hold them now on account of "internal disturbances" as provided by the Treaty of Balta-Liman.²⁰² And, as the Russians have actually put everything in the Principalities topsy-turvy, the existence of such disturbances cannot be denied. Lord Clarendon confirmed, in the sitting of the House of Lords of August 2d, the statement given in my last letter with regard to the Hospodars having been prohibited from transmitting their tribute to Constantinople, and from entertaining further communications with Turkey.^b Lord Clarendon declared with great gravity of countenance, and a pompous solemnity of manner, that he would

"instruct, by the messenger who leaves London this night, Sir Hamilton Seymour to demand from the Russian Cabinet the *explanation* which England is entitled to."^c

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 235.—*Ed.*

^c Here and below the quotations are from House of Commons speeches of M.P.s, published in *The Times*, No. 21497, August 3, 1853.—*Ed.*

While Clarendon sends all the way to St. Petersburg to request *explanations*, the *Patrie* of to-day^a has intelligence from Jassy of the 20th ultimo, that the Russians are fortifying Bucharest and Jassy; that the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia^b are placed under a Russian Board of Control composed of three members; that contributions in kind are levied on the people, and that some refractory Boyards have been incorporated in Russian regiments. This is the “explanation” of the manifesto of Prince Gorchakoff, according to which

“his august master had no intention of modifying the institutions which governed the country, and the presence of his troops would impose upon the people neither new contributions nor charges.”

In the sitting of the House of Commons of the same day Lord John Russell declared, in answer to a question put by Lord Dudley Stuart, that the four powers had convened at Vienna on a common proposition to be made to the Czar, “acceptable” to Russia and to Turkey, and that it had been forwarded to St. Petersburg. In answer to Mr. Disraeli he stated:

“The proposition was in fact an *Austrian proposition*, though it came originally from the Government of France.”

This original Frenchman, naturalized in Austria, looks very suspicious, and the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*^c gives, in a Vienna letter, the *explanation* that

“the Russian and Austrian Cabinets have fully resolved in common not to allow English influence to predominate in the East.”

The Englishman^d observes, on the *explanations* of the Coalition Ministry:

“They are great in humiliation, strong in imbecility, and most eloquent in taciturnity.”

Moldavia and Wallachia once Russified, Galicia, Hungary and Transylvania would be transformed into Russian “*enclaves*.”

I have spoken in a former letter of the “hidden treasures” in the Bank of St. Petersburg, forming the metal reserve for a three times larger paper circulation.^e Now, the Russian Minister of War^f

^a The reference is to Charles Schiller’s report, published in *La Patrie*, No. 216, August 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b G. Ghica and B. Stirbei.—*Ed.*

^c *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, No. 177, August 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

^d A. Richards (below Marx quotes his article “The Demand for Explanations” in *The Morning Advertiser*, No. 19382, August 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, p. 117.—*Ed.*

^f V. A. Dolgorukov.—*Ed.*

has just applied for the transfer of a portion of this treasure into the military chest. The Minister of Finance^a having objected to this step, the Emperor applied himself to the Holy Synod, the depository of the Church-Property, for a loan of 60 millions of rubles. While the Czar is wanting in wealth, his troops are wanting in health. It is stated on very reliable authority, that the troops occupying the Principalities have suffered enormously from heat on their march, that the number of sick is extraordinary, and that many private houses at Bucharest and Jassy have been converted into hospitals.

The Times of yesterday denounced the ambitious plans of Russia on Turkey, but tried, at the same time, to cover her intrigues in Denmark. It does the work of its august master even while ostentatiously quarreling with him.

"We discredit," says *The Times*, "[...] the assertion that the Russian Cabinet has succeeded in establishing its hold upon the Court of Copenhagen, and the statement that the Danish Government have proceeded, under Russian influence, to abrogate or impair the Constitution of 1849, is wholly inaccurate. The Danish Government have caused a bill or draft to be published, containing *some modifications of the Constitution* now in force, but this bill is to be submitted to the discussion and vote of the Chambers when they reassemble, and it has not been promulgated by Royal authority."

The dissolution of a Legislative Assembly into four separate feudal provincial diets, the right of self-assessment canceled, the election by universal suffrage suppressed, the liberty of the press abolished, free competition supplanted by the revival of close guilds, the whole official, i.e. the only intelligent class in Denmark excluded from being eligible except on Royal permission, that you call "some modifications of the Constitution?" As well you might call Slavery a slight modification of Freedom. It is true that the Danish King^b has not dared to promulgate this new "fundamental law" as law. He has only sent, after the fashion of Oriental Sultans, the silken string to the Chambers with orders to strangle themselves. Such a proposition involves the threat of enforcing it if not voluntarily submitted to. So much for the "some modifications of the Constitution." Now to the "Russian influence."

In what way did the conflict between the Danish King and the Danish Chambers arise? He proposed to abrogate the *Lex Regia*,²⁰³ viz.: The existing law of succession to the throne of Denmark. Who urged the King to take this step? Russia, as you will have seen from the note of Count Nesselrode, dated 11th

^a P. F. Brok.—*Ed.*

^b Frederick VII.—*Ed.*

May, 1853, communicated in my last letter.^a Who will gain by that abrogation of the Lex Regia? No one but Russia. The Lex Regia enables the female line of the reigning family to succeed to the throne. By its abrogation the agnates would remove from the succession all the claims of the cognates hitherto standing in their way. You know that the kingdom of Denmark comprehends, besides Denmark Proper, viz.: the Isles and Jutland, also the two Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. The succession to Denmark Proper and Schleswig is regulated by the same Lex Regia, while in the Duchy of Holstein, being a German fee, it devolves to the agnates, according to the Lex Salica.²⁰⁴ By the abrogation of the Lex Regia the succession to Denmark and Schleswig would be assimilated to that of the German Duchy of Holstein, and Russia, having the next claims on Holstein, as the representative of the house of Holstein-Gottorp, would in the quality of chief agnate, also obtain the next claim on the Danish throne. In 1848-50, Denmark, being assisted by Russian notes and fleets, made war on Germany^b in order to maintain the Lex Regia, which forbade Schleswig to be united with Holstein, and to be separated from Denmark.²⁰⁵ After having beaten the German revolution, under the pretext of the Lex Regia, the Czar confiscates democratic Denmark by abrogating the same law. The Scandinavians and the Germans have thus made the experience that they must not found their respective national claims on the feudal laws of Royal succession. They have made the better experience, that, by quarrelling amongst themselves, instead of confederating, Germans and Scandinavians, both of them belonging to the same great race, only prepare his way to their hereditary enemy, the Slave.

The great event of the day is the appearance of American policy on the European horizon. Saluted by one party, detested by the other, the fact is admitted by all.

"Austria must look to the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire for indemnification for the loss of her Italian provinces—a contingency not rendered less likely by the quarrel [...] she has had the folly to bring on her with Uncle Sam. An American squadron in the Adriatic would be a very pretty complication of an Italian insurrection, and we may all live to see it, for the Anglo-Saxon spirit is not yet dead in the West."

Thus speaks *The Morning Herald*,^c the old organ of the English Aristocracy.

^a See this volume, pp. 237-38.—Ed.

^b *The New-York Daily Tribune* has: "made over to Germany", which seems to be a misprint.—Ed.

^c *The Morning Herald*, No. 22228, August 4, 1853.—Ed.

"The Koszta affair," says the Paris *Presse*, "is far from being terminated. We are informed that the Vienna Cabinet has asked from the Washington Cabinet a reparation, which it may be quite sure not to receive. Meanwhile, Koszta remains under the safeguard of the French Consul."^a

"We must go out of the way of the Yankee, who is half of a buccanier and half a backwoodsman, and no gentleman at all," whispers the Vienna *Presse*.

The German papers grumble about the secret treaty pretended to have been concluded between the United States and Turkey, according to which the latter would receive money and maritime support, and the former the harbor of Enos in Rumelia, which would afford a sure and convenient place for a commercial and military station of the American Republic in the Mediterranean.

"In due course of time," says the Brussels *Emancipation*,^b "the conflict at Smyrna between the American Government and the Austrian one, caused by the capture of the refugee Koszta, will be placed in the first line of events of 1853. Compared with this fact, the occupation of the Danubian Principalities and the movements of the western diplomacy and of the combined navies at Constantinople, may be considered as of second-rate importance. The event of Smyrna is the beginning of a new history, while the accident at Constantinople is only the unraveling of an old question about to expire."

An Italian paper, *Il Parlamento*, has a leader under the title "*La Politica Americana in Europa*," from which I translate the following passages literally:

"It is well known," says the *Parlamento*, "that a long time has elapsed since the United States have tried to get a maritime station in the Mediterranean and in Italy, and more particularly at such epochs when complications arose in the Orient. Thus for instance in 1840, when the great Egyptian question was agitated, and when St. Jean d'Acre was assailed, the Government of the United States asked in vain from the King of the Two Sicilies^c to temporarily grant it the great harbor of Syracuse. To-day the tendency of American policy for interfering with European affairs cannot be but more lively and more steadfast. There can be no doubt but that the actual Democratic Administration of the Union manifests the most clamorous sympathies with the victims of the Italian and Hungarian revolution, that it cares nothing about an interruption of the diplomatical intercourse with Austria, and that at Smyrna it has supported its system with the threat of the cannon. It would be unjust to grumble at this aspiration of the great transatlantic nation, or to call it inconsistent or ridiculous. The Americans certainly do not intend conquering the Orient and going to have a land war with Russia. But if England and France make the best of their maritime forces, why should not the Americans do so, particularly as soon as they will have obtained a station, a point of retreat and of "approvisionnement" in the Mediterranean? For them there are great interests at stake, the republican element being diametrically opposed to the

^a Quoted from Nefftzer's report "Bulletin du jour", *La Presse*, August 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b *L'Emancipation*, No. 204, July 23, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Ferdinand II.—*Ed.*

Cossack one. Commerce and navigation having multiplied the legitimate relations and contracts between all peoples of the world, none can consider itself a stranger to any sea of the Old or New Continent, or to any great question like that of the destiny of the Ottoman Empire. The American commerce, and the residents who exercise it on the shores of our seas, require the protection of the stars and stripes, and in order to make it permanent and valid in all seasons of the year, they want a port for a military marine that ranks already in the third line among the maritime powers of the world. If England and France interfere directly with all that regards the Isthmus of Panama, if the former of those powers goes as far as to invent a king of the Mosquitoes, in order to oppose territorial rights to the operations of the United States, if they have come to the final understanding, that the passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific shall be opened to all nations, and be possessed by a neutral State, is it not evident then, that the United States must pretend at exercising the same vigilance with regard to the liberty and neutrality of the Isthmus of Suez, holding their eyes closely fixed on the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, which will be likely to devolve Egypt and Libya wholly or partly to the dominion of some first-rate power? Suez and Panama are the two great doorways of the Orient, which, shut till now, will hereafter compete with each other. The best way to secure their ascendancy in the Transatlantic question is to cooperate in the Mediterranean question. We are assured that the American men-of-war in the neighborhood of the Dardanelles do not renounce the pretension to enter them whenever they please, without being subjected to the restrictions convened upon by the Great Powers in 1841, and this for the incontrovertible reason, that the American Government did not participate in that Convention. Europe is amazed at this boldness, because it has been, since the peace of 1783, in the habit of considering the United States as in the condition of the Swiss Cantons after the Westphalian treaty,²⁰⁶ viz.: as peoples allowed a legitimate existence, but which it would be too arduous to ask to enter into the aristocracy of the primitive Powers, and to give their votes on subjects of general policy. But on the other side of the Ocean the Anglo-Saxon race sprung up to the most exalted degree of wealth, civilization and power, cannot any longer accept the humble position assigned to it in the past. The pressure exercised by the American Union on the Council of Amphictyons of the Five Powers, till now the arbiters of the globe, is a new force that must contribute to the downfall of the exclusive system established by the treaties of Vienna. Till the Republic of the United States succeed in acquiring a positive right and an official seat in the Congresses arbitrating on general political questions, it exercises with an immense grandeur, and with a particular dignity the more humane action of natural rights and of the *jus gentium*.^a Its banner covers the victims of the civil wars without distinction of parties, and during the immense conflagration of 1848-49 the hospitality of the American Navy never submitted to any humiliation or disgrace."

Written on August 5, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3850, and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 859, August 19, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a International law.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE WAR QUESTION.—
BRITISH POPULATION AND TRADE RETURNS.—
DOINGS OF PARLIAMENT²⁰⁷

London, Friday, Aug. 12, 1853

Bonaparte compensates the French Navy for their humiliating position in Besika Bay by a reduction in the price of tobacco to the sailors, as we are informed by to-day's *Moniteur*.^a He won his throne by sausages.²⁰⁸ Why should he not try to hold it by tobacco? At all events, the Eastern complication will have produced the *démonétisation* of Louis Bonaparte in the eyes of the French peasants and the army. They have learned that the loss of liberty at home is not made up by a gain of glory abroad. The "Empire of all the glories" has sunk even lower than the "Cabinet of all the talents."

From the Constantinople journals which have just arrived, we learn that the Sultan's^b manifesto to his subjects appeared on the 1st August, that the Russian Consul at Adrianople has received orders from St. Petersburg to withdraw from Turkey, that the other Russian Consuls expect similar orders, and that the Constantinople papers have been prohibited in the Principalities. The *Impartial* of Smyrna, of Aug. 1, has the following communication with regard to Persia:

"The Shah of Persia,^c after the correspondence exchanged between the Porte and the Russian Cabinet on the occasion of the pending dispute, had been communicated to him on his request, has officially declared that all the right was on the side of the Porte, and that in case of war, he will fairly stand by her. This news had made a great impression on the Russian Ambassador at Teheran, who is said to prepare for demanding his passports."

The contents of the proposition made to Russia, and accepted by the Czar,^d according to the mysterious Petersburg dispatch,

^a *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 223, August 11, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^c Nasr-ed-Din.—*Ed.*

^d Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

form the subject of conjecture through the whole European Press. The Palmerstonian *Morning Post* avers:

“On the 25th of July M. de Meyendorff transmitted to his Imperial master, not indeed the formal propositions” (accepted at the Vienna Conference), “but an account of what had passed at the conference of the 24th.... We believe we shall not be far wrong when we confidently affirm that the affair is settled in such a manner as to preserve intact the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The mode of settlement will be this: Reshid Pasha will address the Count Nesselrode a note, in which he will inclose the firmans in which are accorded to the Greek Christians, subjects of the Sultan, more privileges than even Russia had asked for them. He will say many civil things to the Czar and assure him of the excellent disposition of the Sultan towards his own subjects, to whom he has accorded such and such rights. This note will be presented by a Turkish Ambassador, and the affair will be at an end.... By the 10th of September the last Russian soldier will have crossed the Pruth!”^a

On the other hand, private letters from Vienna, alluding to the appearance of Russian gun-boats above the confluence of the Pruth and the Danube, confirm the statement given in my last letter, that the propositions sent to St. Petersburg, do not include at all the withdrawal of the Russian armies from the Principalities, that they emanate from the Austrian Cabinet, to whose intervention the British Ambassador at Vienna,^b “that true lover of harmony,” had appealed, after the French and English proposals had been rejected by the Czar; and that they afford Russia the desired opportunity for prolonging negotiations *in infinitum*.²⁰⁹ According to the semi-official Frankfort *Ober-Postamts-Zeitung*, Russia has only permitted Austria to enlighten Turkey with regard to her own interests.

The lately published Population Returns prove the slow but steady decrease of the population of Great Britain.^c In the quarter ending June, 1853,

the number of deaths was	107,861
while the number of births was	158,718
Net increase of births as far as the registered districts are concerned	50,857
The excess of births over deaths in the United Kingdom is assumed to be	79,820
Number of emigrants during the quarter	115,959
Excess of emigration over increase of births	36,139

^a *The Morning Post*, August 11, 1853.— *Ed.*

^b J. Westmorland.— *Ed.*

^c The data are quoted from *The Times*, No. 21498, August 4, 1853.— *Ed.*

The last Return showed an excess of emigration over births of only 30,000.

The decrease of population, resulting from emigration, coincides with an unprecedented increase in the powers of production and capital. When we remember Parson Malthus denying emigration any such influence, and imagining he had established, by the most elaborate calculations, that the united navies of the world could never suffice for an emigration of such dimensions as were likely to affect in any way the overstocking of human beings, the whole mystery of modern political economy is unraveled to our eyes. It consists simply in transforming transitory social relations belonging to a determined epoch of history and corresponding with a given state of material production, into eternal, general, never-changing laws, natural laws, as they call them. The thorough transformation of the social relations resulting from the revolutions and evolutions in the process of material production, is viewed by the political economists as a mere Utopia. They see the economical limits of a given epoch, but they do not understand how these limits are limited themselves, and must disappear through the working of history, as they have been created by it.

The accounts relating to Trade and Navigation for the six months ending July 5, 1853, as published by the Board of Trade, show in general a great increase when compared with the exports, imports, and shipping in the corresponding period of the year 1852.^a The import of oxen, bulls, cows, calves, sheep and lambs has considerably increased.

The total import of grains amounted, in the six months ending July 5th, 1852, to	qrs. 2,604,201
But in the corresponding months of 1853, to	qrs. 3,984,374
The total imports of Flour and Meal amounted, during six months of 1852, to	qrs. 1,931,363
And in the corresponding months, 1853, to	qrs. 2,577,340
Total imports of Coffee, 1852	lbs. 19,397,185
Total imports of Coffee, 1853	lbs. 21,908,954
Total imports of Wine, 1852	gals. 2,850,862
Total imports of Wine, 1853	gals. 4,581,300
Total imports of Eggs, 1852	No. 64,418,591
Total imports of Eggs, 1853	No. 67,631,380
Total imports of Potatoes, 1852	cwts. 189,410

^a Below the figures are quoted from "Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation" and other material published in *The Economist*, No. 519, August 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

Total imports of Potatoes, 1853	cwts.	713,941
Total imports of Flax, 1852	cwts.	410,876
Total imports of Flax, 1853	cwts.	627,173
Total imports of Raw Silk, 1852	lbs.	2,354,690
Total imports of Raw Silk, 1853	lbs.	2,909,733
Total imports of Cotton, 1852	cwts.	4,935,317
Total imports of Cotton, 1853	cwts.	5,134,680
Total imports of Wool (sheep and lambs), 1852	lbs.	26,916,002
Total imports of Wool (sheep and lambs), 1853	lbs.	40,189,398
Total imports of Hides (tanned), 1852	lbs.	1,075,207
Total imports of Hides (tanned), 1853	lbs.	3,604,769

A decrease is found in cocoa, guano, unrefined sugar, tea, &c.
As to the exports we find:

Those of Cotton Manufactures in 1852	£11,386,491
Those of Cotton Manufactures in 1853	13,155,679

As to cotton yarn—and the same remark applies to linen and silk yarn—we find that the exported *quantity* has decreased, but that the declared *value* had considerably risen.

Linen Manufactures, 1852	£2,006,951
Linen Manufactures, 1853	2,251,260
Silk Manufactures, 1852	467,838
Silk Manufactures, 1853	806,419
Woolen Manufactures, 1852	3,894,506
Woolen Manufactures, 1853	4,941,357
Earthen Ware Manufactures, 1852	590,663
Earthen Ware Manufactures, 1853	627,218
Glass Manufactures, 1852	187,470
Glass Manufactures, 1853	236,797
Haberdashery and Millinery, 1852	884,324
Haberdashery and Millinery, 1853	1,806,007
Hardware and Cutlery, 1852	1,246,639
Hardware and Cutlery, 1853	1,663,302
Machinery, 1852	476,078
Machinery, 1853	760,288
Iron Bars, Bolts and Rods, 1852	1,455,952
Iron Bars, Bolts and Rods, 1853	2,730,479
Wrought Iron, 1852	696,089
Wrought Iron, 1853	1,187,059
Wire, 1852	42,979
Wire, 1853	106,610

With regard to the imports of manufactures, the greatest increase is found in shoes, boots and gloves, and the greatest decrease in glass manufactures, watches, woolen stuffs, and Indian silk manufactures. With regard to exports, the increase is greatest in linen, silks, woolens and metals. As to the importations of articles of consumption, we find that, with the exception of grains and cattle, the increase in nearly all articles bears witness that the home consumption of the higher and middle classes has advanced in a much larger proportion than that of the working classes. While, for instance, the consumption of wine has doubled, the consumption of cocoa, unrefined sugar, and tea has decidedly retrograded.

Out of 260 reports on the wheat crops throughout the United Kingdom, only 25 speak of the crop as fine and abundant, 30 as an average one, and above 200 reports declare it to be bad and deficient. Oats, barley and beans are expected to turn out less unfavorable, as the wet has benefited them; but the potatoes are blighted in all parts of the country. Messrs. J. [and] C. Sturge & Co. remark, in their last circular on the wheat crop:

“The wheat crop on the aggregate will probably be the least productive of any since 1816, and unless the harvest of 1854 is very early, we may require an importation of all kinds of grain and breadstuffs greater even than that of 1847—probably not less than 15,000,000 quarters—but our present prices are sufficient to induce imports to this extent, unless France should compete with us in the producing markets.”

As to a very early crop in 1854, there seems to be no great prospect of that, inasmuch as experience has shown that bad harvests generally follow in succession just as the good ones; and the succession of good harvests since 1848 has already been unusually long. That England will obtain a sufficient supply of corn from foreign countries is, perhaps, pretty sure; but that the exportation of her manufactures will, as Free Traders expect, keep pace with the importations of grains, cannot be presumed. The probable excess of importation over exportation will, besides, be accompanied by a falling off in the home consumption of manufactures. Even now the bullion reserve in the Bank of England is decreasing week after week, and has sunk to £17,739,107.

The House of Lords in its sitting of Friday last rejected the Combination of Workmen Bill, which had passed through the Commons. This bill was but a new interpretation of the old Combination Act of 1825,²¹⁰ and intended, by removing its cumbrous and equivocal terminology, to place the workmen on

a more equal footing with their employers, as far as the legality of combination is concerned. The sentimental lords who please themselves in treating the workingmen as their humble clients, feel exasperated whenever that rabble asks for rights instead of sympathies. The so-called Radical papers have, of course, eagerly seized on this opportunity to denounce the Lords to the proletarians as their "hereditary foes." I am far from denying it. But let us now look at these Radicals, the "natural friends" of the workingmen. I told you in a former letter that the Manchester master-spinners and manufacturers were getting up an association for resisting the demands of their "hands."^a This association calls itself "an association for the purpose of aiding the trade in regulating the excitement among the operatives in the Manchester district." It purports to have been formed for the following purposes:

"1. The establishment of wages for various operations connected with spinning and weaving, similar to those paid in the other districts of the cotton trade.

"2. The mutual protection of its members in the payment of such wages against the resistance offered to them on the part of the operatives employed by them respectively.

"3. The securing to the operatives themselves the advantage of a uniformity of adequate wages, to be paid to them throughout town and neighborhood."^b

In order to effect these purposes they have resolved to set up a whole organization, by forming local associations of master-spinners and manufacturers, with a central committee.

"They will resist all demands made by *associated bodies* of mill-hands, as any concession to them would be injurious to employers, operatives, and the trade generally."

They will not allow the machinery set up by and for themselves to be counterbalanced by a similar machinery set up by their men. They intend fortifying the monopoly of capital by the monopoly of combination. They will dictate terms as an associated body. But the laborers shall only dispute them in their individual capacity. They will attack in ranged battle, but they will not be resisted, except in single fight. This is "*fair competition*," as understood by the Manchester Radicals and model Free Traders.

In its sitting of Aug. 9, the House of Lords had to decide on the fate of three Ireland Bills, carried through the Commons after ten months' deliberation, viz.: the *Landlord and Tenant Bill*, removing

^a See this volume, pp. 225-26.—*Ed.*

^b This and the following quotation are from "Manchester.—Meeting of Manufacturers" in *The People's Paper*, No. 63, July 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

the laws concerning mortgages, which form at present an insuperable bar to the effective sale of the smaller estates not falling under the *Encumbered Estates Act*²¹¹; the *Leasing Powers Bill*, amending and consolidating more than sixty acts of Parliament which prohibit leases to be entered into for 21 years, regulating the tenant's compensation for improvements in all instances where contracts exist, and preventing the system of sub-letting; lastly, the *Tenant's Improvement Compensation Bill*, providing compensation for improvements effected by the tenant in the absence of any contract with the landlord, and containing a clause for the retrospective operation of this provision. The House of Lords could, of course, not object to parliamentary interference between landlord and tenant, as it has laden the statute book from the time of Edward IV to the present day, with acts of legislation of landlord and tenant, and as its very existence is founded on laws meddling with landed property, as for instance the *Law of Entail*. This time, the noble lords sitting as Judges on their own cause, allowed themselves to run into a passion quite surprising in that hospital of invalids.

"Such a bill," exclaimed the Earl of Clanricarde, "as the Tenants' Compensation Bill, such a total violation and disregard of all contracts, was never before, he believed, submitted to Parliament, nor had he ever heard of any government having ventured to propose such a measure as was carried out in the retrospective clauses of the bill."^a

The Lords went as far as to threaten the Crown with the withdrawal of their feudal allegiance,²¹² and to hold out the prospect of a landlord rebellion in Ireland.

"The question," remarked the same nobleman, "touched nearly [...] the *whole question of the loyalty and confidence of the landed proprietors in Ireland in the Government of this country*.[...] If they saw landed property in Ireland treated in such a way, he would like to know what was to *secure their attachment to the Crown, and their obedience to its supremacy?*"

Gently, my lord, gently! What was to secure their obedience to the supremacy of the Crown? One magistrate and two constables. A landlord rebellion in Great Britain! Has there ever been uttered a more monstrous anachronism? But for a long time the poor Lords have only lived upon anachronisms. They naturally encourage themselves to resist the House of Commons and public opinion.

^a M.P.s' speeches in the House of Lords are quoted from *The Times*, No. 21503, August 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

"Let not their lordships," said old Lord St. Leonards, "for the sake of preventing what was called a *collision* with the other House, or for the sake of popularity, or on account of a pressure from without, pass imperfect measures like these." "I do not belong to any party," exclaimed the Earl of Roden, "but I am highly interested in the welfare of Ireland."

That is to say, his lordship supposes Ireland to be highly interested in the welfare of the Earl of Roden. "This is no party question, but a Lords' question," was the unanimous shout of the House; and so it was. But between both parties, Whig Lords and Tory Lords, Coalition Lords and Opposition Lords, there has existed from the beginning a secret understanding to throw the bills out, and the whole impassioned discussion was a mere farce, performed for the benefit of the newspaper reporters.

This will be evident when we remember that the bills which formed the subject of so hot a controversy were originated, not by the Coalition Cabinet, but by Mr. Napier, the Irish Attorney-General under the Derby Ministry, and that the Tories at the last elections in Ireland appealed to the testimony of these bills introduced by them. The only substantial change made by the House of Commons in the measures introduced by the Tory Government was the excluding of the growing crops from being distrained upon. "The bills are not the same," exclaimed the Earl of Malmesbury, asking the Duke of Newcastle whether he did not believe him. "Certainly not," replied the Duke. "But whose assertion would you then believe?" "That of Mr. Napier," answered the Duke. "Now," said the Earl, "here is a letter of Mr. Napier, stating that the bills are not the same." "There," said the Duke, "is another letter of Mr. Napier, stating that they are."

If the Tories had remained in, the Coalition Lords would have opposed the Ireland Bills. The Coalition being in, on the Tories fell the task of opposing their own measures. The Coalition having inherited these bills from the Tories and having introduced the Irish party into their own cabinet, could, of course, not oppose the bills in the House of Commons; but they were sure of their being burked in the House of Lords. The Duke of Newcastle made a faint resistance, but Lord Aberdeen declared himself contented with the bills passing formally through a second reading, and being really thrown out for the session. This accordingly was done. Lord Derby, the chief of the late Ministry, and Lord Lansdowne, the nominal President of the present Ministry, yet at the same time one of the largest proprietors of land in Ireland, managed, wisely, to be absent from indisposition.

On the same day the House of Commons carried the *Hackney Carriages Duties Bill* through the third reading, renewing the official price-regulations of the 14th century, and accepting the clause proposed by Mr. F. Scully, which subjects cab proprietors' strikes to legal penalties. We have not now to settle the question of state interference with private concerns. We have only to state that this passed in a free-trade House. But, they say, that in the cab trade there exists monopoly and not free competition. This is a curious sort of logic. First they subject a particular trade to a duty, called license, and to special police regulations, and then they affirm that, in virtue of these very burdens imposed upon it, the trade loses its free-trade character and becomes transformed into a state monopoly.

The *Transportation Bill* has also passed through Committee. Except a small number of convicts who will continue to be transported to Western Australia, the penalty of transportation is abolished by this bill. After a certain period of preliminary imprisonment the offenders will receive tickets of leave in Great Britain, liable to be revoked, and then they will be employed on the public works at wages to be determined by Government. The philanthropic object of the latter clause is the erection of an artificial surplus in the labor market, by drawing forced convict-labor into competition with free labor; the same philanthropists forbidding the workhouse paupers all sort of productive labor from fear of creating competition with private capital.

The London *Press*, a weekly journal, inspired by Mr. Disraeli, and certainly the best informed paper as far as ministerial mysteries are concerned, made, on Saturday last, and accordingly before the arrival of the Petersburg dispatch, the following curious statement:

"We are informed, that in their private and confidential circles, the ministers declare that there is not only now no danger of war, but that the peril, if it ever existed, has long been averted. It seems that the proposition formally forwarded to St. Petersburg, [...] had been previously approved by the Emperor; and while the British Government assume in public countenance a tone which is exercising a deleterious influence on the trade of the country, in private they treat the panic as a hoax, scoff off any idea of war having ever been seriously contemplated by any power, and speak of the misunderstanding in question 'as a thing that has been settled these three weeks.' What does all this mean, what is the mystery of all this conduct? ... The propositions now at St. Petersburg, and which were approved by the Emperor before they were transmitted to St. Petersburg, involve a complete concession by Turkey to Russia of all those demands, a resistance to which brought about the present war between these two countries. Those demands were resisted by the Porte under the counsel and at the special instigation of England and France. By the advice and special instigation of England and France, those demands, according to this project, are now to be complied with. [...] There is some

change of form, [...] but there is nothing material in that change. [...] The Emperor of Russia, in virtually establishing the Protectorate over the great bulk of the population of European Turkey, is to declare, that in so doing he has no wish to impugn the sovereign rights of the Sultan. Magnanimous admission!"^a

Royalty in Great Britain is supposed to be only a nominal power, an assumption which accounts for the peace all parties keep with it. If you were to ask a Radical why his party abstained from attacking the prerogatives of the Crown, he would answer you: It is a mere State decoration which we don't care about. He would tell you that Queen Victoria has only once dared to have a will of her own, at the time of the famous bed chambermaid's catastrophe, when she insisted upon retaining her female Whig *entourage*, but was forced to yield to Sir Robert Peel, and dismiss it. Various circumstances, however, connected with the Oriental question—the inexplicable policy of the Ministry, the denunciations of foreign journals, and the successive arrival of Russian princes and princesses, at a moment when England was supposed to be on the eve of a war with the Autocrat—have accredited the rumor that there existed, during the whole epoch of the Eastern crisis, a Court conspiracy with Russia, sustaining the good old Aberdeen in office, paralyzing the showy alliance with France, and counteracting the official resistance to Russian encroachments. The Portuguese counter-revolution is hinted at, which was enforced by an English fleet, for the sole interest of the Coburg family.²¹³ It is iterated that Lord Palmerston, too, had been dismissed from the Foreign Office in consequence of Court intrigues. The notorious friendship between the Queen and the Duchess of Orleans is alluded to. It is remembered that the Royal Consort is a Coburg,^b that the Queen's uncle is another Coburg,^c highly interested as King of Belgium and as the son-in-law of Louis Philippe, in the fall of Bonaparte, and officially received into the circle of the Holy Alliance, by the marriage of his son^d with an Austrian Archduchess.^e Lastly, the reception which the Russian guests meet with, is contrasted with the imprisonment and chicanery English travelers lately met with in Russia.

The Paris *Siècle* some weeks ago denounced the English Court. A German paper dwelt on the Coburg-Orleans conspiracy, which, for the sake of family interests, had, through the medium of King

^a *The Press*, No. 14, August 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Prince Albert.—*Ed.*

^c Leopold I.—*Ed.*

^d Léopold Louis Philippe Marie Victor.—*Ed.*

^e Marie Henriette.—*Ed.*

Leopold and Prince Albert, enforced upon the English Ministry a line of policy dangerous to the Western nations, and fostering the secret intentions of Russia. The Brussels *Nation* had a long report of a Cabinet Council held at London, in which the Queen had formally declared that Bonaparte, by his pretensions to the Holy Shrines, had been the only cause of the present complications, that the Emperor of Russia wished less to humiliate Turkey than his French rival, and that she would never give her Royal assent to any war against Russia for the interest of a Bonaparte.

These rumors have been delicately alluded to by *The Morning Advertiser*, and have found a loud echo in the public, and a cautious one in the weekly press.

“Without desiring,” says *The Leader*,^a “to put constructions too wide, let us simply observe facts. The Princess Olga has come to England with her husband,^b and her sister,^c the Duchess of Leuchtenberg, the Emperor’s most diplomatic daughter. She has been received by Baron Brunnow, and [...] she is at once welcomed *at Court*, and surrounded by the representatives of good society in England, Lord Aberdeen being among that [...] number.”

Even *The Examiner*, the first of the first-rate London weekly papers, announces the arrival of these guests under the laconic rubric “*More Russians*.” In one of its leaders we find the remark,

“No earthly reason now exists why the Peace Society should not reappear before the world, in the most approved form, *under the patronage of His Royal Highness, Prince Albert*.”^d

A more direct allusion is not allowable in a journal of the standing of *The Examiner*. It concludes the article from which I quote by contrasting the English Monarchy with the Transatlantic Republic:

“If the Americans should be ambitious to seize the place we once held in Europe, that is no affair of ours. Let them reap the present honor and ultimate advantage of enforcing the law of nations, and of being revered as the protectors of the feeble against the [...] strong. England is content, provided only Consols be at par, and her own coasts [...] secure against any immediate attack of a foreign army.”

On a vote of £5,820, to defray the charge of works, repairs, furniture, etc., at the residence of the British Ambassador at Paris,

^a *The Leader*, No. 176, August 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Charles Frederick Alexander.—*Ed.*

^c Maria Nikolayevna.—*Ed.*

^d Here and below Marx quotes from “Triumph of the Peace Party” in *The Examiner*, No. 2375, August 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

for the year ending 31st March, 1854, being proposed, Mr. Wise asked what had become of the £1,100 a year, voted for the last thirty years, in order to keep in repair the residence of the British Ambassador at Paris. Sir William Molesworth was compelled to own that the public money had been misapplied, and that, according to the architect Albano, sent by Government to Paris, the residence of the British Ambassador was in a most dilapidated state. The verandah around the house had fallen in; the walls were in a state of decay; the house had not been painted for several years; the staircases were unsafe; the cesspools were exhaling a most offensive effluvium; the rooms were full of vermin, which were running over the tables, and maggots were in every place on the furniture and on the curtains, while the carpets were stained by the dirt of dogs and cats.

Lord Palmerston's *Smoke Nuisance Suppression Bill* has passed a second reading. This measure once carried, the metropolis will assume a new aspect, and there will remain no dirty houses in London, except the House of Lords and the House of Commons.

Written on August 12, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3854, August 24, 1853 and in abridged form in German in *Die Reform*, No. 43, August 27, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx
 URQUHART.—BEM.—
 THE TURKISH QUESTION IN THE HOUSE
 OF LORDS²¹⁴

London, Tuesday, August 16, 1853

David Urquhart has published four letters on the Oriental question,^a purporting to expose four delusions—firstly, that regarding the identity of the Oriental and Russian Churches; secondly, of there being a diplomatical contest between England and Russia; thirdly, of there being a possibility of war between England and Russia; and lastly, the delusion of union between England and France. As I intend to recur another time more fully to these letters,²¹⁵ I confine myself for the present to communicating to you the following letter addressed by Bem to Reshid Pasha, a letter published for the first time by Mr. Urquhart.

“Monseigneur! Not seeing the order arrive to command my presence at Constantinople, I conceive it to be my duty to address to your Highness some considerations which appear to me to be urgent. I commence by declaring that the Turkish troops which I have seen, cavalry, infantry, and field artillery—are excellent. In bearing, instruction, and military spirit, there can be no better. The horses surpass those of any European cavalry. That which is inappreciable is the desire felt by all the officers and all the soldiers to fight against Russia. With such troops I would willingly engage to attack a Russian force double their number, and I should be victorious. And as the Ottoman Empire can march against the Russians more troops than that Power can oppose to them, it is evident that the Sultan^b may have the satisfaction to see restored to his sceptre all the Provinces treacherously withdrawn from his ancestors by the Czars of Moscow....

Bem.”^c

^a D. Urquhart, “What Means Protection of the Greek Church”, “Time in Diplomacy.—The European Recognition”, “The Relative Power of Russia and Great Britain”, “War between England and France”, *The Morning Advertiser*, August 11, 12, 15, 16. 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^c *The Morning Advertiser*, August 15, 1853.—*Ed.*

The Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs^a has sent to all the European Courts a note relative to the conduct of the American frigate *St. Louis*, in the Koszta affair, denouncing the American policy in general. Austria contends that she has the right to kidnap foreigners from the territory of a neutral power, while the United States have no right to commence hostilities in order to defend them.

On Friday, in the House of Lords, the Earl of Malmesbury did not inquire into the mystery of the Vienna Conference, or of the propositions forwarded by it to the Czar,^b nor did he inquire as to the present state of transactions. His curiosity was rather of a retrospective and antiquarian character. What he moved for was "simple translations" of the two manifestos addressed by the Emperor, in May and June, to his diplomatical agents, and published in the *St. Petersburg Gazette*,²¹⁶ and also "for any answer which Her Majesty's Government might have sent to the statements therein contained." The Earl of Malmesbury is no ancient Roman. Nothing could be more repulsive to his feelings than the Roman manner of openly examining foreign Ambassadors amid the *pates conscripti*.

The two Russian circulars he stated himself to "have been published openly to all Europe by the Emperor of Russia [...] in his own language, and [...] have also appeared in the English and French languages in the public prints."

What possible good, then, could result from translating them again from the language of the writers of the public prints into the language of the clerks of the Foreign Office?

"The French Government did answer the circulars immediately and ably.... The English reply, as we are told, was made soon after that of the French Government."

The Earl of Malmesbury was anxious to know how the indifferent prose of M. Drouyn de Lhuys might look when translated into the noble prose of the Earl of Clarendon.

He felt himself bound to remind "his noble friend opposite," that John Bull, after thirty years of peace, of commercial habits, and of industrial pursuits, had become "somewhat nervous" with regard to *war*, and that this nervousity had, since the month of

^a *K. Buol-Schauenstein.—Ed.*

^b *Nicholas I.—Ed.*

^c Here and below passages from Malmesbury's speech and from those of other speakers in the House of Lords on August 12, 1853, are quoted from *The Times*, No. 21506, August 13, 1853.—*Ed.*

March last, "increased from the continued and lengthened mystery which the Government have drawn over their operations and negotiations." In the interest of peace, therefore, Lord Malmesbury interpellates, but in the same interest of peace the Government keeps silence.

The first signs of aggression of Russia on European Turkey no one was more annoyed at than the noble Earl himself. He had never suspected such a thing as Russian designs upon Turkey. He would not believe in what he saw. There was above all "the honor of the Emperor of Russia." But did the aggrandizement of his Empire ever damage the honor of an Emperor? There was "his conservative policy [...] which he had emphatically proved during the revolutions of 1848." Indeed, the Autocrat did not join in the wickedness of those revolutions. Especially, in 1852, when the noble Earl held the Foreign Office

"it was impossible for any Sovereign to give more repeated assurances, or to show a more sincere interest in the maintenance of the treaties by which Europe is bound, and the maintenance of the territorial arrangements which have existed for the happiness of Europe for so many years."

Certainly, when Baron Brunnow induced the Earl of Malmesbury to sign the treaty of 8th May, 1852, with regard to the succession of the Danish throne, he caught him with repeated assurances as to the foible of his august master for existing treaties; and when he persuaded him, at the time the Earl hailed the usurpation of Bonaparte, to enter into a secret alliance with Russia, Prussia, and Austria against this same Bonaparte, he made a great show of his sincere interest in the maintenance of the existing territorial arrangements.

In order to account for the sudden and unexpected change which has overcome the Emperor of Russia, the Earl of Malmesbury then enters into a psychological analysis "of the new impressions made on the *Emperor of Russia's mind*." The "feelings" of the Emperor, he ventures to affirm, "were irritated at the conduct of the French Government in regard to the Holy Shrines in Palestine." Bonaparte, it is true, in order to allay those irritated feelings, dispatched M. De la Cour to Constantinople, "a man of singularly mild and conciliatory conduct." But says the Earl, "it appears that in the Emperor of Russia's mind, what had passed had not been effaced," and that there remained a residue of bitter feeling with regard to France. M. De la Cour, it must be confessed, settled the question finally and satisfactorily, before Prince Menchikoff's arrival at Constantinople. "Still the impression

on the mind of the Russian Emperor remained unaltered." So strong was this impression, and the mental aberration resulting from it, "that the Emperor still suspected the Turkish Government of wishing to impose upon Russia conditions which she had no right to impose." The Earl of Malmesbury owns that it is "impossible" not only for "any human being," but even for an English Lord, to "read the human mind;" nevertheless, "he cannot help thinking that he can account for those strange impressions effected upon the Emperor of Russia's mind." The moment, he says, had arrived, which the Russian population had been taught for many generations to look forward to as the "predestinated epoch of their obtaining Constantinople, and restoring the Byzantine Empire." Now he supposes "these feelings" to have been shared by "the present Emperor." Originally, the sagacious Earl intended to explain the Emperor's obstinate suspicion, that the Turkish Government wanted to hurt him in his rights, and now he informs us that he suspected Turkey, because he thought the proper moment to have arrived of swallowing her. Arrived at this point the noble Earl had necessarily to change the course of his deductions. Instead of accounting for the new impressions on the Emperor of Russia's mind which altered the old circumstances, he accounts now for the circumstances, which restrained for some time the ambitious mind and the old traditional feeling of the Czar from "giving way to temptation." These circumstances resolve themselves in the one great fact, that at one period the Earl of Malmesbury was "in," and that at the other period he was "out."

When "in" he was the first, not only to acknowledge Boustrapa,^a but also to apologize for his perjury, his murders, and his usurpation. But, then,

"the newspapers of the day continually found fault with what they called a subservient and cringing policy to the French Emperor."

The Coalition Ministry came, and with it Sir J. Graham and Sir Charles Wood,

"condemning at public meetings the policy and character of the French Emperor, and condemning the French people, too, for the choice of this prince as their sovereign."

^a A nickname of Louis Bonaparte, composed from the first syllables of the towns Boulogne and Strasbourg, where Bonapartist putsches were organised in 1836 and 1840, and of Paris, where a coup d'état was staged on December 2, 1851.—*Ed.*

Then followed the Montenegro affair,²¹⁷ and the Coalition

“allowing Austria to insist on the Sultan giving up any further coercion of the rebellious Montenegrins, and not even securing to the Turkish army a safe and peaceable retreat, thus causing Turkey a loss of from 1,500 to 2,000 men.”^a

At a later period the recall of Col. Rose from Constantinople, the refusal of the British Government to order simultaneously with France their fleet to Besika Bay or Smyrna—all these circumstances together, produced the impression on the Emperor of Russia’s mind that the people and the Government of England were hostile to the French Emperor, and that no true alliance was possible between the two countries.

Having thus traced with a delicacy worthy of a romance-writer, who analyzes the undulating feelings of his heroine, the succession of circumstances belaboring the Emperor of Russia’s impressionable mind and seducing him from the path of virtue, the Earl of Malmesbury flatters himself to have broken through the prejudices and antipathies which had alienated for centuries the French from the English people by his close alliance with the oppressor of the French people, he congratulates the present Government upon having inherited from him the intimate alliance with the Western Czar, and upon having reaped where the Tories had sown. He forgets that it is exactly this intimate alliance under the auspices of which the Sultan has been sacrificed to Russia, the Coalition being backed by the French Emperor, while the French Soulouque eagerly seizes the opportunity of slipping on the shoulders of the Mussulman into a sort of Vienna Congress and becoming respectable. In the same breath in which he congratulates the Ministry on their close alliance with Bonaparte, he denounces the very policy which has been the fruit of that *mésalliance*.

We shall not follow the Earl in his exhortations on the importance of Turkish integrity, in his denial of her decay, in his repudiation of the Russian religious Protectorate, nor in his reproaches to the Government for not having declared the invasion of the Principalities a *casus belli*, and for not having answered the crossing of the Pruth by sending out their fleet. He has nothing new except the following letter, “perfectly unsurpassed for insolence,” addressed by Prince Menchikoff to Reshid Pasha on the eve of his departure from Constantinople:

^a Here Marx quotes not from Malmesbury’s speech, as below and above, but from Clarendon’s speech in the House of Lords on August 12, 1853.—*Ed.*

“Buyukdere, May 9, [21st]

“At the moment of departure from Constantinople, the undersigned Ambassador of Russia, has learnt that the Sublime Porte manifested its intention to proclaim a guaranty for the exercise of the spiritual rights vested in the clergy of the Eastern Church, which, in fact, renders doubtful the maintenance of the other privileges which that Church enjoys. Whatever may be the motive of this determination, the undersigned is under the necessity of informing his Highness, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that a declaration or any other act, which, although it may preserve the integrity of the purely spiritual rights of the orthodox Eastern Church, tends to invalidate the other rights, privileges and immunities accorded to her religion and clergy, from the most ancient times, and which they enjoy at the present moment, will be considered by the Imperial Cabinet as an act of hostility to Russia and to her religion.

“The undersigned begs, &c.

“Menchikoff.”

The Earl of Malmesbury “could hardly believe that the Russian Emperor countenanced the conduct of Prince Menchikoff, or the manner in which he acted,” a doubt confirmed by Nesselrode’s notes following Menchikoff’s departure, and the Russian army following Nesselrode’s notes.

The “silent” Clarendon, “painful as it was to him,” was obliged “to give the same answer over and over again,” viz.: to give no answer at all. He felt it “his public duty not to say a word” which he had not already said, of “not laying any communication before them, and of not producing any separate dispatch.” The noble Earl accordingly gave not one iota of information which we did not know before. His principal aim was to establish that, during the whole time that the Austrian and Russian Cabinets were making their encroachments, he was in “constant communication” with them. Thus he was in constant communication with the Austrian Government when it sent Prince Leiningen to Constantinople and its troops to the frontier, “because,” at least this, says the innocent Clarendon, was the “reason given”—“because it apprehended an outbreak of its own subjects on the frontier.” After the Sultan had yielded to Austria, by withdrawing his force, the energetic Clarendon “was again in communication with Austria, in order to insure the full execution of the treaty.”

“I believe,” continues the credulous Lord, “it was carried out, for the Austrian Government assured us that such was the case.”

Very good, my Lord! As to the *entente cordiale* with France, it had ever existed since 1815! As to the part the French and English Governments took “with respect to the sending of their respective

fleets," there "was not a shade of difference." Bonaparte ordered his fleet to proceed to Salamis,

"believing that danger was imminent," and, "although he" (Clarendon) "told him the danger was not so imminent, and that for the moment it was not necessary for the French fleet to leave the French ports," he ordered the French fleet to leave them; but this circumstance did not make the *slightest difference* because it was much more handy and more advantageous to have one fleet at Salamis and the other at Malta, than to have one at Malta and the other at Toulon."

Lord Clarendon further states that throughout the insolent pressure of Prince Menchikoff on the Porte

"it was a matter of satisfaction that the fleet was not ordered out because no one could say that the Turkish Government acted under their dictation."

After what has passed, it is indeed probable, that, had the fleet then been ordered out, the Sultan would have been forced to draw in. As to Menchikoff's "valedictory letter," Clarendon owned it to be correct, "but such language in diplomatic negotiations with governments was, fortunately, rare, and he hoped would long remain so." As to the invasion of the Principalities, the English and French Governments

"advised the Sultan to waive his undoubted right of treating the occupation of the Principalities as a *casus belli*."

As to the negotiations yet pending, all he would say was that,

"an official communication had been received this morning from Sir Hamilton Seymour, that the propositions agreed upon by the Ambassadors at Vienna, *if slightly modified*, would be received at St. Petersburg."

As to the terms of the settlement, he would rather die than let them slip out.

The noble Lord was responded to by Lord Beaumont, the Earl of Hardwicke, the Marquis of Clanricarde, and the Earl of Ellenborough. There was not one single voice to felicitate Her Majesty's Government on the course pursued in these negotiations. There were very great apprehensions on all sides that the ministerial policy had been the wrong way; that they had acted as mediators in behalf of Russia, instead of as defenders of Turkey, and that an early display of firmness on the part of England and France, would have placed them in a better position than that which they now hold. The old obstinate Aberdeen answered them, that "it was easy to speculate on what would have been the case, after the event had occurred; to say what might have been the

case, had they followed a different course.” However, his most startling and important statement was the following:

“Their Lordships must be aware that they were not bound by any treaty. He denied that this country was bound by the stipulations of any treaty to take part in any hostilities in support of the Turkish Empire.”

The Emperor of Russia, when England and France first showed their disposition to meddle with the pending Turkish affair, utterly repudiated the binding force of the treaty of 1841 upon his own dealings with the Porte, and the right of interposition resulting therefrom on the part of the Western Cabinets. At the same time he insisted upon the exclusion of the ships of war of the other Powers from the Dardanelles, in virtue of the same treaty of 1841. Now, Lord Aberdeen, in open and solemn assembly of Parliament, endorses this arrogant interpretation of a treaty which is only respected by the Autocrat when it excludes Great Britain from the Euxine.^a

Written on August 16, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3862 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 863, September 2, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Ancient name of the Black Sea.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE TURKISH QUESTION IN THE COMMONS²¹⁸

London, Friday, Aug. 19,^a 1853

Lord John Russell having postponed his explanations on the Turkish question again and again, till at last, the last week of the Parliamentary session had happily arrived, came suddenly forward on Monday last, and gave notice that he would make his long deferred statement on Tuesday. The noble lord had ascertained that Mr. Disraeli had left London on Monday morning. In the same manner Sir Charles Wood, when he knew Sir J. Pakington and his partisans to be out of the House, suddenly brought in his India Bill, as amended by the House of Lords, and carried, in a thin house, without division, the re-enactment of the Salt-Monopoly. Such mean and petty tricks are the nerves and sinews of Whig Parliamentary tactics.

The Eastern question in the House of Commons, was a most interesting spectacle. Lord J. Russell opened the performances in a tone quite conformed to the part he had to play. This diminutive earthman, supposed to be the last representative of the once powerful Whig tribe, spoke in a dull, low, dry, monotonous, and barren-spirited manner—not like a Minister, but like a police reporter, who mitigates the horrors of his tale by the trivial, commonplace, and business-like style in which he relates it. He offered no “apology,” but he made a confession. If there was any redeeming feature in his speech, it was its stiffness itself, which seemed intended to conceal some painful impressions laboring in

^a The article is dated “August 18” in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. This is evidently a slip of the pen because Friday was on August 19, which was also put down in Marx’s notebook as the date of sending the article to New York.—*Ed.*

the little man. Even the inevitable phrase of "the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire," sounded like an old reminiscence, recurring, by some inadvertence, in a funeral oration over that same Empire. The impression produced by this speech, which purported to announce the settlement of the Eastern complication, may be judged from the fact that, as soon as transmitted by telegraph to Paris, the funds fell immediately.

Lord John was right in stating that he had not to defend the Government, the Government not having been attacked; on the contrary, every disposition had been shown on the part of the House to leave negotiations in the hands of the Executive. Indeed no motion has been put by any member of Parliament to force discussion upon Ministers and there has not been held any meeting out of the House to force such a motion upon members of Parliament. If the ministerial policy has been one of secrecy and mystification, it was so with the silent consent of Parliament and of the public. As to the withholding of documents while negotiations were pending, Lord John asserted it to be an eternal law established by parliamentary tradition. It would be tedious to follow him in the narration of events familiar to everybody, and infused with no new life by his manner of rather enumerating than reciting them. There are, however, some important points Lord John was the first officially to confirm.

Before Prince Menchikoff's arrival at Constantinople the Russian Ambassador^a informed Lord John that the Czar^b intended to send a special mission to Constantinople with propositions relating exclusively to the Holy Cross and the immunities of the Greek Church connected with them. The British Ambassador at St. Petersburg,^c and the British Government at home suspected no other intention on the part of Russia. It was not until the beginning of March, when the Turkish Minister informed Lord Stratford (Mr. Layard, however, affirms that Colonel Rose and many other persons at Constantinople were already initiated in the secret) that Prince Menchikoff had proposed a secret treaty²¹⁹ incompatible with Turkish independence, and that he had declared it to be the intention of Russia to consider any communication of the fact to either France or England as an act of direct hostility against Russia. It was known at the same time, not

^a F. I. Brunnow.—*Ed.*

^b Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^c G. H. Seymour.—*Ed.*

from mere rumor, but from authentic reports that Russia was accumulating great masses of troops on the frontiers of Turkey and at Odessa.

As to the note forwarded by the Vienna Conference to the Czar, and agreed upon by him, it had been prepared at Paris by M. Drouyn de Lhuys, who took the reply of Reshid Pasha to the last Russian note²²⁰ for his basis. It was afterward taken up, in an altered form, by Austria, as her own proposition, on the 24th July, and received its final touch on the 31st of July. The Austrian Minister^a having previously communicated it to the Russian Ambassador at Vienna,^b it was already, on the 24th, conveyed to St. Petersburg before it was finally arranged, and it was not sent to Constantinople till the 2d of August, when the Czar had already agreed to it. Thus, after all, it is a Russian note addressed through the means of the four Powers to the Sultan, instead of a note of the Four Powers addressed to Russia and Turkey. Lord John Russell states that this note has "not the *exact form of Prince Menchikoff's note*," owning thereby that it has its exact contents. To leave no doubt behind, he adds:

"*The Emperor considers that his objects will be attained.*"^c

The draft contains not even an allusion to the evacuation of the Principalities.

"Supposing that note," says Lord John, "to be finally agreed upon [...] by Russia and [...] Turkey, *there will still remain the great question of the evacuation of the Principalities.*"

He adds at the same time, that the British Government "considers this evacuation to be essential," but upon the mode by which this object is to be obtained he asks permission to say nothing. He gives us, however, sufficiently to understand that the fleets of England and France may have to leave Besika Bay before the Cossacks shall have left the Principalities.

"We ought not to consent to any arrangement by which it may be stipulated that the advance of the fleets to the neighborhood of the Dardanelles should be considered as equivalent to an actual invasion of the Turkish Territories. But, of course, if the matter is settled, if peace is secured, Besika Bay is not a station which would be of any advantage either to England or France."

^a K. Buol-Schauenstein.— *Ed.*

^b P. K. Meyendorff.— *Ed.*

^c Russell's speech and those of other speakers in the House of Commons on August 16, 1853, are quoted from *The Times*, No. 21509, August 17, 1853.— *Ed.*

Now, as no man in his senses has ever supposed the French and English fleets are to remain for all time at Besika Bay, or France and England to enter into a formal stipulation forbidding them to advance to the neutral neighborhood of the Dardanelles, these ambiguous and cumbrous phrases, if they have any meaning at all, mean that the fleets will retire, after the note shall have been accepted by the Sultan and the Cossack promised to evacuate the Principalities.

“When the Russian Government,” says Lord John, “had occupied the Principalities, Austria [...] declared that, in conformity with the spirit of the Treaty of 1841, it was absolutely necessary that the representatives of the Powers should meet in conference, and should endeavor to obtain some amicable solution of a difficulty which might otherwise threaten the peace of Europe.”

Lord Aberdeen, on the contrary, declared some days ago^a in the House of Lords, and also, as we are informed from other sources, in a formal note communicated to the Cabinets of St. Petersburg and Constantinople in the course of last June, that

“the Treaty of 1841 did not in any way impose upon the Powers who signed it the obligation of actual assistance in behalf of the Porte [but of a temporary abstention from entering the Dardanelles!] and that the Government of Her British Majesty^b held themselves perfectly free to act or not to act, according to its own interests.”

Lord Aberdeen only repudiates all obligations toward Turkey, in order not to possess any right against Russia.

Lord John Russell concludes with “*a fair aspect*” of the negotiations approaching their crowning result. This seems a very sanguine view of the matter, at the moment when the Russian note, arranged at Vienna and to be presented by Turkey to the Czar, has not yet been accepted by the Sultan, and when the *sine qua non* of the Western Powers, viz.: the evacuation of the Principalities, has not yet been pressed upon the Czar.

Mr. Layard, the first speaker who rose in response to Lord John, made by far the best and most powerful speech—bold, concise, substantial, filled with facts, and proving the illustrious scholar to be as intimately acquainted with Nicholas as with Sardanapalus, and with the actual intrigues in the Orient as well as with the mysterious traditions of its past.

Mr. Layard regretted that Lord Aberdeen had “on several occasions, and in several places, declared that his policy is essentially a policy based on peace.” If England shrank from

^a On August 12, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Victoria.—*Ed.*

maintaining her honor and interests by war, she encouraged on the part of a lawless Power like Russia, pretensions which must inevitably lead sooner or later to war. The present conduct of Russia must not be considered as a mere casual and temporary occurrence, but as part and parcel of a great scheme of policy.

As to the "concessions" made to France and the "intrigues" of M. de Lavalette, they could not even afford a pretext to Russia, because

"a draught of the firman making those concessions, of which Russia complains, was delivered by the Porte to M. de Titoff some days, if not weeks, before it was issued, and [...] no objection whatever was made to the terms of that firman."

Russia's designs with regard to Serbia, Moldo-Wallachia and the Christian population of Turkey were not to be misunderstood. Immediately after his public entry at Constantinople, Prince Menchikoff demanded the dismissal of M. Garašanin, from his post of Serbian Minister. That demand was complied with, although the Serbian Synod protested. M. Garašanin was one of the men brought forward by the insurrection of 1842, that national movement against Russian influence which expelled the then reigning Prince Michel from Serbia,²²¹ he and his family being mere tools in the hands of Russia. In 1843 the Russian Government claimed the right of interference in Serbia. Completely unauthorized by any treaty, she was authorized by *Lord Aberdeen*, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, who declared, "*that Russia had the right to place her own construction on her own treaties.*"

"By her success in that transaction," says Mr. Layard, "Russia showed that she was mistress of Serbia and could check any rising independent nationality."

As to the Danubian Principalities, Russia first took advantage of the national movement of 1848 in those provinces, compelling the Porte to expel from them every man of liberal and independent opinions. Then, she forced upon the Sultan the treaty of Balta-Liman,²²² by which she established her right to interfere in all the internal affairs of the Principalities,

"and her present occupation of them has proved that Moldavia and Wallachia are to all intents and purposes Russian provinces."

There remained the Greeks of Turkey and the Slavonians of Bulgaria professing the Christian religion.

"The spirit of inquiry and independence has sprung up among the Greeks, and this together with their commercial intercourse with the free States of Europe, has

greatly alarmed the Russian Government. There was another cause, viz., the spread of the Protestant faith among the Christians of the East, [...] mainly through the influence and teachings of American missionaries, scarcely a considerable town exists in Turkey, in which there is not a nucleus of a Protestant community. [Another motive for American intervention.] The Greek clergy backed by the Russian mission have done all in their power to check this movement, and, when persecution was no longer available, Prince Menchikoff appeared at Constantinople. [...] The great end of Russia has been to crush the spirit of religious and political independence, which has manifested itself of late years among the Christian subjects of the Porte."

As to the establishment of a so-called *Greek Empire at Constantinople*, Mr. Layard, meaning of course the Greeks in contradistinction to the Slavonians, stated that the Greeks amount hardly to 1,750,000; that the Slavonians and Bulgarians have been struggling for years to throw off all connection with them, by refusing to accept for their clergy and bishops the priests of the Greek nation; that the Serbians have created a Patriarch of their own in lieu of that at Constantinople; and that establishing the Greeks at Constantinople would be playing the whole of Turkey into the hands of Russia.

To the members of the House, who declared that it would signify little whether Constantinople was in the hands of Russia or not, Mr. Layard replied that, Constantinople being broken, all the great Provinces which constitute Turkey, as, for instance, Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia, would fall into a state of confusion and anarchy. The power into whose hands they were to fall, would command India. The power which held Constantinople, would ever be looked upon in the East as the dominant power of the world.

Russia, however, was aware that no European State would permit her to take possession of Constantinople at this time. Meanwhile,

"her object is to render all independent nationalities in that country impossible—to weaken the Turkish power gradually, but surely; and to show to those who would oppose her designs, that any such opposition is not only useless, but would entail upon them her vengeance; in fact, to render any other government but her own impossible in Turkey. *In those designs she has entirely succeeded on this occasion.*"

Mr. Layard represented that the Government, after the demand of a secret treaty by Prince Menchikoff, and the great Russian armaments on the frontier and at Odessa, were satisfied with the explanations and assurances given at St. Petersburg, and failed to declare that England and France would consider the passing of

the Pruth as a *casus belli*, and that they had not interdicted Russia from entering into any treaties or engagements with Turkey without their participation.

“If we had taken that step Russia would never have dared to cross the Pruth.”

Mr. Layard then exposed how the Principalities, independent, united with Bessarabia and leaning on Hungary, would ultimately be the only means of preserving Constantinople from the Russians and of cutting the great Slav race in two. He thinks that Russia *will* evacuate the Principalities.

“It would not be worth the while of Russia to engage in a war with the Great Powers of Europe on account of those provinces, which are already, to all intents and purposes, her own. [...] Russia has gained, without firing a shot, what is worth to her a bloody and expensive campaign; she has established her power in the East; she has humiliated Turkey; she has compelled her to go to all the expense of a war, and has exhausted her resources; but, what is more, she has humiliated this country and France in the eyes of her own subjects and of the populations of the East.”

The note drawn up by the Vienna Conference will have the result that,

“if the Porte declines to adhere to it, Russia will have turned the tables completely upon us, and made us her ally against Turkey in compelling her to accept an unjust proposal. If she accept, England has directly sanctioned the right of Russia to interfere in behalf of twelve millions of Christians, the subjects of the Porte.... Look at the question as we will; it is clear that we have taken the place of a second-rate Power in it, and conceded that of a first-rate Power to Russia alone.... We had an opportunity which, perhaps, will never occur again of settling on a proper basis this great Eastern question.... Russia has been enabled to strike a blow from which Turkey will never recover.... The result of the policy which this country has pursued will not end here. Sweden, Denmark, every weak State of Europe, which has placed dependence on the character of this country, [...] will see that it is useless any more to struggle against the encroachments of Russia.”

Sir John Pakington next made some remarks, which were important as declaratory of the views of the Tory opposition. He regretted that Lord John Russell could not make a statement more satisfactory to the House and to the country. He assured the Government that its determination to consider the evacuation of the Principalities as a *sine qua non*, will “be supported not only by the opinion of this House, but by the almost unanimous opinion of the people of this country.” Till the papers should have been produced, he must reserve his judgment on the policy of advising Turkey not to consider the occupation of the Principalities as a *casus belli*, of not following a more vigorous and decisive policy at

an earlier period, of injuring and holding in suspense the interests of Turkey and of Great Britain, and their commerce, by transactions protracted for six months.

Lord Dudley Stuart indulged in one of his habitual good-natured Democratic declamations, which are certainly more gratifying to the man who spouts them than to anybody else. If you compress inflated balloons or blown up phrases, there remains nothing in your hands, not even the wind that made them appear like something. Dudley Stuart repeated the often repeated statements on the improvements going on in Turkey, and on the greater liberality of the Sultan's rule, whether in regard to religion or commerce, when compared with that of Russia. He remarked, justly, that it was useless to boast of peace, while the unhappy inhabitants of the Danubian Principalities actually endured the horrors of war. He claimed for the inhabitants of these provinces the protection of Europe against the terrible oppression to which they were now subjected. He showed, by facts from Parliamentary history, that the members of the House had the right of speechifying, even while negotiations were going on. He forgot hardly anything, which must be familiar to a true and constant reader of *The Daily News*. There were two "points" in his speech:

"Although the explanation of the noble lord" (J. Russell) "had not been very full, for he told the House nothing but what it knew before, still, from its very omissions, he was afraid that they must come to the conclusion, *that the noble lord had been doing something of which he ought to be ashamed.*"

As to the Earl of Aberdeen,

"he had told them that peace had been preserved for thirty years, with great advantage to the prosperity and liberty of Europe, but he" (Dudley Stuart) "denied that the liberty of Europe had been benefited by the peace. Where, he would ask, was Poland? where Italy? where Hungary?—nay, where Germany?"

Borne along by the power of fluency, that fatal gift of third-rate orators, the Democratic lord cannot stop, till he arrives, from the despots of the Continent, to his native monarch, "who rules in the hearts of her subjects."

Mr. M. Milnes, one of those ministerial retainers, on whose brow you read:

"Do not talk of him
But as a property,"^a

^a Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act IV, Scene 1.—*Ed.*

did not dare to make a decidedly ministerial speech. He made an alternative speech. On the one side he found that Ministers, by withholding the papers from the table of the House, "acted with very great prudence and judgment," but, on the other hand, he gave them to understand that they would have acted "more strongly and firmly" the other way. On the one hand he thought the Government might have been right in submitting to the demands of Russia, but, on the other hand, it seemed questionable to him whether they had not, in some degree, encouraged Turkey to pursue a line of policy which they were not prepared to support, etc., etc. On the whole, he made out that "the more he reflected on those subjects, the more extreme were the difficulties which they presented to his mind"—the less he understood those subjects, the better he understood the temporizing policy of the Government.

After the alternative juggle and perplexed mind of Mr. Monckton Milnes we are refreshed by the rough straightforwardness of Mr. Muntz, M.P. for Birmingham, and one of the matadors of the Reform-House of 1831.

"When the Dutch Ambassador made to Charles II some very objectionable proposition, the King replied: 'God bless me! you never made such a proposition to Oliver Cromwell.' 'No,' said the Ambassador, 'you are a very different man from Oliver Cromwell.' If this country had had now such a man as Oliver Cromwell, we should have had a different Minister, and a very different Government, and Russia would never have marched into the Danubian Provinces. [...] The Emperor of Russia knew, that nothing would make this country go to war: witness Poland, witness Hungary. This country was now reaping the benefit of its own conduct in those instances. [...] He considered the state of this country in relation to its foreign affairs was a very objectionable and a very unsatisfactory one. And he believed that the people of England felt that their character had been degraded, and that all sense of honor on the part of the Government was absorbed in consideration of mere pounds, shillings and pence. The only questions mooted by the Government now were simply what would be the expense, and would war be agreeable to the different tradesmen of the nation?"

Birmingham happening to be the center of an armament-manufacturing and musket-selling population, the men of that town naturally scoff at the Manchester Cotton-Peace-Fraternity.

Mr. Blackett, the member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, did not believe that the Russians would evacuate the Principalities. He warned the Government

"not to be swayed by any dynastic sympathies or antipathies."

Assailed on all sides, from all shades of opinion, the Ministers sat there mournful, depressed, inanimate, broken down; when

Richard Cobden suddenly rose, congratulating them for having adopted his peace doctrines and applying that doctrine to the given case, with all the sharp ingenuity and fair sincerity of the *monomaniac*, with all the contradictions of the *idéologue*, and with all the calculating cowardice of the shop-keeper. He preached what the ministry had openly acted, what the Parliament had silently approved, and what the ruling classes had enabled the ministry to do and the Parliament to accept. From fear of war he attained for the first time to something like historical ideas. He betrayed the mystery of middle-class policy, and therefore he was repudiated as a traitor. He forced middle-class England to see herself as in a mirror, and as the image was by no means a flattering one, he was ignominiously hissed. He was inconsistent, but his inconsistency itself was consistent. Was it his fault if the traditional fierce phrases of the aristocratic past did not harmonize with the pusillanimous facts of the stockjobbing present?

He commenced by declaring that there was no difference of opinion on the question:

“Still, there was apparently very great uneasiness on the subject of Turkey.”

Why was this? Within the last twenty years there had been a growing conviction that the Turks in Europe were intruders in Europe; that they were not domiciled there; that their home was Asia; that Mohammedanism could not exist in civilized States; that we could not maintain the independence of any country, if she could not maintain it for herself; that it was now known that there were three Christians to every Turk in European Turkey.

“We could not take a course which would insure Turkey in Europe as an independent power against Russia, unless the great bulk of the population were with us in our desire to prevent another power from taking possession of that country.... As to sending our fleets up to Besika Bay, and keeping out the Russians, no doubt we could do that, because Russia would not come into collision with a maritime power; but we were keeping up these enormous armaments, and were not settling the Eastern Question.... The question was, what were they going to do with Turkey, and with the Christian population of Turkey. Mohammedanism could not be maintained; and we should be sorry to see this country fighting for Mohammedanism in Europe.”

Lord Dudley Stuart had talked about maintaining Turkey on account of commerce. He (Cobden) never would fight for a tariff. He had too much faith in free trade principles to think that they needed fighting for. The exports to Turkey had been overrated. Very little of it was consumed in the countries under the dominions of the Turks.

"All the commerce which we had in the Black Sea, was owing to the encroachments of Russia upon the Turkish coast. Our grain and flax we did not now get from Turkey, but from Russia. And would not Russia be as glad to send us her tallow, hemp and corn, whatever aggressions she might make on Turkey? [...] We had a trade with Russia in the Baltic.... What prospect had we of a trade with Turkey? It was a country without a road. [...] Russia was the more commercial people. Let us look at St. Petersburg, at her quays and wharves, and warehouses.... What natural alliance then could we have with such a country as Turkey?... Something had been said about the balance of power. That was a political view of the question.... A great deal had been said about the power of Russia, and the danger to England in consequence of her occupying those countries on the Bosphorus. [...] Why, what an absurdity it was to talk of Russia coming to invade England! Russia could not move an army across her own frontiers, without coming to Western Europe for a loan.... A country [...] so poor, [...] a mere aggregate of villages without capital and without resources, as compared with England, never could come and injure us, or America, or France.... England was ten times more powerful than she had ever been, and far more able to resist the aggressions of a country like Russia."

And now Cobden passed to the incomparably greater dangers of war to England in her present condition than at former epochs. The manufacturing population had greatly increased. They were far more dependent on the export of their produce and on the import of raw materials. They possessed no longer the monopoly of manufacture. The repeal of the Navigation Laws²²³ had thrown England open to the competition of the world in shipping as well as in everything else.

"He begged [...] Mr. Blackett to consider that no port would suffer more than that which he represented. [...] The Government had done wisely in disregarding the cry of thoughtless men.... Their taking up a position for maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire he did not blame, as that was a traditional policy handed down to them.... The Government of the day would obtain credit for having been as peaceable as the people would allow them to be."

Richard Cobden was the true hero of the drama, and shared the fate of all true heroes—a tragical one. But then came the sham hero; the fosterer of all delusions, the man of fashionable lies and of courtly promises; the mouthpiece of all brave words that may be said in the act of running away; Lord Palmerston came. This old, experienced and crafty debater saw at once that the criminal might escape sentence by disavowing his advocate. He saw that the Ministry, attacked on all sides, might turn the tables by a brilliant diatribe against the only man who dared to defend it, and by refuting the only grounds on which its policy possibly might have been excused. There was nothing easier than to show the contradictions of Mr. Cobden. He had stated his perfect concurrence with the precedent orators, and ended by differing from

them on every point. He had defended the integrity of Turkey, and did everything to show that she was worth no defence. He, the preacher of peace, had advocated the aggressions of Russia. Russia was weak, but a war with Russia would be inevitable ruin to England. Russia was a conglomerate of mere villages, but St. Petersburg being a finer city than Constantinople, Russia was entitled to possess them both. He was a Free Trader, but he preferred the protective system of Russia to the free-trade system of Turkey. Whether Turkey consumed herself, or was a canal through which passed articles of consumption to other parts of Asia, was it indifferent to England that she should remain a free passage? Mr. Cobden was a great advocate for the principle of non-intervention, and now he would dispose, by parliamentary enactments, of the destinies of the Mohammedans, Greeks, Slavonians, and other races inhabiting the Turkish Empire. Lord Palmerston exalted the progress Turkey had made, and the forces she now commanded. "Turkey, it is certain, has no Poland and no Siberia."^a Because Turkey possessed so much strength, Lord Palmerston would, of course, compel her to suffer a few provinces to be invaded by the Russians. A strong empire can suffer anything. Lord Palmerston proved to Richard Cobden that there existed not one sound reason for adopting the course adopted by Lord Palmerston and his colleagues, and, interrupted at each sentence by enthusiastic cheers, the old histrion contrived to sit down, with the impudent and self-contradictory phrase:

"I am satisfied that Turkey has within itself the elements of life and prosperity, and I believe that the course adopted by Her Majesty's Government is a sound policy, deserving the approbation of the country, and which it will be the duty of every English Government to pursue." (Cheers.)

Palmerston was great in "*fearful bravery*," as Shakespeare calls it.^b He showed, as Sidney said, "a fearful boldness, daring to do that which he knew that he knew not how to do."

Written on August 19, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3862 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 863, September 2, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a The *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Ser., Vol. CXXIX, p. 1809, gives "Circassia" instead of "Siberia" as cited in the report of *The Times*.—Ed.

^b Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act V, Scene 1.—Ed.

Karl Marx

AFFAIRS CONTINENTAL AND ENGLISH²²⁴

London, Tuesday, Aug. 23, 1853

The German and Belgian papers affirm, on the authority of the telegraphic dispatches from Constantinople, of the 13th inst., that the Porte has acceded to the proposals of the Vienna Conference. The French papers, however, having received dispatches from Constantinople of the same date, state merely that the Divan had shown a willingness to receive those proposals. The definitive answer could hardly reach Vienna before the 20th inst. The pending question, and a very serious one, is, whether the Porte will send its Ambassador to St. Petersburg before or after the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the Principalities.

The last accounts from the Black Sea announce that the north-east winds had begun to disturb the navigation. Several ships anchored at Penderekli and other places on the coast, had been compelled to quit their anchorage to avoid being cast ashore.

You know that after the events in Moldavia and Wallachia, the Sultan^a had ordered the Hospodars^b to leave the Principalities for Constantinople, and that the Hospodars refused to comply with their sovereign's demands. The Sultan has now deposed the Hospodar of Wallachia on account of his favorable reception of the Russian troops and the support he gave them. On the 9th inst. this firman was read to the Assembly of Boyards, who resolved to petition the Hospodar not to abandon the Government in the present critical circumstances. The Prince acted accordingly. Mano, the Secretary of State, and Ioanidis, the Director of the Ministry of the Interior, have also been summoned to Constan-

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b G. Ghica (Moldavia) and B. Stirbei (Wallachia).—*Ed.*

tinople; they, however, refused to go, on the pretext that public order might be disturbed. The French and British Consuls, upon this, suspended immediately all relations with the rebel Government.

Affairs in Serbia are taking a complicated turn. The Paris *Constitutionnel* of last Friday had the following Constantinople intelligence.^a Austria, taking advantage of the Sultan's difficulties, had pressed certain demands upon him.

An Austrian Consul-General, having lately made a tour of inspection through Bosnia and Serbia, declared to Alexander, the Prince of Serbia, that Austria was prepared to occupy Serbia with her troops in order to suppress any dangerous movement among the population. The Prince, having refused the offer of the Consul-General, at once dispatched a special messenger to Constantinople with an account of this Austrian overture, and Reshid Pasha referred to Baron de Bruck for explanations. The latter said that the Consul-General had previously communicated with the Prince, alleging the fear Austria was in, lest her subjects, on the borders of Serbia, should become involved in any disturbances arising in that province. The reply of Reshid Pasha was to the effect that any occupation of Serbia by Austrian troops would be considered an act of hostility by the Porte, which would itself be answerable for the tranquility of that province; moreover, the Pasha promised that a special Commissioner should be at once sent to see and report on the state of affairs in Serbia.

The day after, several London papers announced the entrance into Serbia of the Austrian troops, an announcement which, however, has turned out to be unfounded. Yesterday the same papers communicated the outbreak of a counter-revolution in Serbia, yet this news likewise rested on no better foundation than a false translation of the German word, *Auflauf*,^b the fact being that only a small riot had taken place. To-day the German papers publish news from Constantinople of the 9th inst. According to them, several divans had been held on Serbian affairs. The conduct of Prince Alexander was much approved of, and the decision arrived at that, if Austrian troops should attempt to occupy that province, they should, if necessary, be expelled by force. A division of troops has actually been directed towards the frontiers of Bosnia. Private letters received at Constantinople on the 8th inst.,

^a The reference is to the report in *Le Constitutionnel*, No. 231, August 19, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Unlawful assembly, riot, tumult.—*Ed.*

conveyed thither the news of Prince Alexander having, in consequence of his conflict with the Austrian Consul, appealed to the decision of the Consuls of France and England, and absented himself momentarily from Belgrade. It is said that he went to Nissa, there to wait for orders from the Porte.

Mr. D. Urquhart, in a letter^a addressed to *The Morning Advertiser* of this day, remarks, with regard to the Serbian complication:

“War with Turkey is not [...] at present contemplated by Russia; for, by the cooperation of Austria, she would lose her ‘Greek’ allies, but she involves Austria in a preparatory collision, which will bring Serbia into a condition parallel to that of the Principalities. Thus will be introduced a religious warfare between Latins and Greeks.... Russia, by a sudden shifting of decorations, may render her own occupation of the Principalities acceptable to Turkey, as a protection against the Austrian occupation of Serbia, and thus mutually engage Austria and Turkey in projects of dismemberment, and support them therein.”

The Hospodar of Moldavia proposes to contract a loan with Russian bankers in order to meet the extraordinary expenses of the occupation.

The want of provisions is so great in the fortresses of Bulgaria that the strictest economy has to be observed, and the garrisons are suffering severely.

The *Journal de Constantinople* reports from Aleppo:

“A discovery has recently been made of a gang of evil-disposed Turks about to rise, as in 1850, against the Christian population of that town. But thanks to the extreme vigilance of the Governor Pasha,^b and of Ali Asmi Pasha, the Commander-in-Chief of the troops at Aleppo, their attempts have been suppressed and public order has been preserved. On this occasion Demetrius, the Patriarch of the Greek Catholic creed, and Basilius, the Patriarch of the Armenian creed, have addressed in the name of their respective communities a collective letter of gratitude to Reshid Pasha, for the protection afforded to the Christians by the Sultan’s Government.”

The German *St. Petersburg Gazette* has the following in a leader on Oriental affairs:

“What the friends of peace could only hope for at the commencement of July, has become a certainty in the latter days. The work of mediation between Russia and Turkey is now definitively placed in the hands of Austria. At Vienna there will be devised a solution of the Eastern question, which in these latter times has kept in suspense all the action between the Black Sea and the Ocean, and which alone has prevented European Diplomacy from taking its habitual holidays.”

^a “The Kaiser and the Czar.”—*Ed.*

^b Osman Pasha.—*Ed.*

Observe the studious affectation with which, in lieu of the four Powers, Austria alone is constituted mediator, and which places the suspense of nations, in the true Russian style, only on a scale with the interrupted holidays of diplomacy.

The Berlin *National Zeitung* publishes^a a letter from Georgia, dated 15th July, stating that Russia intends a new campaign against the people of the Caucasus at the end of the present month, and that a fleet in the Sea of Azov is fitted out in order to support the operations of the land army.

The session of 1853 was brought to a close on Saturday last—Parliament being prorogued until October 27. A very indifferent and meager speech, purporting to be the Queen's^b message, was read by commission. In answer to Mr. Milnes Lord Palmerston assured Parliament that it could safely disband, as far as the evacuation of the Principalities was concerned, giving, however, no pledge of any kind but "his confidence in the honor and the character of the Russian Emperor," which would move him to withdraw his troops *voluntarily* from the Principalities.^c The Coalition Cabinet thus revenged itself for his speech against Mr. Cobden,^d by forcing him to record solemnly his "confidence in the character and the honor" of the Czar. The same Palmerston received on the same day a deputation from the aristocratic fraction of the Polish Emigration at Paris and its collateral branch at London,²²⁵ presenting his lordship with an address and medallions in gold, silver and bronze of Prince Adam Czartoryski, in testimony of their gratitude to his lordship for allowing the sequestration of Cracow in 1846, and for otherwise exhibiting sympathy with the cause of Poland. The inevitable Lord Dudley Stuart, the patron of the London branch of the Paris society, was of course the master of ceremonies. Lord Palmerston assured these simple-minded men "of his deep interest in the history of Poland, which was a very painful history."^e The noble lord omitted not to remind them that he spoke not as a member of the Cabinet, but received them only as a private amateur.

The first half of the long protracted session of 1853 was filled up with the death-struggle of the Derby Ministry, with the

^a *National-Zeitung*, No. 384, August 19, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Victoria.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted according to *The Times*, No. 21513, August 22, 1853.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 275-76.—*Ed.*

^e Quoted from "Lord Palmerston and the Poles" published in *The Times*, No. 21513, August 22, 1853.—*Ed.*

formation and final victory of the Coalition Cabinet, and with the Easter recess of Parliament. As to the real session, its most remarkable features were the dissolution of all the old political parties, the corruption of the members of Parliament, and the petrification of the privileged constituencies revealing the curious working of the Government, embracing all the shades of opinion, and all the talents of the official world, proclaiming postponement the solution of all questions, shifting all difficulties by half-and-half measures, feeding upon promises, declaring "performance as a kind of will or testament which argues a great weakness in his judgment that makes it," retracting, modifying, unsettling its own legislative acts as quickly as it brought them in, living upon the inheritance of predecessors whom it had fiercely denounced, leaving the initiative of its own measures to the house which it presumed to lead, and reaping failure as the inevitable fate of the few acts, the uncontroverted authorship of which it holds. Thus parliamentary reform, national education reform, and law reform (a few trifles apart) have been postponed. The Transportation bill, the Navigation bill, etc., were inherited from the Derby Cabinet. The Canada Clergy Reserves²²⁶ bill was dreadfully mutilated by the Government a few days after having introduced it. As to the budget, the Succession act was proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer only after he had voted against it. The Advertisement act was undergone by him only when his opposition to it had twice been voted down. The new regulation of the licensing system was finally abandoned, after it had suffered various transformations. Introduced by Mr. Gladstone with pretensions to a great scheme, a thing worth the budget as a whole, it came out of the House as a miserable patch-work, as a mere conglomerate of fortuitous, incoherent and contradictory little items. The only great feature of the India bill, the non-renewal of the Company's charter, was introduced by the Ministry after they had announced its renewal for 20 years more. The two acts truly and exclusively belonging to the Ministry of all the talents: the Cab act and the Conversion of the Public Debt, had scarcely passed the threshold of the House, when they were publicly hissed as failures. The foreign policy of the "strongest Government England ever saw," is owned by its own partisans to have been the *nec plus ultra* of helpless, vacillating weakness. The Chesham Place Treaty, however, contracted between the Peelite bureaucrats, the Whig oligarchs and the sham-Radicals,²²⁷ has been linked the more strongly by the threatening aspect of things abroad and by the even more imminent symptoms of popular discontent at home—manifested

through the unprecedented intensity and generality of strikes, and the renewal of the Chartist agitation. In judging the external policy of the ruling classes and of the Cabinet, we must not lose sight of a war with Russia training behind it a general revolutionary conflagration of the Continent, and at this time likely to meet with a fatal echo from the masses of Great Britain.

As to the House of Lords, its doings admit of a very short *résumé*. It has exhibited its bigotry by the rejection of the Jewish Emancipation bill,²²⁸ its hostility to the working classes by burking the Workingmen's Combination bill, its interested hatred of the Irish people by shelving the Irish Land bills, and its stupid predilection for Indian abuses by re-establishing the Salt monopoly. It has acted throughout in secret understanding with the Government that whatever progressive measures might by chance pass the Commons, should be canceled by the enlightened Lords.

Among the papers laid on the table of Parliament before its prorogation, there is a voluminous correspondence carried on between the British and Russian Governments with regard to the obstructions to navigation in the Sulina mouth of the Danube. The correspondence begins on Feb. 9, 1849, and concludes in July, 1853, having concluded nothing whatever. Things have now arrived at such a point that even the Austrian Government is forced to announce that the mouth of the Danube has become impassable for navigation, and that its own mails to Constantinople will be henceforth forwarded by Trieste. The whole difficulty is the fruit of British connivance at Muscovite encroachments. In 1836 the English Government acquiesced in the usurpation of the mouth of the Danube by Russia, after having instructed a commercial firm to resist the interference of the officers of the Russian Government.

The so-called peace concluded with Burma, announced with a proclamation of the Governor-General of India,^a dated June 30, 1853, and upon which the Queen is made to congratulate Parliament, is nothing but a simple truce. The King of Ava,^b starved into submission, expressed his desire for the cessation of war, set the British prisoners at liberty, asked for the raising of the river blockade, and forbade his troops to attack the territories of Mecadeay and Toungu, where the British Government had placed garrisons—in the same manner as the Turkish Government has forbidden its troops to attack the Russians stationed in the

^a J. Dalhousie.—*Ed.*

^b Mindon.—*Ed.*

Principalities. But he does not recognize the claims of England to Pegu or to any other portion of the Burmese Empire. All that England has got by this struggle is a dangerous and controverted frontier instead of a secure and acknowledged one. She has been driven out of the ethnographical, geographical and political circumscription of her Indian dominions, and the Celestial Empire itself no longer forms any natural barrier to her conquering force. She has lost her point of gravitation in Asia and pushed into the indefinite. She is no longer mistress of her own movements, there being no stopping but where the land falls into the sea. England seems thus to be destined to open the remotest Orient to Western intercourse, but not to enjoy nor to hold it.

The great colliers' strikes in South Wales not only continue, but out of them have arisen new strikes among the men employed at the iron mines. A general strike among the British sailors is anticipated for the moment when the Merchant Shipping bill will come into operation, the foreigners being, as they say, admitted only for the purpose of lowering their wages. The importance of the present strikes, to which I have repeatedly called the attention of your readers, begins now to be understood even by the London middle-class press. Thus, the *Weekly Times* of last Saturday remarks:

“The relations between employer and employed have been violently disturbed. Labor throughout the length and breadth of the land has bearded capital, and it may safely be asserted that the quarrel thus evoked has only just commenced. The working classes have been putting forth strong feelers to try their position. [...] The agitation at present is limited to a series of independent skirmishes, but there are indications that the period is not very distant when this desultory warfare will be turned into a systematic and universal combination against capital”^a

Written on August 23, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3864, September 5, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 864, September 6, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Quoted from “The Parliamentary Doings of '53” in the *Weekly Times*, No. 345, August 21, 1853.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

MICHAEL BAKUNIN²²⁹TO THE EDITOR OF *THE MORNING ADVERTISER*

Sir,—Messrs. Herzen and Golovine have chosen to connect the *New Rhenish Gazette*, edited by me in 1848 and 1849, with the polemics going on between them and “F.M.,”^a with regard to Bakunin. They tell the English public that the calumny against Bakunin took origin in that paper, which had even ventured to appeal to the testimony of George Sand. Now, I care nothing about the insinuations of Messrs. Herzen and Golovine. But, as it may contribute to the settlement of the question raised about Michael Bakunin, permit me to state the real facts of the case:

On July 5th, 1848, the *New Rhenish Gazette* received two letters from Paris—the one being the authographic correspondence of the Havas-Bureau, and the other a private correspondence, emanating from a Polish refugee,^b quite unconnected with that concern—both stating that George Sand was in possession of papers compromising Bakunin as having lately entered into relations with the Russian Government.

The *New Rhenish Gazette*, on July 6th, published the letter of its Paris correspondent.

Bakunin, on his part, declared in the *Neue Oder-Zeitung*^c (a Breslau^d paper), that, *before the appearance* of the Paris correspondence in the *New Rhenish Gazette*, similar rumours had been secretly colported at Breslau, that they emanated from the Russian embassies, and that he could not better answer them than by

^a Francis Marx.—*Ed.*

^b A. Ewerbeck, who is referred to below as the Paris correspondent.—*Ed.*

^c In 1846-49 known as *Allgemeine Oder-Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^d Wroclaw.—*Ed.*

appealing to George Sand. His letter to George Sand was published simultaneously with his declaration. Both the declaration and the letter were reprinted immediately by the *New Rhenish Gazette*, (vide *New Rhenish Gazette*, July 16, 1848). On August 3, 1848, the *New Rhenish Gazette* received from Bakunin, through the means of M. Kościelski, a letter addressed by George Sand to its editor, which was published on the same day, with the following introductory remarks:—

“In number 36, of this paper, we communicated a rumour circulating in Paris, according to which George Sand was stated to be possessed of papers which placed the Russian refugee, Bakunin, in the position of an agent of the Emperor Nicholas. We gave publicity to this statement, because it was communicated to us simultaneously by two correspondents wholly unconnected with each other. By so doing, we only accomplished the duty of the public press, which has severely to watch public characters. And, at the same time we gave to Mr. Bakunin an opportunity of silencing suspicions thrown upon him in certain Paris circles. We reprinted also from the *Neue Oder-Zeitung* Mr. Bakunin’s declaration, and his letter addressed to George Sand, without waiting for his request. We publish now a literal translation of a letter addressed to the Editor of the *New Rhenish Gazette* by George Sand, which perfectly settles this affair.”—(Vide *New Rhenish Gazette*, Aug. 3, 1848.)^a

In the latter part of August, 1848, I passed through Berlin, saw Bakunin there, and renewed with him the intimate friendship which united us before the outbreak of the revolution of February.

In its number of October 13, 1848, the *New Rhenish Gazette* attacked the Prussian ministry for having expelled Bakunin, and for having threatened him with being delivered up to Russia if he dared to re-enter the Prussian States.

In its number of February 15, 1849, the *New Rhenish Gazette* brought out a leading article on Bakunin’s pamphlet—*Aufruf an die Slaven*, which article commenced with these words—“*Bakunin is our friend*. This shall not prevent us from subjecting his pamphlet to a severe criticism.”^b

In my letters, addressed to the *New-York Daily Tribune* on “Revolution and Contre-revolution in Germany,” I was, as far as I know, the first German writer who paid to Bakunin the tribute due to him for his participation in our movements, and, especially

^a See present edition, Vol. 7, p. 315.—*Ed.*

^b See Frederick Engels, “Democratic Panslavism” (present edition, Vol. 8, p. 363).—*Ed.*

in the Dresden insurrection,²³⁰ denouncing, at the same time, the German press and the German people for the most cowardly manner in which they surrendered him to his and their enemies.^a

As to "F.M." proceeding, as he does, from the fixed idea, that continental revolutions are fostering the secret plans of Russia, he must, if he pretend to anything like consistency, condemn not only Bakunin, but every continental revolutionist as a Russian agent. In his eyes revolution itself is a Russian agent. Why not Bakunin?

London, August 30, 1853.

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Morning Advertiser*,
September 2, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a The articles, written by Engels, were published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* under the signature of Marx as its official correspondent. For the relevant passage on Bakunin see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 90.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

RISE IN THE PRICE OF CORN.—CHOLERA.—
STRIKES.—SAILORS' MOVEMENT²³¹

London, Tuesday, Aug. 30, 1853

The *Breslau Gazette* states that the exportation of corn from Wallachia is definitively prohibited.

There is at this moment a somewhat greater question at issue than the Eastern one, viz.: the question of subsistence. Prices of corn have risen at Königsberg, Stettin, Dantzic, Rostock, Cologne, Hamburg, Rotterdam, and Antwerp, and of course at all importing markets. At the principal provincial markets in England wheat has advanced from 4 to 6s. per qr. The constantly increasing prices of wheat and rye in Belgium and France, and the consequent dearness of bread, create much anxiety. The French Government is buying up grain in England at Odessa, and in the Baltic. The conclusive report of the crops in England will not be out before next week. The potatoe disease is more general here than in Ireland. The export of grain has been prohibited by all Italian Governments, including that of Lombardy.

Some cases of decided Asiatic cholera occurred in London during the last week. We also hear that the cholera has now reached Berlin.

The battle between labor and capital, between wages and profits, continues. There have been new strikes in London on the part of the coal-heavers, of the barbers, of the tailors, ladies' boot and shoe makers, umbrella and parasol covers, shirtmakers and makers of underclothing generally, and of other working people employed by slopsellers and wholesale export-houses. Yesterday, a strike was announced from several bricklayers, and from the Thames lightermen, employed in the transit of goods between the

wharfs and ships in the river. The strikes of the colliers and iron-workers in South Wales continues, and a new strike of colliers in Resolven has to be added to the list, etc., etc.

It would be tedious to go on enumerating, letter after letter, the different strikes which come to my knowledge week after week. I shall therefore merely dwell occasionally on such as offer peculiar features of interest, among which, though not yet exactly a strike, the pending conflict between the police-constables and their chief, Sir Richard Mayne, deserves to be mentioned. Sir Richard Mayne, in his circular addressed to the several divisions of the metropolitan police force, has prohibited policemen from holding meetings, or combining, while he professed himself willing to attend to individual complaints. The policemen respond to him that they consider the right of meeting to be inalienable from Englishmen. He reminds them that their scale of wages was struck at a time when provisions were much dearer than they are at present. The men reply that "their claim is not grounded on the price of provisions only, but that it rests on the assurance that flesh and blood are not so cheap as they have been."

The most important incident in this history of strikes is the declaration of the "Seamen's United Friendly Association," calling itself the Anglo-Saxon Sailor's Bill of Rights. This declaration refers to the Merchant Shipping Bill, which repeals the clause of the Navigation Act,²³² rendering it imperative on British owners to carry at least three-fourths of British subjects on board their ships; which bill now throws open the coasting trade to foreign seamen even where foreign ships are excluded. The men declare this bill to be, not a Seamen's bill but an Owners bill. Nobody had been consulted but the ship-owner. The manning clause had acted as a check on the conduct of masters in the treatment and retention of crews. The new law would place seamen completely in the power of any bad officer. The new law proceeded upon the principle "that the 17,000 masters were all men of kind disposition, overflowing with generosity, benevolence and amiability; and that all seamen were untractable, unreasonable and naturally bad." They declare that while the owner may take his ships wherever he pleases, their labor is restricted to their own country, as the Government had repealed the Navigation law without first procuring reciprocal employment for them in the ships of other nations.

"Parliament having offered up the seamen as a holocaust to the owners, we as a class are constrained to combine and take measures for our own protection."

These measures consist chiefly in the intention of the seamen to uphold on their part the *manning clause*, it being declared at the same time

“that the seamen of the United States of America be considered as British; that an appeal be made to them for aiding their union; and that, as there would be no advantage to sail as an Englishman after the first of October, when the above law will be passed; as on the contrary freedom from impressment or service in Her Majesty’s Navy during war might be secured by serving as foreigners in British ships during peace, and as there would be more protection during peace by possessing the freedom of America, [...] the seamen [...] will procure certificates of the United States citizenship, on arrival at any port of that Republic.”²³³

Written on August 30, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3873, September 15, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 867, September 16 and the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 627, September 17; published simultaneously in abridged form in German in *Die Reform*, No. 49, September 17, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE PEOPLE'S PAPER*²³⁴

Dear Sir,—*The Morning Advertiser*, of the 3rd inst., published the subjoined article, "How to write History.—By a Foreign Correspondent," while he refused to insert my answer to the "Foreign Correspondent." You will oblige me by inserting into *The People's Paper* both, the Russian letter and my reply to it.

Yours truly,

Dr. *Karl Marx*.

London, September 7th.

HOW TO WRITE HISTORY.—
BY A FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT

"Bakunin is a Russian agent—Bakunin is not a Russian agent. Bakunin died in the prison of Schlüsselburg, after having endured much ill-treatment—Bakunin is not dead: he still lives. He is made a soldier and sent to the Caucasus—no, he is not made a soldier: he remains detained in the Citadel of St. Peter and St. Paul. Such are the contradictory news which the press has given us in turn concerning Michael Bakunin.

"In these days of extensive publicity, we only arrive at the true by affirming the false, but, has it at least been proved that Bakunin has not been in the military pay of Russia?

"There are people who do not know that humanity makes men mutually responsible—that in extricating Germany from the influence which Russia exercises on it, we react upon the latter country, and plunge it anew into its despotism, until it becomes vulnerable to revolution. Such people it would be idle to attempt to persuade that Bakunin is one of the purest and most generous representatives of progressive cosmopolitanism.

"'Calumniate, calumniate,' says a French proverb, [and] 'something will always remain.' The calumny against Bakunin, countenanced in 1848 by one of his friends, has been reproduced in 1853 by an unknown person.

“‘One is never betrayed but by one’s own connexion,’ says another proverb; ‘and it is better to deal with a wise enemy than with a stupid friend.’ The conservative journals have not become the organ of the calumny insinuated against Bakunin. A friendly journal undertook that care.

“Revolutionary feeling must be but slightly developed, when it can be forgotten for a moment, as Mr. Marx has forgotten, that Bakunin is not of the stuff of which police spies are made. Why, at least, did he not do, as is the custom of the English papers—why did he not simply publish the letter of the Polish refugee, which denounced Bakunin? He would have retained the regret of seeing his name associated with a false accusation!”

THE FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT IN SATURDAY’S
MORNING ADVERTISER

“‘It is better to deal with a wise enemy than a stupid friend.’ Exactly so.

“‘Is he not a ‘stupid friend’ who is astonished at the discovery, that a controversy involves antagonistic opinions, and that historical truth cannot be extricated but from contradictory statements?

“‘Is he not a ‘stupid friend’ who thinks necessary to find fault with explanations in 1853, with which Bakunin himself was satisfied in 1848, to ‘plunge Russia anew in its despotism,’ from which she has never emerged, and to call French a trite Latin proverb?

“‘Is he not a ‘stupid friend’ who assures a paper to have ‘countenanced’ a statement made by its Foreign Correspondent and unmarked by its editor?

“‘Is he not a ‘stupid friend’ who sets up ‘conservative journals’ as models for ‘revolutionary feeling’ at its highest pitch, invented the *lois des suspects*,²³⁵ and suspected the ‘stuff’ of a traitor even in the Dantons, the Camille Desmoulins, and the Anacharsis Clootzes, who dares attack third persons in the name of Bakunin, and dares not defend him in his own name?

“In conclusion, let me tell the friend of proverbial commonplace that I have now done with him and with all such-like friends of Bakunin.”

“Karl Marx.

“London, September 4th.”

First published in *The People's Paper*,
No. 71, September 10, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

Karl Marx

[THE VIENNA NOTE.—
THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE.—LETTERS FROM
SHUMLA.—PEEL'S BANK ACT]²³⁶

London, Friday, Sept. 9, 1853

When I told you in my letter of August 30, that the Vienna Note was “rejected” by the Porte, inasmuch as the alterations demanded by it and the condition of immediate and previous evacuation^a cannot be considered otherwise than as a refusal of Russia’s pretensions, I found myself in contradiction with the whole Press, which assured us that the alterations were insignificant, not worth speaking of, and that the whole affair might be regarded as settled.²³⁷ Some days later, *The Morning Chronicle*^b startled the confiding stockjobbers with the announcement that the alterations proposed by the Porte were of a very serious character, and by no means easy to be dealt with. At this moment there exists only one opinion, namely, that the whole Eastern question has come back to its point of issue, an impression in no way impaired by the complete publication in yesterday’s papers of the official Note addressed by Reshid Pasha to the Representatives of Austria, France, Great Britain, and Prussia, dated August 19, 1853.

That the Russian Emperor will reject the Turkish “alterations” there is not the slightest doubt. Already, we are informed by the *Assemblée nationale*, the Paris *Moniteur* of the Emperor of Russia, that,

“according to correspondences received to-day at Paris, the first impressions produced on the Cabinet of St. Petersburg were by no means favorable to the modifications proposed by the Porte. [...] Whatever may be the resolution of that Cabinet we must prepare ourselves beforehand to take it coolly and to repress our

^a Of the Danubian Principalities.— *Ed.*

^b Of September 3, 1853.— *Ed.*

fears. We have to consider that even were the Russian Cabinet to refuse the proposed change of the note, there would remain the resources of fresh negotiation at Constantinople."^a

The intimation contained in this last hint, that Russia will attempt to gain another delay of the decision of the dispute, is confirmed by the Berlin *Lithographic Correspondence*.

"The Austrian Government has presented a memorial to the Emperor Nicholas containing new propositions of modification, and it has undertaken to terminate the crisis in a manner quite different from all previous attempts."

In a letter published by the Vienna *Wanderer* from Odessa dated 26th Aug. the solution of the Oriental question is stated "to be not so near at hand as was expected by some people. The armaments have not been suspended for one day, and the army in the Principalities continually receives reinforcements."^b The Kronstadt *Satellite* positively announces that the Russian troops will take up their winter quarters in the Principalities.

A note issued from Washington could scarcely have produced a greater sensation in Europe than your editorial remarks on Capt. Ingraham.^c They have found their way, with and without commentaries, into almost the whole weekly press of London, into many French papers, the Brussels *Nation*, the Turin *Parlamento*, the *Basle Gazette*, and every liberal newspaper of Germany. Your article on the Swiss-American alliance having simultaneously been reprinted in a number of German journals, you may consider the following passage from an article of the Berlin *Lithographic Correspondence* as partly addressed to you:

"Some time since the press has had various occasions to pronounce itself on the United States theory with regard to intervention. Very recently the Koszta affair at Smyrna has renewed the discussion, and this affair is not yet terminated, when already foreign and native journals hold out the prospect of an intervention on the part of the United States in favor of Switzerland, if it should be threatened by an attack. To-day we are informed that several Powers have the intention of making a collective declaration against the doctrine of international right put forth by the United States, and that we may hope to see those Cabinets arrive at a perfect understanding. If the American intervention theories were not *refuted* in a peremptory manner, *the extirpation of the revolutionary spirit in Europe would meet with an insuperable obstacle*. We may add, as an important fact, that France is among the Powers ready to participate in this remonstrance."

^a *L'Assemblée nationale*, No. 251, September 8, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b *Der Wanderer*, September 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c The reference is to the editorial "Peace or War" in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3839, August 6, 1853.—*Ed.*

On this last point, the *Constitutionnel* of Tuesday last takes good care not to leave any doubt, when it says:

"It is necessary to be candid in all things. It is not as a citizen of the United States that Koszta is defended against Austria by the agents of the American Republic, but as a revolutionist. But none of the European Powers will ever admit as a principle of public law that the Government of the United States has the right to protect revolution in Europe by force of arms. On no grounds would it be permitted to throw obstacles in the way of the exercise of the jurisdiction of a government, under the ridiculous pretense that the offenders have renounced their allegiance, and from the real motive that they are in revolt against the political constitution of their country. The Navy of the American Union might not always have such an easy triumph, and such headstrong conduct as that pursued by the Captain of the *St. Louis* might on another occasion be attended with very disastrous consequences."^a

The *Impartial* of Smyrna, received to-day, publishes the following interesting letters from Shumla:

"Shumla, Aug. 8, 1853

"The Commander-in-Chief, Omer Pasha, has so ably distributed his troops, that on the first emergency, he may within 24 hours concentrate at any point on the Danube, a mass of 65,000 men, infantry and cavalry, and 180 pieces of cannon. A letter I received from Wallachia, states that typhus is making frightful havoc in the Russian army, and that it has lost not less than 13,000 men since its entry into campaign. Care is taken to bury the dead during the night. The mortality is also very high among the horses. Our army enjoys perfect health. Russian detachments, composed of 30 to 60 soldiers, and dressed in Moldavian uniform, appear from time to time on the opposite bank of the Danube. Our general is informed of all their movements. Yesterday 1,000 Roman Catholic Albanians arrived. They form the vanguard of a corps of 13,000 men expected without delay. They are sharpshooters. Yesterday there arrived also 3,000 horse, all of them old soldiers, perfectly armed and equipped. The number of our troops is increasing every day. Ahmet Pasha started yesterday for Varna. He will wait there for the Egyptian forces, in order to direct them to the points they are to occupy.

"Shumla, Friday, Aug. 12, 1853

"On the 9th inst. two regiments of infantry and one battery of light artillery, belonging to the guards of the Sultan, started for Rasgrad. On the 10th we got news that 5,600 Russians had encamped themselves on the bank of the Danube near the port of Turtukai, in consequence of which the outposts of the two armies are only at the distance of a rifle-shot from each other. The gallant Colonel Skander-Bey has left for that post, with several officers. Omer Pasha has established telegraphs, with a view of having communicated to the headquarters at every time of day or night the events passing on every point of the river.

"We have had continual rains for some days past, but the works of fortification have none the less been continued with great activity. A salute of cannon is fired

^a Quoted from Boniface's article in *Le Constitutionnel* of September 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

twice a day, at sunrise and sunset. We hear nothing of this sort from the opposite side of the river.

"The Egyptian troops, after having undergone their quarantine at Constantinople, will embark for Varna, whence they are to be directed to Babadegh. The Brigadier Izet Pasha expects them there. In the district of Dobrudja-Ovassi 20,000 Tartars have assembled, in order to participate in the war against the Russians. They are for the greater part ancient emigrants, who left the Crimea at the time of its conquest by Russia. The Ottoman army, whose strength augments every day by the arrival of troops, both regular and irregular, is tired of passiveness, and burns with the desire of going to war. It is to be feared that we shall have one of these days a transit across the Danube without superior orders, especially now that the presence of the Russians, who show themselves on the opposite bank, adds to the excitement. Several physicians, Mussulmans and Christians, left some days ago, in order to establish military hospitals on the European plan at Plevna, at Rasgrad, at Widin, and at Silistra. On the 11th there arrived from Varna two superior English officers. They have had a long audience with Omer Pasha, and have visited the fortifications, attended by several Turkish officers. They have found them in a perfect state of defense, provided with ample magazines, baking-stoves, fountains of fresh water, etc. All these fortifications are constructed with the greatest solidity. The most severe discipline prevails among our troops.

"Shumla, Monday, Aug. 15, 1853

"On the 13th, the English General O'Donnell arrived from Constantinople. He had an interview of two hours' duration with Omer Pasha, and left on the following day, attended by an aide-de-camp of the Commander-in-Chief, for the purpose of inspecting the fortifications. Yesterday three batteries and an immense train of ammunition arrived from Varna. To-morrow a reinforcement of one battery, two battalions of infantry, and 1,000 horse, will leave for the port of Rahova.^a The engineers at this place are busily engaged in restoring the fortifications destroyed by the Russians in 1828. Turkey may have unbroken confidence in her army."

The Earl of Fitzwilliam addressed a letter on Thursday last to the meeting of Sheffield cutlers, in which he protests against the monstrous assumption with which Parliament was closed by the heroic Palmerston, that "reliance was to be placed on the honor and character of the Emperor of Russia."

Mr. Disraeli has summoned his constituents to meet him at Aylesbury on the 14th inst. *The Daily News* of yesterday attempted, in a long and dull article, to combat what Mr. Disraeli is supposed by it to be likely to tell his electors. Such a performance I think *The Daily News* might have left with greater propriety to its venerable grandsire, the London *Punch*.

It is now the fourth time since January, that the rate of interest has been raised by the Bank of England. On Sept. 4, it was fixed at 4 per cent.

^a Orekhovo.—*Ed.*

"Another attempt has been made to reduce the circulating medium of the country—another effort to arrest the tide of national prosperity,"

exclaims the London *Sun*.^a On the other hand, it comforts itself with the consideration that the Bank of England has lost much of its mischievous power in consequence of the Peel Act of 1844.²³⁸

The Sun is mistaken in what it fears, and in what it hopes. The Bank of England has as little as any other bank either the power of expanding or of contracting the currency of the country. The really mischievous powers possessed by it are by no means restricted, but on the contrary strengthened by the Peel Act of 1844.

As the Bank Act of 1844 is generally misunderstood, and as its working will become, in the approaching crisis, of paramount importance not only to England but to the whole commercial world, I propose briefly to explain the tendency of the act.

Peel's Bank Act of 1844 proceeds on the assumption that the metallic circulation is the normal one; that the amount of the currency regulates prices; that in the case of a purely metallic circulation, the currency would expand with a favorable exchange and with an influx of bullion, while it would be contracted by an adverse exchange and a drain of bullion; that a circulation of bank notes has exactly to imitate the metallic circulation; that accordingly there had to be a degree of correspondence between the variations in the amount of bullion in the vaults of the Bank of England and the variations in the quantity of its notes circulating among the public; that the issue of notes must be expanded with a favorable, and contracted with an unfavorable exchange; lastly, that the Bank of England had the control over the amount of its notes in circulation.

Now there is not one of these premises which is not utterly fallacious and contradictory to facts. Suppose even a purely metallic circulation, the amount of currency could not determine prices, no more than it could determine the amount of commercial and industrial transactions; but prices on the contrary would determine the amount of currency in circulation. Unfavorable exchanges, and a drain of bullion, would not contract even a purely metallic circulation, as they would not affect the amount of currency in circulation, but the amount of currency in reserve, sleeping in the banks as deposits, or in private hoards. On the other hand, a favorable exchange and a concomitant influx of bullion, would augment, not the currency in circulation, but the

^a *The Sun*, September 3, 1853.—*Ed.*

currency deposited with bankers or hoarded by private individuals. The Peel Act, therefore, starting upon a false conception of a purely metallic circulation, naturally arrives at a false imitation of it by a paper circulation. The idea itself, that a bank of issue has a control over the amount of its outstanding notes, is utterly preposterous. A bank issuing convertible notes or advancing notes generally on commercial securities, has neither the power of augmenting the natural level of circulation nor the power to cripple it by one single note. A bank may certainly issue notes to any amount its customers will accept; but, if not wanted for circulation, the notes will be returned to it in the form of deposits, or in payment for debts, or in exchange for metal. On the other hand, if a bank intend to forcibly contract its issues, its deposits would be withdrawn to the amount needed for filling up the *vacuum* created in the circulation. Thus a bank has no power whatever over the quantity of circulation, whatever may be its power for the abuse of other people's capital. Although in Scotland banking was practically unrestricted before 1845, and the number of banks had considerably increased since 1825, the circulation declined, and there was only £1 (of paper) per head of population, while there was in England £2 per head, notwithstanding that the whole circulation below £5 was metallic in England and paper in Scotland.

It is an illusion that the amount of circulation must correspond to the amount of bullion. If the bullion increases in the vaults of a bank, that bank certainly tries by all means to extend its circulation, but, as experience teaches, to no purpose. From 1841-'43, the bullion in the Bank of England rose from £3,965,000 to £11,054,000, but its total circulation declined from £35,660,000 to £34,094,000. Thus the Bank of France had, on March 25, 1845, an outstanding circulation of 256,000,000 f., with a bullion reserve of 234,000,000 f.; but on March 25, 1846, its circulation was 249,404,000 f., with a bullion reserve of only 9,535,000 f.

It is an assumption no less incorrect, that the internal circulation must diminish in the case of a drain of bullion. At this moment, for instance, while the efflux of bullion is going on, \$3,000,000 have been brought to the mint and added to the circulation of the country.

But the main fallacy rests on the supposition that demand for pecuniary accommodation, i.e. loan of capital, must converge with demand for additional means of circulation; as if the greater amount of commercial transactions were not effected by bills,

checks, book-credits, clearing-houses, and other forms of credit quite unconnected with the so-called circulation. There can exist no better mode of verifying the facility of bank-accommodations than the market rate of interest, and no more efficient means for ascertaining the amount of business actually done by a bank than the return of bills under discount. Let us proceed on this two-fold scale of measurement. Between March and September, 1845, when with the speculation mania the fictitious capital reached its utmost height and the country was inundated with all possible enterprises on an immense scale, the rate of interest being nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the circulation of bank notes remained nearly stationary, while at a later period in 1847, the rate of interest being $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the price of shares having sunk to the lowest ebb, and discredit spreading in all directions, the circulation of bank notes reached its maximum.

The note circulation of the Bank of England was £21,152,853 on the 17th April; £19,998,227 on the 15th of May; and £18,943,079 on the 21st of August, 1847. But while this falling off in the circulation occurred, the market rate of interest had declined from 7 and 8 to 5 per cent. From the 21st Aug., 1847, the circulation increased from £18,943,079 to £21,265,188 on Oct. 23. At the same time the market rate of interest rose from 5 to 8 per cent. On the 30th of October the circulation was £21,764,085, the interest paid in Lombard-st. amounting to 10 per cent. Take another instance:

	Bank of England Bills under Discount	Notes in Circulation
Sept. 18, 1846	£ 12,323,816	£ 20,922,232
April 5, 1847	18,627,116	20,815,234

So that the banking accommodation in April, 1847, greater by 6,000,000 than that of Sept., 1846, was carried on with a less amount of circulation.

Having exposed the general principles of Peel's Bank Act, I come now to its practical details. It assumes that £14,000,000 of bank notes form the necessary minimum amount of circulation. All notes issued by the Bank of England beyond that amount shall be represented by bullion. Sir Robert Peel imagined he had discovered a self-acting principle for the issue of notes, which would determine with mechanical accuracy the amount of the circulation, and which would increase or diminish [it] in the precise degree in which the bullion increased or decreased. In order to

put this principle into practice, the Bank was divided into two departments, the Issue Department and the Banking Department, the former a mere fabric of notes, the latter the true Bank, receiving the deposits of the State and of the public, paying the dividends, discounting bills, advancing loans, and performing in general the business with the public, on the principles of every other banking concern. The Issue Department makes over its notes to the Banking Department to the amount of £14,000,000, plus the amount of bullion in the vaults of the Bank. The Banking Department negotiates those notes with the public. The amount of bullion necessary to cover the notes beyond £14,000,000, remains in the Issue Department, the rest being surrendered to the Banking Department. If the amount of bullion diminish beneath the circulation exceeding £14,000,000, the notes returning to the Banking Department in discharge of its advances, or under the form of deposits, are not reissued nor replaced, but annihilated. If there were a circulation of £20,000,000, with a metallic reserve of £7,000,000, and if the Bank were further drained by an efflux of £1,000,000, all the bullion would be requested by the Issue Department, and there would not remain one sovereign in the Banking Department.

Now everybody will understand that this entire machinery is illusory on the one hand, and of the most pernicious character on the other hand.

Take, for instance, the Bank returns in last Friday's *Gazette*.^a There you find, under the head of the Issue Department, the amount of notes in circulation stated to be £30,531,650, i.e., £14,000,000+£16,962,918—the latter sum corresponding to the bullion reserve of last week. But, turning to the head of Banking Department, you will find £7,755,345 in notes in its assets. This is the portion of the £30,531,650 not accepted by the public. Thus the self-acting principle determines only the £30,531,650 in notes to be transported from the Issue Department to the Banking Department. But there they remain. As soon as the Banking Department comes into contact with the public, the amount of circulation is regulated, not by Peel's Act, but by the wants of business. The self-acting principle, accordingly, extends its operation not beyond the vaults of the Bank premises.

On the other hand, there occur moments, when the Bank of England, by her exceptional position, exercises a real influence, not only on English commerce, but on the commerce of the world.

^a *The Economist*, No 523, September 3, 1853.—*Ed.*

This happens in moments of general discredit. In such moments the Bank may, by raising in accordance with the Peel Act its minimum rate of interest, correspondingly with the efflux of bullion, and by refusing her accommodation, depreciate the public securities, lower the prices of all commodities, and enormously aggravate the disasters of a commercial crisis. It may, in order to stop the efflux of bullion and to turn the exchanges, transform every commercial stagnation into a monetary peril. And in this manner the Bank of England has acted and was forced to act by the Peel Act in 1847.

This, however, is not all. In every banking concern, the heaviest liabilities are not the amount of notes in circulation, but the amounts of notes and metals in deposit. The banks of Holland, for instance, had, as Mr. Anderson stated before a Committee of the House of Commons, before 1845, £30,000,000 in deposit, and £3,000,000 only in circulation.

“In all commercial crises,” says Mr. Alex. Baring, “for instance, in 1825, the claims of the depositors were the most formidable, not those of the holders of notes.”

Now, while the Act of Peel regulates the amount of bullion to be held in reserve for the convertibility of notes, it leaves Directors the power to do with the deposits as they please. Yea, more. The very regulations of this act, as I have shown, may force the Banking Department to stop the payment of the deposits and of the dividends, while bullion to any amount may lie in the vaults of the Issue Department. This happened, indeed, in 1847. The Issue Department being yet possessed of £61,000,000 of bullion, the Banking Department was not saved from bankruptcy but by the interference of Government suspending, on their responsibility, the Peel Act, on 25th Oct., 1847.

Thus the result of the Peel Act has been that the Bank of England changed its rate of interest thirteen times during the crisis of 1847, having changed it only twice during the crisis of 1825; that it created amid the real crisis a series of money panics in April and October, 1847; and that the Banking Department would have been obliged to stop but for the stoppage of the act itself. There can, therefore, exist no doubt that the Peel Act will aggravate the incidents and severity of the approaching crisis.

Written on September 9, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3881, September 24, 1853

Karl Marx

POLITICAL MOVEMENTS.—
SCARCITY OF BREAD IN EUROPE

London, Tuesday, Sept. 13, 1853

The *Sunday Times* published in its last number a dispatch from Lord Clarendon to Sir H. Seymour, in answer to the note of Count Nesselrode of June 20. This dispatch bears date July 16. It is a mere “doublière” of the reply of M. Drouyn de Lhuys.^a A correspondent of *The Leader* on Saturday last, expresses himself in the following spirited manner on the “antagonism” between Lords Aberdeen and Palmerston^b:

“Lord Aberdeen [...] could never understand Lord Palmerston’s affectations—never seeing that, consequent upon these affectations, *Lord Palmerston was always able to promote unmolested the Russian system, even better than Lord Aberdeen himself.*... Lord Palmerston [...] disguises cynicism in *Compromise.*... Lord Aberdeen did, as Lord Palmerston did not, express his convictions.... Lord Palmerston sees the expediency, and Lord Aberdeen does not see the expediency of talking intervention, while acting non-intervention.... Lord Aberdeen knowing, from his acquaintance with the governing classes, how seats are got, and voters bought, does not think the British Constitution the most perfect of human institutions; and, calculating that the people of Continental Europe are not more amiable or more honest than the people of Great Britain, he abstains from urging on continental governments the desirability of abolishing paternal despotism in favor of self-government by governing classes.... Lord Aberdeen [...] perceives that Great Britain is a power made up of conquests over nationalities, and scorns a foreign policy affecting to befriend struggling nationalities. Lord Aberdeen does not see why England, which has conquered and plundered India, and keeps India down for India’s good, should set up for a hater of Czar Nicholas, who [...] a good despot in Russia, and keeps Poland down for Poland’s obvious good. Lord Aberdeen does not see why England, which has crushed several rebellions in Ireland, should be fanatically angry with Austria for keeping down Hungary; and knowing that England

^a See this volume, pp. 203-09.—*Ed.*

^b Below is quoted the second article of the series “The Governing Classes”, dealing with Aberdeen’s surrender. (*The Leader*, No. 181, September 10, 1853).—*Ed.*

forces an alien Church on Ireland, he understands the eagerness of the Pope^a to plant Cardinal Wiseman in Westminster. He knows that we have had Kaffir wars, and does not think Nicholas a ruffian for thinning his army among the Caucasians; he knows that we send off periodically, rebellious Mitchells and O'Briens to Van Diemen's Land^b and does not feel horror because Louis Napoleon institutes a Cayenne. Whenever he has to write to the Neapolitan Government about Sicilian affairs, he does not plunge into ecstatic liberalism, because he bears in mind that Great Britain has a proconsul at Corfu.... It is a happy arrangement, a Coalition Government, which includes, with Lord Aberdeen *acting* the Russian, Lord Palmerston, to *talk* the Bermondsey *policy*."²³⁹

As a proof that I have not undervalued the heroism of Switzerland,^c I may allege a letter addressed by its Federal Council to the Ticinese Government, contending that

"the affair of the Capuchins²⁴⁰ is purely a Cantonal question, and that consequently it is for the Canton of Ticino to consider whether it is better for it to resist, and continue subject to the rigorous measures of Austria, or to make to the Government offers of renewal of negotiations."^d

Thus it appears that the Swiss Federal Council tries to bring down its dispute with Austria within the proportions of a simple Cantonal affair. The same Council has just ordered the expulsion of the Italians, Clementi, Cassola and Grillenzoni, after the Jury at Chur had acquitted them from the charge of having abetted the Milan insurrection²⁴¹ by the forwarding of arms across the Ticinese frontier.

The British support to Juggernaut appears not yet to have been altogether done away with. On the 5th of May, 1852, the following dispatch was addressed by the Court of Directors to the Governor of India:

"We continue to be of opinion that it is desirable finally to dis sever the British Government from all connection with the temple, and we therefore authorize to make arrangements for accomplishing this object by the discontinuance of any periodical allowance to it, in lieu of which some final payment may be made in the way of compensation to any persons who may appear upon a liberal construction of past engagements or understandings to be entitled to such indemnifications."

On the 11th April, 1853, however, nothing had been done by the Indian Government, the subject being still under consideration at that date.

A week has been consumed in a government inquiry into the cruelties practised upon the prisoners in Birmingham jail, cruelties which have induced several of them to commit and others to

^a Pius IX.—*Ed.*

^b Tasmania.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 107-08.—*Ed.*

^d *The Leader*, No. 181, September 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

attempt suicide. Startled on one side by an exposition of atrocities not surpassed by any committed in an Austrian or Neapolitan *carcere duro*,^a we are on the other side surprised at the tame acquiescence of the visiting magistrates in the representations which were made to them by interested parties, and at their utter want of sympathy with the victims. Their solicitude for the barbarous gaoler was so great that they regularly forewarned him of their approaching visits. The chief culprit, Lieutenant Austin, is one of those persons whom Carlyle designated in his *Model Prisons*²⁴² as the true officers of the pauper and criminal.

One of the topics of the day is *Railway morality*. The Yorkshire and Lancashire Board of Directors particularly announce on their tickets that

“whatever accident may happen, whatever injury may be inflicted through their own negligence or that of their servants, they would hold themselves absolved from all legal responsibility.”^b

At the same time the Directors of the Birmingham and Shrewsbury line appeared before the Vice-Chancellor's Court on Saturday for having cheated their own shareholders. There exists a rivalry between the Great Western and the North-Western lines as to which of the two should absorb the above line in question. The majority of the shareholders being in favor of amalgamation with the North-Western, and the Directors of absorption into the Great Western, it occurred to the latter to turn a number of shares held by them in trust for the Company to account, for the manufacture of fictitious voters. For this purpose the shares were transferred to a number of nominal holders—in some instances it would seem without the concurrence of the parties whose names were used, and in one instance to a child of nine years of age—who paid no consideration for the shares, but executed re-transfers of them into the hands of the Directors, and supplied them, in virtue of their nominal ownership, with a given number of proxies, to insure a majority in favor of the union with the Great Western. The learned Judge remarked that “anything more flagrant or more gross could scarcely be conceived, and the way in which the plan had been carried out was still more gross.” With this reflection he dismissed the guilty parties, as is usual among the bourgeoisie, while a poor devil of a proletarian would have been sure to be transported for a theft beyond five pounds.

^a Punishment cell.—*Ed.*

^b This and the following quotation are from “Vice-Chancellor's Court, Saturday, Sept. 3”, *The Times*, No. 21525, September 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

It is curious to observe the British public in its fluctuating indignation now against the morality of mill lords, and now against the pit-owners, now against the little dealers in adulterated drugs, and then against the railwaymen who have supplanted the obsolete highwaymen; in short, against the morality of every particular class of capitalists. Taking the whole, it would seem that capital possesses a peculiar morality of its own, a kind of superior law of *a raison d'état*, while ordinary morals are a thing supposed to be good for the poor people.

Manchester Parliamentary Reformers seem to be in a pretty fix. The election revelations of the last session concerned almost exclusively boroughs, and even the great ones, as Hull, Liverpool, Cambridge and Canterbury. The liberal election-broker, Mr. Coppock, confessed in a fit of veracity: "What St. Albans was all other boroughs are." Now the oligarchy meditate turning these exposures to recount in effecting a reform in favor of counties and at the cost of boroughs. The Manchester Reformers, who desire no general extension of the suffrage, but only one within the borough-limits, are, of course, dumb under such a proposition. It is pitiful to see how their organ, *The Daily News*, struggles to get out of this difficulty.

On January 14, 1846, the Bank rate of interest was raised to 3 1/2 per cent.; on Jan. 21, 1846, to 4 per cent.; and it was not until April, 1847, that the rate rose to 5 per cent.; but it is known that in the last three weeks of April, 1847, almost all operations of credit were at a deadlock. In 1853, the upward movement of the Bank rate of interest was by far more rapid. From 2 per cent., at which it was on 24th April, 1852, it rose to 2 1/2 per cent. on Jan. 8, 1853; to 3 per cent. on the 22d of the same month, to 3 1/2 per cent. on the 4th June, to 4 per cent. on the 1st of September, and already the rumor runs through the city that it will shortly rise to 5 per cent. In Nov. 1846, the average price of wheat was 56/9 per qr.; in the latter weeks of August, 1853, it had reached 65/ to 66/. About this period last year the Bank of England

held in its cellars	£ 21,852,000
It now holds only	£ 16,500,068
	<hr/>
Being a difference of	£ 5,351,932

The bullion decreased during last week but one by £208,875, and in last week by £462,852. The effect upon prices at the Stock Exchange has been immediate, every description of security declining. We read in the Money article of last Wednesday's *Times*:

"Notwithstanding the depression in the Stock-market, Exchequer bills remained at 2 per cent. discount to 1 per cent. premium, but an impression is entertained that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to sustain the price, causes them to be purchased on Government account, in the absence of any funds immediately available for that purpose, by the sales of 3 per cent. Stocks held on account of savings-banks."^a

This would be a masterpiece on the part of Mr. Gladstone: selling Consols at a low figure and purchasing Exchequer bills at a high one, causing a loss of half the income of the 3 per cent. stocks by converting them into Exchequer bills bearing little more than 1½ per cent. interest.

How can we reconcile an unfavorable exchange or drain of bullion with the unprecedented increase of British exports, which at the end of the year will surpass by £16,000,000 even the exports of 1852?

"As we give credit [...] to all the world in the case of our exports, and pay ready money in the case of our imports, a large expansion of our trade at any moment must necessarily lead to a considerable balance in the payments against us at the time, but which must all be returned when the credit upon our exports has expired, and remittances ought to be made for them."

So says *The Economist*.^b According to this theory, if the exports of 1854 were to surpass again those of 1853, the exchange must continue to be against England, and a commercial crisis would be the only means of adjustment. *The Economist* thinks that disasters like those of 1847 are out of the question, because no considerable portion of capital has been fixed now as then, in railways, etc. He forgets that it has been converted into factories, machinery, ships, etc. On the other hand, *The Observer* laments the

"foolish investments in *foreign railways*, and other companies of very doubtful and suspicious character."^c

The Economist thinks that the extended commercial operations, so far as Europe is concerned, may receive a *wholesome check* from the high price of corn, but that *America and Australia*, etc., are *sure*. *The Times* at the same time asserts that the tightness of the New-York money market will put a *wholesome check* on American operations.

"We must not calculate on the same extent of orders from the United States that we have hitherto experienced," exclaims *The Leader*.^d

^a *The Times*, No. 21527, September 7, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b In "As Applied to Interest on Capital", *The Economist*, No. 524, September 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c *The Observer*, September 11, 1853. The passages rendered below are from the issue of September 4, 1853.—*Ed.*

^d "The Threatened Stop in the Rise of Wages", *The Leader*, No. 180, September 3, 1853.—*Ed.*

Australia remains. Here steps in *The Observer*:

“Exports have been pushed injudiciously forward. [...] From the 74,000 tons of shipping now entered in London for the southern colonies, the condemnatory notices we gave from Adelaide, Melbourne, etc., will receive their justification. It is not to be denied that present prospects are not promising.”

As to the Chinese market all reports are unanimous on the point that there exists a great alacrity to sell, but as great a reluctance to buy, the precious metals being hoarded, and any alteration of this state of things remains out of question as long as the revolutionary movement in the monster Empire has not accomplished its end.

And the home market?

“Large numbers of the power-loom weavers in Manchester and its neighborhood have followed the example of Stockport in striking for an advance of 10 per cent. on their wages.... The factory heads will probably find, before the end of the winter, that the question is not whether an increase of 10 per cent. will be conceded, but whether the manufacturers will allow work to be resumed at the present rate of wages.”

In these terms, not to be misunderstood, *The Morning Chronicle*^a alludes to the imminent decline of the domestic market.

I have repeatedly dwelt on the immense enlargement of the old factories, and the unparalleled erection of new ones. I reported to you upon some new-built mills which form, as it were, whole manufacturing towns. I stated that at no former epoch had such a proportion of the floating capital accumulated during the period of prosperity, been directly sunk for manufacturing purposes^b. Now, take these facts on the one hand, and on the other the symptoms of overstocked markets at home and abroad; remember also, that an unfavorable exchange is the surest means to precipitate over-exports into foreign markets.

But it is the bad harvest which, above all, will drive the long-accumulated elements of a great commercial and industrial crisis to eruption. Every other sort of produce, when enhanced, checks its own demand; but Corn, as it becomes appreciated, is only the more eagerly sought for, drawing depreciation on all other commodities. The most civilized nation, like the most brutal

^a On September 7, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See Marx's articles “Pauperism and Free Trade.—The Approaching Commercial Crisis” and “Political Prospects.—Commercial Prosperity.—Case of Starvation” (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 357-63, 477-85).—*Ed.*

savage, must procure its food before it can think of procuring anything else, and the progress of wealth and civilization is generally in the same proportion, in which the labor and cost of producing food diminish.—A general bad harvest is in itself a general contraction of markets, at home and abroad. Now the present harvest is at least as deficient in the southern part of Europe, in Italy, France, Belgium, Rhenish Prussia, as it was in 1846-47. It is by no means promising in the north-west and north-east. As to England, *The Mark Lane Express*, that *Moniteur* of the London Corn Exchange, states in its number of yesterday week^a:

“That the produce of wheat in the United Kingdom will be the smallest gathered for many years, does not admit of question. [...] The average yield will fall materially short in almost all parts of the kingdom, [...] independent of which it must be borne in mind that the breadth of land sown was, owing to the unpropitious weather during the seeding time, at least one-fourth less than usual.”

This situation will not be alleviated by the delusion of commercial convulsions, industrial over-production, and bad harvests having been simultaneously done away with by *free trade*. On the contrary.

“Holders,” remarks the same *Mark Lane Express*, “cannot yet realize the idea of scarcity under Free Trade. Hence few are disposed to hold heavy stocks. [...] If our necessities should drive us hereafter to import largely, the chances are, that we shall have to pay *dearly* for supplies.”

The Mark Lane Express of yesterday adds:

“There is still so large a proportion of the crops abroad that the character of the weather for some weeks to come will have great influence on trade. [...] The quality of the grain exposed in the fields has already suffered from the last rains, [...] and a continuance of wet might be productive of an immense amount of mischief.... The ultimate result of the harvest threatens to be [...] less satisfactory than appeared likely a week or two ago.... The accounts which have reached us the last few days with regard to *potatoes*, are less favorable than those previously received.... Notwithstanding the enormously large supplies from abroad during last week (88,833 qrs.), the reaction on prices has been only small, the fall from the highest point not having exceeded 1s. to 2s. per quarter.... The probable result of the harvest in the Baltic is on the whole of an unsatisfactory character.... According to the latest advices, wheat was at 60s. f. o. b. at Dantzic, at 56s. 3d. at Königsberg, 54s. at Stettin, 58s. at Rostock.”

The consequences of the dearth are already appearing, as in 1847, on the political horizon. At Naples the town authorities are without means to employ the laborers on public works, and the Exchequer is unable to pay the State officers. In the Papal States,

^a Of September 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

at Tolentino, Terni, Ravenna and Trastevere, there have been bread riots by no means mitigated by the recent arrests, the invasion of the Austrians, and the threat of the *bastinado*. In Lombardy the political consequences of dearth and industrial stagnation will not be avoided by Count Strassoldo's imposing an additional tax of 6½ kreuzen per florin, payable on the 20th Sept. and 10th Oct., this year, and to be levied on all payers of direct taxes, including the income tax and the tax upon salaries. The general distress in Austria is betrayed by her lingering after a new loan, introduced on the market as usual by the assertion that she wants the money only to reduce her army. The feverish anxiety of the French Government may be inferred from its false harvest accounts, its false assize of bread at Paris, and its immense purchases of corn on all markets. The provinces are disaffected, because Bonaparte feeds Paris at their expense; the bourgeoisie are disaffected because he interferes with commerce in behalf of the proletarians; the proletarians are disaffected because he gives wheat bread instead of brown to the soldiers, at the moment when peasants and workmen are menaced with the prospect of no bread at all; lastly, the soldiers are disaffected because of the humble anti-national attitude of France in the Eastern question. In Belgium several food riots have echoed the foolish festivities lavished by the Coburgs on the Austrian Archduchess.^a In Prussia the fear of the Government is so great that several corn-brokers have been arrested by way of show, and the rest summoned before the Police President, who "requested" them to sell at "honest" prices.

I conclude by again recording my opinion, that neither the declamation of the demagogues, nor the twaddle of the diplomats will drive matters to a crisis, but that there are approaching economical disasters and social convulsions which must be the sure forerunners of European revolution. Since 1849 commercial and industrial prosperity has stretched the lounge on which the counter-revolution has slept in safety.

Written on September 13, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3886 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 871, September 30, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

^a Marie Henriette.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[THE WESTERN POWERS AND TURKEY.—
IMMINENT ECONOMIC CRISIS.—
RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN INDIA²⁴³]

London, Tuesday, Sept. 20, 1853

In my letter of July 19, I said:

“The Western Powers [...] *commence* by encouraging the Sultan^a to resist the Czar, from fear of the encroachments of Russia, and *terminate by compelling the former to yield*, from fear of a general war giving rise to a general revolution.”^b

Now, at this moment the strength of the combined fleets is intended to be used *for Russia against Turkey*. If the Anglo-French fleet enter the Dardanelles at all, it will be done not to bombard Sebastopol, but to reduce to terms the Mussulmans who might prevent the Sultan from accepting *without conditions* the Vienna Note.

“On the 13th of September,” says D. Urquhart, “[...] the four Foreign Secretaries^c quietly assembled in Downing-st., and decided to send orders to Constantinople to enforce upon the Porte the withdrawal of the modifications which the European Conference had accepted. Not content with this, and in case the Sultan should find himself unable to resist the exasperation of his people, they send orders for the squadron to advance into the waters of the Bosphorus to support him against his subjects. Nor content with this, they also dispatched orders to Omer Pasha to forbid him from passing from one province to another in his Sovereign’s Dominions.

“They have consequently contemplated the rebellion as the result of their dispatch, and provided means for putting it down, these means being the allied squadron.”^d

^a Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 212.—*Ed.*

^c Clarendon, the Foreign Secretary at the time, and the former Foreign Secretaries Aberdeen, Palmerston and Russell.—*Ed.*

^d [D. Urquhart.] “The Political Malefactors”, *The Morning Advertiser*, September 20, 1853. Below on pp. 315-16 Marx quotes from the same article.—*Ed.*

It was from Sunday's *Journal des Débats* that the English public became acquainted with this news. The *Journal des Débats* stated that Mr. Reeve, having left London on the 13th inst., with dispatches for Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, arrived in Paris on the morning and left it on the evening of the 14th, after he had communicated to the French Government the tenor of his instructions, ordering the English Ambassador to demand the entire adhesion of the Porte to the Vienna proposals, the retraction of its modifications of the 19th August, threatening it with the withdrawal of the support of the four Powers in the event of a war arising from its refusal to yield, and offering it the assistance of the French and English fleets for putting down any insurrection that might break out in Constantinople if the Porte were to comply with the Vienna Note, and against Omer Pasha, if he dared to act in disobedience to the orders of the Porte. Before the arrival of the *Journal des Débats*, we were informed that the Vienna Conference, on receipt of the Emperor's^a refusal, sent proposals to the Sultan that he should recall his words, that he should sign the note he had refused to sign, and be content with an assurance that the Conference would put any interpretation on the note agreeable to the Sultan himself. *The Times* avoids speaking of the compromising revelations made by the *Journal des Débats*. So does *The Morning Chronicle*, *The Morning Post*, and the whole of the governmental London press. In the meantime *The Morning Post* denounces the fanaticism of the Constantinople mob, *The Morning Chronicle* is exciting its dull readers by romantic descriptions of the fierce and undisciplined Asiatic hordes inundating European Turkey, and swelling Omer Pasha's army; the gallant *Globe* publishes day after day carefully selected extracts from the peace-mongering press of the Manchester school, and, in due time, the respectable classes of England will be prepared "to annihilate Paganism," and to shout with Prince Gorchakoff, "Long life to the Czar! Long life to the God of the Russians!"

In its to-day's number *The Times* discovers that "*the Turkish question has plainly become a question of words*;" the inference to be drawn from its premises being, that the Sultan who intends exposing the peace of the world for mere words, must be forcibly brought to reason by the more sober-minded Palmerstons and Aberdeens. The Czar, we are told by *The Times*, having preferred unjust demands upon the Sultan, the Sultan rejected them, the Czar seized the Danubian Principalities, England and France dispatched their fleets

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

to Besika Bay, and the representatives of these Powers met those of Austria and Prussia in Vienna.

Why did they meet them in Vienna? *In favor of Turkey*, says *The Times*.

“Not only could there be *no desire of coercing the Ottoman Government*, but there was *no occasion for such an action*.”

If, then, there is now a desire on the part of the four Powers for *coercing* the Ottoman Government, “it is simply because there is now” an *occasion* for “such an action.” Would it then be wrong to suppose that the sole and principal aim of the Vienna Conference and of the interference of Palmerston and Aberdeen has been the affording such an occasion, that they made only a show of resistance to Russia, in order to gain a pretext for coercing Turkey into submission to her?

“The demands of Russia,” continues *The Times*, were “thought unjustifiable by the other Great Powers, [...] incompatible with the sovereign rights of the Sultan,” and therefore, the Great Powers drew up a Note to be presented by the Sultan to the Czar, ratifying all the demands of the Czar and something more.

“The terms of this document,” says *The Times*, “were *liable to misconception*, [...] but two points were unimpeachably clear—first, that the four Powers intended to maintain the territorial and administrative rights of the Porte; and, next, that in the event of dispute *they would have been bound by this intention*.”

Why should the Sultan not subscribe a note derogatory of his sovereign rights and surrendering the protectorate of twelve millions of his subjects to the control of the autocrat, while he feels himself backed by the good “*intentions*” of the four Powers and by their being *bound* by hidden “good *intentions*” in the case of a dispute? As the Sultan has had occasion to learn, the four Powers feel themselves not bound either by the law of nations, or by explicit treaties, to defend him in the event of a dispute with Russia; why should he not trust to their valor in the event of a dispute arising from a note which endows Russia with open claims and Turkey with “hidden intentions?”

“Let us take,” says *The Times*, “the extreme case of supposing that, after the acceptance [...] *pure et simple* of the original Vienna Note, the Czar should [...] have availed himself of those opportunities with which the note [...] is thought to have provided him.”

What then?

“*The Sultan would have protested*, and the case would have arisen for the application of the adjustment of 1853.”

As if there had arisen no case for the application of the adjustment of 1840 and 1841, of the treaty of Balta-Liman,²⁴⁴ and of the violation of the law of nations, characterized by Lord Clarendon himself as “an act of piracy!”

“The ambiguity,” says *The Times*, “[...] would merely have misled the Emperor of Russia.”

Exactly so, as the treaty of 1841 has “misled” him to keep the united fleets out of the Dardanelles while he himself entered the Principalities.

The Sultan, however, is stiff-necked. He has refused compliance with a note which was able to express its good intentions for Turkey only by delivering her up to Russia. He proposed certain modifications in this note, and “the four Powers,” says *The Times*, “showed by their approval of the Turkish modifications, that they believed them to coincide with their own proposals.” But, as the Emperor of Russia is of a contrary opinion, and as *The Times* thinks it most undoubtedly true, that the Czar’s “proceedings in this dispute deserve *no consideration whatever*,” *The Times* comes to the conclusion that, as Russia will not yield to the reasonable [...] conditions of Turkey, Turkey must yield to the unreasonable conditions of Russia, and that

“a state which [...] is yet so impotent as to require European protection at every menace of aggression from without or insurrection from within, *must at least so far pay the penalty of its weakness as to receive aid indispensable to its existence on the terms least onerous to its supporters.*”

The four Powers, of course, must join Russia against Turkey, because Turkey is supposed to want their aid in order to resist Russia.—Turkey must “pay the penalty for its weakness,” in having had recourse to the four Great Powers she is obliged by treaties to appeal to.

“There is no alternative. Either the laws of England have to be exercised in their penal rigour^a upon the persons of four traitors” (Aberdeen, Clarendon, Palmerston, and Russell), “or the Czar of Russia commands the world.”

Such declamation as this uttered in *The Morning Advertiser* by D. Urquhart, is good for nothing. Who is to judge the four traitors? Parliament. Who forms that Parliament? The representatives of the Stockjobbers, the Millocrats, and the Aristocrats. And what foreign policy do these representatives represent? That of the *paix*

^a *The Morning Advertiser* has “vigour”.—Ed.

partout et toujours.^a And who execute their ideas of foreign policy? The identical four men to be condemned by them as traitors, according to the simple-minded *Morning Advertiser*. One thing must be evident at least, that it is the Stockjobbers, and the Peacemongering Bourgeoisie, represented in the Government by the Oligarchy, who surrender Europe to Russia, and that in order to resist the encroachments of the Czar, we must, above all, overthrow the inglorious Empire of those mean, cringing and infamous adorers of the *veau d'or*.^b

Immediately after the arrival of the Vienna Note at Constantinople, the Ottoman Porte called 80,000 men of the Redifs^c under arms. According to a telegraphic dispatch dated Constantinople, Sept. 5, the Turkish Ministry had resolved, after a conference held at the house of the Grand Vizier,^d to maintain their last note at the hazard of war. The enthusiasm of the Mussulman population has reached its highest pitch. The Sultan, having reviewed the Egyptian troops, and being received with deafening acclamations, was, after the review, lifted from his horse by the multitude and carried in triumph through the streets of Stambul. He has reiterated to the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia^e his order to quiet the Principalities. As the Russian subjects resident at Constantinople have been convicted of intriguing against the Turkish Government, Reshid Pasha has given a warning to the Russian Consul on their behalf. A Constantinople journal states that the Israelite community at Constantinople has offered to the Sultan a million of piasters in order to contribute to the expenses occasioned by the military preparations of the Empire. The Smyrna Israelites are said to have come to a similar resolution. A letter in the Vienna *Presse* informs us that several boyards have been arrested at Galatz because they had entered into a secret correspondence with Omer Pasha informing him of all details with regard to the state of the Russian army in the Principalities. A letter of Omer Pasha has been found inviting these boyards to enlist as many foreigners as possible.

Prince Menchikoff had arrived at Vienna on the 13th instant, accompanied by a Secretary, and as the bearer of a new manifesto of the Emperor Nicholas, addressed to the European Powers, and

^a Peace at all costs.—*Ed.*

^b The golden calf.—*Ed.*

^c Reserve troops in the Ottoman Empire.—*Ed.*

^d Mustafa Pasha.—*Ed.*

^e Ghica and Stirbei.—*Ed.*

explaining his reasons for rejecting the Turkish modifications. The Emperor himself will arrive at Olmütz on the 21st instant, accompanied by Count Nesselrode and by Baron de Meyendorff. The King of Prussia^a whom he had summoned by Prince de Lieven to the Olmütz Conference, has refused to make his appearance on the ground that, under existing circumstances, such a step on his part would have too much *éclat*. A Russian corps d'armée 30,000 strong is stationed now at Krajova on the frontiers of Bulgaria. Until now there have existed only eight army commissariats in the Russian Empire. A regular ninth commissariat has just been established at Bucharest—a sure indication that the Russians do not think of evacuating the Principalities.

On the 15th of Sept. the Bank of England raised its rates of interest to 4½ per cent. The Money article in to-day's *Times* tells us that "The measure is regarded with general satisfaction." In the same article, however, we find it stated that,

"at about 2 p.m. business at the Stock Exchange was in fact almost wholly suspended, and when the announcement was made, shortly afterward, of the advance to 4½ per cent., prices declined to 95 for money and 95⅛ to ¼ for the 13th of Oct. A general opinion prevailed, that if the advance had been to 5 instead of 4½ per cent., the effect on the market would possibly have been less unfavorable, since the public would then have considered the probability of any further action to have ceased.... In the Railway market [...] a severe relapse occurred after the breaking up of the Bank Court, and prices of all kinds left off with a very unsettled appearance."^b

The writer in *The Times* congratulates the Bank Directors on their following up the policy of the Peel Act.

"In proportion as the circulation diminished from the drain of gold, the Directors have asked a higher price for the use of what remained, and have thus allowed the Bank Charter Act of Sir R. Peel that *free course*, by which alone its soundness can be demonstrated, and which was prevented by the infatuated proceedings of the Directors in 1847."

Now I have shown in a former letter that the infatuation of the Directors in 1847 consisted precisely in their close adherence to the Peel Act, the "free course" of which had to be interrupted by Government, in order to save the Banking Department from the necessity of stopping payment.^c We read in *The Globe*:

^a Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

^b This and the following quotation are from *The Times*, No. 21535, September 16, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 300-01.—*Ed.*

"It is highly improbable that the causes which have produced our present prosperity will continue to operate in the same proportion. Unhealthy results have already appeared in Manchester, where some of the largest firms have been compelled to limit their amount of production.... All departments of the Stock Exchange continue in a very depressed state. The Railway market is in a complete state of panic.... The efflux of gold to the Continent continues, and nearly half a million of money goes over to St. Petersburg in a day or two by steamer.... One object of its" (the Bank's) "husbanding its resources of specie is probably a desire to assist the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the seven or eight millions which he will require to pay off the South Sea stockholders and other dissentients."^a

The Morning Post of the 14th inst. reports from Manchester:

"The market for cloth and yarn is dull, and the prices of all descriptions of manufactures are barely supported. The absence of demand from almost every foreign market and the anticipated money pressure at home, have mainly contributed to a state of things which is most anomalous, when contrasted with the accounts of prosperity generally current."

The same journal, of the 15th inst., winds up a leading article on the collecting elements of the approaching crisis in the following terms:

"We warn the commercial world that we are at a phase in which care and steady consideration are eminently requisite in the conception and conduct of enterprise. Our financial position, besides, is one which, in our view, is full of dangers even more serious and more difficult of avoidance than our commercial."

From the combined statements of *The Globe* and *Morning Post*, it follows that while the demand is declining on the one hand, the supply, on the other, has been overdone. Manufacturers will attempt to cover their retreat by falling back on the quarrel existing with their workmen. The trade reporter in yesterday's *Morning Chronicle* writes from Manchester:

"Manufactures are becoming greatly indifferent about entering into engagements, from the persuasion that an extensive, if not *universal stoppage of mills* must take place before any settlement of the wages question can be effected. On this subject there have been conferences among employers in various parts of the districts within the last few days; and it is evident that the exorbitant clamors set up by the operatives, together with the wild attempts at dictation, are forcing the millowners into a general combination for self-defense."

We read in the money article of *The Times*:

"Masters are forming Unions for self-defense in all the districts. At Ashton, Stalybridge, Hyde, and Glossop, nearly 100 firms have placed their names to a

^a *The Globe*, September 13, 1853.—*Ed.*

deed of Union within the last few days. At Preston the masters have entered into heavy bonds to each other to resist the operatives by closing their mills for three months."^a

A telegraphic dispatch from Marseilles reports that wheat has again advanced by 2 frs. 25 cent. per hectolitre.

"The augmentation of the interest on treasury bonds, announced in the *Moniteur*, produced a most unfavorable impression at the Bourse, that measure being generally considered as a sign that the Government is in want of money. [...] A loan was spoken of which the Government would be obliged to contract. [...] The Minister of Finance^b has sent a circular to a vast number of landed proprietors, asking them to pay six months' taxes in advance, as a mark of gratitude for the great benefits which the present Government had conferred on them, and for the additional value which it had imparted to property." "This," remarks *The Observer*, "is the beginning of the end."^c

Having dwelt in a former letter on the vital importance of railways for India,^d I think fit to give now the latest news which has been published with regard to the progress and prospects of the intended network. The first Indian railway was the line now in operation between Bombay and Thane. Another line is now to be carried from Calcutta to Russnehael on the Ganges, a distance of 180 miles, and then to proceed along the right bank of the river to Patna, Benares and Allahabad. From Allahabad it will be conducted across the Doab to Agra and thence to Delhi, traversing in this manner a space of 1,100 miles. It is contemplated to establish steam ferry-boats across the Soane and Tunona,^e and that the Calcutta line will finally proceed from Delhi to Lahore. In Madras a railway is to be commenced forthwith, which, running 70 miles due west, will branch off into two arms—one pursuing the Ghats and terminating at Calicut, the other being carried on by Bellary and Poona to Bombay. This skeleton of the chain of railways will be completed by the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, the preliminary surveys for which are now proceeding under the sanction of the Court of Directors. This line will pass from Bombay by Baroda to Agra, where it will meet the great trunk railway from Calcutta to Delhi, and by its means Bombay, the Capital of Western India and the best port of communication with Europe, for all Hindostan, will be put in

^a *The Times*, No. 21537, September 19, 1853.— *Ed.*

^b J. M. Bineau.— *Ed.*

^c *The Observer*, September 19, 1853.— *Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 218-21.— *Ed.*

^e Jumna.— *Ed.*

communication with Calcutta on the one hand, and with the Punjab and the north-western provinces on the other. The promoters of this scheme intend also to throw out branches into the great cotton district of the interior. In the meantime, measures are in progress for extending the electric telegraph throughout the whole of the peninsula of India.

Written on September 20, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3889, and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 872, October 4, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 630, October 8, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

[THE WESTERN POWERS AND TURKEY.—
SYMPTOMS OF ECONOMIC CRISIS]²⁴⁵

London, Friday, Sept. 23, 1853

The Globe, in its number of Sept. 20, denies the authenticity of the statement of the *Journal des Débats* with regard to the mission of Mr. Reeve, and *The Times* of Wednesday reprints the article of *The Globe* under the head of *gobemoucherie*, accusing the French press of trading in *canards*. But did not the leading article of *The Times* I analyzed in my last letter^a wholly confirm the statement of the *Journal des Débats*? Has there appeared any refutation in the *Paris Moniteur*? Did not, on the same day that *The Globe* gave the lie to the *Débats*, the *Assemblée nationale* reiterate that

“Lord Redcliffe was to notify to the Sultan that, if he refused to withdraw his modification, the English fleet would enter the Dardanelles, and the French fleet would not be slow to follow?”^b

Did not *The Times*, on the same day on which it reproduced the denial of *The Globe*, explicitly declare that

“England and France have no business to interfere between Russia and Turkey, except on the terms proposed by the four allied Powers, and accepted by Russia, whether these terms were *agreeable* to the haughty spirit of Turkey or not?”

Were we not told by *The Morning Post*, before the *Journal des Débats* had arrived at London, that

“on the receipt of the Emperor of Russia’s^c answer to the proposal for the modifications of the Vienna Note, the Conference of the Representatives of the Great Powers had immediately assembled, and on the 4th inst. dispatched a courier

^a See this volume, pp. 310-12.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from Am. Pellier’s article in *L’Assemblée nationale*, No. 263, September 20, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

Name Train

- 16 August
 1 Friday Putnam
 2 Friday House of Lords August
 3 Friday Annals of the City
 4 Friday (Palmerston)
 5 Friday 23 August
 6 Friday 30 August
 7 Friday 4 September
 8 Friday 13 September
 9 Friday 19 September
 10 Friday 20 September
 11 Friday 23 September
 12 Friday 27 September
 13 Friday 30 September
 14 Friday 4 October
 15 Friday 7 October
 16 Friday 14 October
 17 Friday Palmerston

A page from Marx's notebook with notes on the mailing of articles to the New-York Daily Tribune

to Constantinople with *certain communications* from the Conference to the Divan, which it was hoped would *induce* the Porte to accept the Vienna Note!"^a

Finally, we read in a morning paper of to-day that

"Mr. Reeve is going to Constantinople, that he is the bearer of dispatches from Lord Clarendon to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and that a connection of the most intimate kind exists between him and the Foreign Office, he having been the channel of communication between Downing-st. and Printing-house Square."

The truth is, that since the last revelations made by the French Press, the Eastern question has again assumed quite a new aspect, and the ignominious resolutions the English Ministry had decided upon are likely to be frustrated by events contrary to all their calculations and expectations.

Austria has seceded from the joint action with her pretended allies; the Vienna Conference has been broken off, at least for a moment. Russia has pulled off the mask she thinks no longer of any avail, and the English Ministry is driven out of its last entrenchments.

"Lord Aberdeen," as the *Liverpool Courier*^b justly remarks, "recommended that the Sultan^c should have recourse to a transparent and contemptible fraud; that the parties to the Vienna Conference should exercise a *mental reservation* with regard to the note, and that the Sultan should read it in an *unnatural sense*, i.e., the terms of the note being clear and precise, and the Emperor of Russia having refused point-blank to adopt the Sultan's modifications, the Powers should hold themselves prepared, hereafter, to act *as if those modifications had been received*."

M. Drouyn de Lhuys suggested to the Vienna Conference an explanatory note conceived in that hypocritical sense, and to be communicated to the Porte, but Count Buol rejected this proposition, declaring that it

"was too friendly to the Porte, that the time was gone by for collective action, and that each power was free to act as it pleased."

Thus the English Ministry has lost the resource of covering itself with the *common* arbitration of the *European* Areopagus, that joint-stock company disappearing before one word of the Austrian Minister, as it had been conjured up by him. In the beginning Austria wanted no conference at all till Russia had crossed the Pruth. Russia having advanced to the Danube, Austria does want the conference no more, at least no more on its primitive

^a *The Morning Post*, No. 24881, September 19, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Of September 21, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

conditions. On the other hand Count de Nesselrode has published two circulars, which do not any longer allow backing the original Vienna Note by hidden "good intentions" or interpreting it in any other sense than its literal one.

The modifications proposed by the Porte have reduced the whole question to "a mere question of words,"^a shouted the whole ministerial press.

By no means, says Nesselrode. The Czar puts the same interpretation upon the original text as the Sultan did. The original note is nothing and has never been intended to be anything but a second edition of Menchikoff's note, and we do abide by the text, the whole text, and nothing but the text. The ministerial *Globe* is of course amazed at the discovery that both the Czar and the Sultan, regard the original note "as implying recognition of those demands which Russia had preferred, which Turkey had refused, and which the four Powers did not" (?) "intend to indorse,"^b and that "Russia insists upon an *absolute* recognition of the claims which she first advanced." And why should she not? If she was bold enough to advance those claims four months ago, why should she desist now after having won the first campaign?

The same *Globe* which pretended some days ago the Turkish modifications to be scholastic *quibbles*, *superfluous* subtilities, is now obliged to own that "the Russian interpretation shows that they were *necessary*."

The *first* dispatch of Nesselrode is not yet made public, but *The Morning Post* assures us that it declares "the Vienna Note to be neither more nor less than the equivalent of Prince Menchikoff's note," and the evening *Globe* adds, that according to it,

"The Emperor regarded [...] the Vienna Note as securing for him that recognition on Turkey, and that hold upon her Government, which the Porte, with the support of the four Powers, had refused, and which it was the object of the mediation to prevent. [...] That the Emperor [...] never ceased to reserve to himself the right of dealing directly with Turkey alone, setting aside the mediators whom he affected to acknowledge."

At no time did he affect to acknowledge them as mediators. He permitted three of them to march in the rear of Austria, while he allowed Austria herself to come an humble supplicant to him.

^a *The Times*, No. 21538, September 20, 1853. See also this volume, p. 310.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below the quotations are from the leader in *The Globe*, September 22, 1853.—*Ed.*

As to the *second* dispatch, dated St. Petersburg, 7th, published by the *Berlin Zeit* on the 18th inst., and addressed to Baron Meyendorff at Vienna, Nesselrode is perfectly right in stating that the original note was described to him as an "*ultimatum*" by the Austrian Envoy, which Russia obliged herself to give her consent to upon the express condition of its being accepted by the Porte *without any alteration whatever*. "Will any one refuse to hear this testimony to the *loyauté* of the Emperor?"^a It is true that he has committed a little act of "piracy" on the Principalities; that he has overrun them, seized them, taxed them, governed them, plundered them, appropriated them, eaten them up, notwithstanding the proclamations of Gorchakoff; but never mind. Did he not, on the other hand, "on the receipt of a first draft of a note, notify his accession to it by telegraph, *without waiting to learn if it had been approved in London or in Paris?*" Could he be expected to do more than to notify by telegraph, that a note, dictated by a Russian Minister at Vienna, would not be rejected by a Russian Minister at St. Petersburg? Could he do more for Paris and London than not even to wait for their approval? But he did more, indeed. The draft, whose acceptance he condescended to notify by telegraph, was "*altered*" at Paris and London, and "did he retract his consent, or raise the smallest difficulty?" It is true, that according to his own statement, the note in its "final form" is "neither more nor less than an *equivalent* of Prince Menchikoff's note;" but an equivalent note remains, at all instances, "*different*" from the original one; and had he "not stipulated the acceptance of the Menchikoff note without *any* alteration?" Might he not, "on this ground alone, have refused to take it into consideration?" He did not do so. "Could a more conciliatory spirit be shown?" The *ultimatum* of the Vienna Conference is no business of his; it is their own property. "It is *their affair* to consider the *delays* which will result" from the Sultan not yielding. He, for his part, does not care about staying some months longer in the Principalities, where his troops are clothed and fed for nothing.

Odessa does not suffer from the mouth of the Danube being blocked, and, if the occupation of the Principalities contributes to raise the price of wheat at Mark-lane,^b the profane Imperials will find the quicker their way back to the Holy Russia. It is, therefore, for Austria and the Powers to

^a Nesselrode's dispatch is quoted from and presented according to *The Times*, No. 21540, September 22, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b The Corn Exchange.—*Ed.*

“declare to the Porte, frankly and firmly, that they, after having in vain opened up to it the only road that could lead to an immediate restoration of its relations with us, henceforth leave *the task for itself alone.*”

They did enough for the Sultan by having opened the road to the Danube to the Czar and closed the road to the Black Sea to the Allied Squadron. Nesselrode’s “august master” denounces then, “the *warlike* inspiration which seems at present to influence the Sultan and the majority of his Ministers.” He, on his part, would certainly prefer the Sultan taking it coolly, opposing peace tracts to gunboats, and compliments to Cossacks. “He has exhausted the measure of concessions, without the Porte having yet made a single one. His Majesty can go no further.” Certainly not, he *can go no further*, without crossing the Danube. Nesselrode compresses his whole argument into a masterly dilemma not to be escaped from. Either the alterations proposed by the Porte mean nothing, or they mean something. If they mean nothing, why should the Porte insist upon them? If they mean something, “it is very simple that we refuse to accede to them.”

“The evacuation of the Principalities,” said Lord Clarendon, “is a *sine qua non*, *preliminary* to any settlement.”^a Quite the contrary, answers Nesselrode. “The settlement,” i.e., the arrival of the Turkish Ambassador bearing the Austrian note without *alterations* “is a *sine qua non* preliminary to the evacuation of the Principalities.”

In one word, the magnanimous Czar is ready to part with the Vienna Conference humbug, as it is no longer wanted for terminating his first campaign; but he will hold the closer the Principalities, as they are the indispensable condition for commencing the second one.

If it be true, as we are informed to-day by telegraphic dispatch, that the Conference has resumed business, the Powers will repeat to Nicholas the song Alexander was received with by the Paris mob:

Vive Alexandre,
Vive le roi des rois,
Sans rien prétendre
Il nous donne des lois.^b

^a Quoted from Clarendon’s House of Lords speech on August 8, 1853 in *The Times*. No. 21502, August 9, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Long live Alexander,
King of Kings.
He grants us laws
And asks for nothing in return.—*Ed.*

The Czar himself, however, holds no longer his former control over the Eastern complication. The Sultan has been forced to conjure up the old fanatic spirit, to cause a new invasion of Europe by the rude warlike tribes of Asia, not to be soothed down with diplomatic notes and conventional lies, and there seems transpiring, even through the insolent note of the Muscovite, something like an apprehension at the "warlike spirit" domineering over Stambul. The manifesto, addressed by the Sultan to the Mussulmans, declines any other concession to Russia, and a deputation of the Ulemas²⁴⁶ is said to have called upon the Sultan to abdicate or to declare war without further delay. The division in the Divan is extreme, and the pacific influence of Reshid Pasha and Mustafa Pasha is giving way to that of Mehemet Ali, the Seraskier.^a

The infatuation of the so-called *radical* London press is quite incredible. After having told us some days ago, that "the laws of England have to be exercised in their *penal rigor*^b upon the persons of *four traitors*"^c (Aberdeen, Clarendon, Palmerston and Russell), *The Morning Advertiser*, of yesterday, concludes one of its leaders as follows:

"Lord Aberdeen must, therefore, make way for a successor. Need we say who that successor must be? There is but one man to whom the country points at this important junction, as fit to be entrusted with the helm of affairs. *That man is Lord Palmerston.*"

The Morning Advertiser being unable to read events and facts, should at least be able to read the articles of Mr. Urquhart, published day after day in its own columns.

On Tuesday evening a meeting of the inhabitants of Sheffield was called, by requisition to the Mayor, "to take into consideration the present unsettled and unsatisfactory state of the Eastern question and the propriety of memorializing government on the subject." A similar meeting is to be held at Stafford and many other attempts are afloat at getting up public demonstrations against Russia and the ministry of "all the talents." But, generally, public attention is absorbed by the rate of discount, corn prices, strikes and commercial apprehensions, and more yet by the *cholera* ravaging Newcastle and being met with explanatory notes by the

^a War Minister.—*Ed.*

^b *The Morning Advertiser* has "vigour".—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from Urquhart's article in *The Morning Advertiser*, September 20, 1853. Marx quotes this statement more fully in his article of September 20, 1853 (see this volume, pp. 312-13).—*Ed.*

London Board of Health. An order in council has been issued, putting in force the provisions of the *Epidemic Disease Act* for the next six months throughout the Islands; and hasty preparations for the due reception of the scourge are making in London and other great towns. If I shared the opinions of Mr. Urquhart, I should say, that the Czar had dispatched the Cholera morbus to England with the "*secret mission*" to break down the last remnant of what is called the Anglo-Saxon spirit.

A wonderful change has come over the manufacturing districts during the last four weeks. In July and the beginning of August there was nothing to be seen but bright prosperity, only slightly overshadowed by the distant cloud of the "Eastern Question," and more so, perhaps, by the fear that a shortness of hands would prevent our cotton-lords to explore to the dregs that immense mine of profitable business which they saw before them. The Eastern dispute seemed settled, the crop might certainly turn out a little short, but there was free trade to keep prices down with the never-failing supplies of America, of the Black Sea and the Baltic. Day after day the demand for manufactured goods went on increasing. California and Australia poured forth their golden treasures into the lap of British industry. *The Times*, forgetting Malthus and all its own former rhapsodies about overpopulation, seriously discussed the question whether the shortness of the supply of working-hands, and consequent rise of wages, would not, by raising the cost of production of British manufactures in a proportionate manner, put a stop to this flourishing trade, unless the Continent sent a colony of workmen. The working classes were, as their employers said, only *too well off*, so much so, that their demands knew no bounds, and their "impudence" was daily becoming more intolerable. But that was in itself a proof of the immense, unheard-of prosperity which the country was enjoying; and what could be the cause of this prosperity but Free Trade? And what was worth more than all this, was the certitude that the enormous trade done was *sound*, that there were no stocks, no wild speculation. Thus the manufacturers, one and all, were wont to express themselves, and they acted upon these views; they built factories by the hundred, they ordered steam-engines of thousands of horse-power, thousands of power-looms, hundreds of thousands of spindles. Never was engineering and machine-making a more profitable trade than in 1853. Establishments broken down in the whole of their internal organization by the great strike of 1851,²⁴⁷ now regained their position, and even improved it; and I could name more than one first-rate and

celebrated machine-making firm who, but for this unprecedented business, would have succumbed under the consequence of the blow inflicted by the mechanics during the great turn-out.

The fact is that the bright sunshine of prosperity is for the moment hidden by gloomy clouds. No doubt the altered aspect of the Eastern dispute has contributed a good deal; but that affects the home American and Colonial trade very little. The raising of the rate of discount is less a cause than a symptom of "something being rotten in the state of Denmark."^a The shortness of the crop and increase in the price of provisions are no doubt causes which have counteracted and will counteract still more the demand for manufactured goods from those markets which are exposed to the operation of these causes, and among these the home market, the mainstay of British industry, stands in the first rank. But the rise in the price of provisions is at this moment, in most districts of England and Scotland, very nearly or altogether compensated by the rise of wages, so that the purchasing power of the consumer can hardly be said to have been *already* lessened much. Then the rise in wages has raised the cost of production in those branches of industry in which manual labor prevails; but the price of nearly all manufactured goods was, up to August, pushed a good deal ahead of the cost of production by the large demand. All these causes have cooperated to deaden business; but, after all, they are not sufficient to account for the general anxiety that pervades the commercial classes of the manufacturing districts.

The fact is, that the spell of the Free Trade delusions is vanishing away, and the bold industrial adventurers begin to have a glimmering that economical revulsions, commercial crises and recurrence of over-production are yet not quite so impossible in a Free Trade country as they dreamt. And over-production there has been, there is, there must be, for even those bugbears of *The Manchester Guardian*, the "Stocks," are there; aye, and increasing too. The demand for goods is decidedly falling off, while the supply increases every day. The largest and most numerous of the new industrial constructions are only *now gradually coming into operation*. The shortness of hands, the strikes of the building trades, the impossibility of supplying the enormous quantities of machinery on order, have caused many an unforeseen delay and postponed, for a time, the eruption of those symptoms of industrial plethora which otherwise would have shown themselves sooner. Thus the largest mill in the world, Mr. T. Salt's, near

^a Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

Bradford, was only to be opened this week, and it will take some time yet, ere the whole of the productive power employed there can be brought fully to bear on the market. Thus plenty of the larger new concerns in Lancashire will not be fit for work before winter, *while it will be spring, and perhaps later, before the market will feel the full effect of this new and stupendous accession of productive power.* According to the last news from Melbourne and Sydney, import markets were becoming much duller, and many shipments will now be indefinitely postponed. As to *over-speculation*, we shall hear of that by and by, when accounts come to be closed. Speculation has been distributed over such a variety of articles that it shows less this time than before, although there is plenty of it.

Written on September 23, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3892 and the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 873, October 7, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Karl Marx

[PANIC ON THE LONDON STOCK EXCHANGE.—
STRIKES]²⁴⁸

London, Tuesday, Sept. 27,^a 1853

The intelligence that the combined fleets had passed up the Dardanelles, concurrent with rumors of a change in the Ministry and of commercial difficulties, produced a real panic at the Stock Exchange on Saturday:

“To describe the state of the English funds, or the scene that has prevailed in the Stock Exchange, would be a task of no small difficulty. It is rare that such excitement is witnessed, and it is well that it is infrequent.... It is perhaps no inflation to assert that the *Bearing* at the present time equals almost what took place during the French Revolution.... Funds have this week been done at 91¹/₂ [...] and [...] have not been so low since 1849.... In the railway market there has been an incessant fall.”

Thus says *The Ministerial Observer*.^b All the leading railway shares were about 68 s. to 80 scp. under the prices of the previous week. As to the sudden pressure of stock upon the market, it would not signify much, as the mere time-dealers are able, at a given moment, to turn the market and intimidate the *bona fide* stockholders. But, coinciding, as it does, with general symptoms of a commercial crisis, the great fluctuation of funds, even if it be of a mere speculative character, will prove fatal in its consequences. At all events, this consternation in the Money market is condemnatory of any State loans looming in the future, and particularly so of the Austrian ones. Moreover, capitalists are reminded that Austria did pay, in 1811, a dividend 1s. 7d.

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* the article was datelined: “Thursday, Sept. 29”. Here it is corrected on the basis of a note in Karl Marx’s notebook.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below the quotations are from *The Observer*, September 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

farthing in the pound on their promissory notes; that, notwithstanding her revenue having been screwed up from £12,000,000 to £18,000,000 sterling, by means of a greatly increased pressure of taxation exerted on Hungary and Lombardy since 1849, her annual deficit amounts, on an average, to more than one-quarter of her whole revenue; that about £50,000,000 have been added to her national debt since 1846; and that she only has been prevented from a new bankruptcy by the interested forbearance of the children of Israel, who still hope to rid their tills of heaps of Austrian paper accumulated in them.

“Trade has been pushed on somewhat beyond its proper limits, and our commercial liabilities have partially outstripped our means,” says *The Observer*. “It is useless,” exclaims *The Morning Post*, “to evade the question, for although there are [...] some favorable features in the pending crisis which did not exist in 1847, it must be perceptible to every intelligent observer of passing events that, to say the least of it, a very trying condition of affairs has arrived.”^a

The bullion reserve in the Bank of England has again decreased by £338,954, and its reserve of notes—i.e., the fund available for discounts,—amounts but to seven millions, a sum fully required by the Chancellor of the Exchequer^b for paying off the dissentient holders of South Sea stock. As to the state of the Corn market, we learn the following from yesterday’s *Mark Lane Express*^c:

“With average crops we have for [...] years consumed some millions of quarters of foreign wheat per annum. What, then, are our requirements likely to be under existing circumstances? The produce of wheat at the utmost cannot be estimated at more than three-quarters of an average, and there is [...] no excess in the yield of any other crop. Potatoes are seriously affected by disease, and have been forced into consumption so rapidly, owing to their unfitness for storing, that this article of food must very shortly become scarce. So enormous has been our consumption that with an importation of 3,304,025 qrs. of wheat and 3,337,206 cwts. of flour during the eight months ending the 5th inst., the stocks in granary are by no means excessive.... We are anxious not to exaggerate the difficulties the country may be placed in, but *that difficulties exist it would be folly to deny*.... The reports as to the yield of wheat are *very unsatisfactory*; in many cases where the produce has been tested by thrashing, the quantity turned out little more than half of what had been calculated upon.”

While thus the bright sunshine of commercial and industrial prosperity is hidden by gloomy prospects, *strikes* are still forming, and will for some time yet form, an important feature of our industrial condition; only they are beginning to change their

^a *The Morning Post*, No. 24887, September 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b Gladstone.—*Ed.*

^c Of September 26, 1853.—*Ed.*

character contemporary with the change that is now going on in the general condition of the country.

At Bury a new advance of 2d. per 1,000 hanks has been asked on the part of the spinners. Masters refusing, they left work, and the weavers will do so as soon as they have worked up the yarn on hand. At Preston, while the weavers still demand an advance of 10 per cent., being supported by the operatives of the surrounding districts, six masters have already locked up their mills and the others are likely to follow them. Two thousand operatives have thus been thrown out of work. At Blackburn the mechanics of Mr. Dickinson, iron-founder, still remain out. At Wigan the capreelers of one mill have struck for an advance of 1d. per score, and the throstle-spinners of another mill refused to commence work until their wages were advanced. The mills were closed. At the same place the coal-miners' strike, embracing about 5,000 hands, is going on. The Earl of Crawford, and other extensive coal-miners in the neighborhood, dismissed their hands on Wednesday evening. A numerous meeting of the colliers was then held in Scales' Orchard. At Manchester 5,000 looms stand still, besides the minor strikes going forward, such as that of the fustian-dyers, the skein-dyers, felt-hat makers, etc. At Bolton, meetings of the operative cotton-spinners are being held for an advance of wages. There are shoemakers' strikes at Trenton, Bridgewater, etc.; cab-drivers' strikes at Glasgow; masons' strikes at Kilmarnock; threatened turn-outs of the police at Oldham, etc. At Birmingham, nailers demand an advance of 10 per cent.; at Wolverhampton, the carpenters one of 6d. per day; the London carpenters ditto, and so on. While through the principal manufacturing towns of Lancashire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, etc., the operatives are holding public meetings, to decide upon measures for the support of their suffering brethren, the masters on the other hand are resolved to close their establishments for an indefinite period, with the design of starving their hands into subjection.

"We find," says the *Sunday Times*, "that, generally speaking, the demand for an advance of wages has not exceeded 6d. a day; and, looking at the present price of provisions, [...] it can hardly be said [...] that the demand is an unreasonable one. We know it has been said that one aim of the present strikers is to obtain a sort of *communistic share* of the real or supposed profits of the manufacturer; but the comparison between the *increased demand for wages* and the *enhanced value of the prime necessities of life*, furnishes an ample refutation of the charge."^a

^a "The Wages Movement,—'The Strikes'", *Sunday Times*, No. 1616, September 25, 1853.—*Ed.*

When the working people ask for more than “the prime necessities of life,” when they pretend “to share” in the profits resulting from their own industry, then they are accused of *communistic* tendencies. What has the price of provisions to do with the “eternal and supreme law of supply and demand?” In 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842, while there was a continued rise in the price of provisions, wages were sinking until they reached the starvation point. “Wages,” said then the same manufacturers, “don’t depend upon the price of provisions, but upon the eternal law of supply and demand.”

“The demands of the working people,” says the *Sunday Times*, “may be submitted to when urged in a *respectful* manner.”

What has *respect* to do with the “eternal law of supply and demand?” Has any one ever heard of the price of coffee rising at Mincing-lane^a when “urged in a *respectful* manner?” The trade in human flesh and blood being carried on in the same manner as that of any other commodity, give it at least the chances of any other.

The wages-movement has been going on now for a period of six months. Let us judge it by the test acknowledged on the part of the masters themselves, by the “eternal laws of supply and demand,” or are we, perhaps, to understand, that the eternal laws of political economy must be interpreted in the same manner as the eternal peace treaties Russia has concluded with Turkey?

Six months ago the work-people, had they even found their position not strengthened by the great demand for their labor, by constant and enormous emigration to the gold fields and to America, must have inferred the enhancement of industrial profits from the general prosperity-cry uttered by the middle-class press exulting at the blessings of Free Trade. The workmen, of course, demanded their share of that so loudly proclaimed prosperity, but the masters fought hard against them. Then, the workmen combine, threaten to strike, enforce their demands in a more or less amicable manner. Wherever a strike occurs, the whole of the masters and their organs in pulpit, platform and press, break out into immoderate vituperation of the “impudence and stupidity” “of such *attempts at dictation*.” Now, what did the strikes prove, if not that the workmen preferred applying a mode of their own of testing the proportion of the supply to the demand rather than to

^a A London street, centre of trade in spices and other goods brought from the colonies.—*Ed.*

trust to the interested assurances of their employers? Under certain circumstances, there is for the workman no other means of ascertaining whether he is or not paid to the actual market value of his labor,²⁴⁹ but to strike or to threaten to do so. In 1852, on an average, the margin between the cost of the raw material and the price of the finished goods—for instance, the margin between the cost of raw cotton and that of yarn, between the price of yarn and that of cotton goods, was greater, consequently the profit of the spinner and the manufacturer was undoubtedly larger than it has been in 1853. Neither yarn nor goods have, until very lately, risen in the same proportion as cotton. Why, then, did the manufacturers not advance wages at once in 1852? There was no cause, they say, in the relative position of supply and demand justifying such a rise of wages in 1852. Indeed? Hands were not quite as short a year ago as they are now, but the difference is out of proportion to the sudden and repeated rise of wages forced out of the manufacturers since then, by virtue of the law of supply and demand, as expounded by turn-outs. There are, certainly, more factories at work than last year, and more able-bodied workmen have emigrated since then, but at the same time never has there been such a supply of factory labor poured into our “hives of industry” from agricultural and other pursuits, as during the last twelve months.

The fact is that the “hands,” as usual, perceived only too late, that the value of their labor had risen 30 per cent. many a month ago, and then, in the summer of this year—only then—they began to strike, first for 10 per cent., then for another 10 per cent., and so on, for as much, of course, as they could get. The constant success of these strikes, while it generalized them all over the country, was the best proof of their legitimacy, and their rapid succession in the same branch of trade, by the same “hands” claiming fresh advances, fully proved that according to supply and demand the work-people had long been entitled to a rise of wages, which was merely kept from them on account of their being ignorant of the state of the labor market. When they at last became acquainted with it, the manufacturers, who had all the while preached “the eternal law of supply and demand,” fell back on the doctrine of “enlightened despotism,” claiming the right to do as they liked with their own, and propounding as their angry *ultimatum* that the work-people don't know what is good for them.

The change in the general commercial prospects must change the relative position of the work-people and their employers. Sudden as it came on, it found many strikes begun, still more in

preparation. No doubt, there will be more, in spite of the depression, and, also, for a rise of wages, for as to the argument of the manufacturer, that he cannot afford to advance, the workmen will reply, that provisions are dearer; both arguments being equally powerful. However, should, as I suppose, the depression prove lasting, the work-people will soon get the worst of it, and have to struggle—very unsuccessfully—against *reduction*. But then their activity will soon be carried over to the *political field*, and the *new organization of trades, gained in the strikes, will be of immense value to them*.

Written on September 27, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3900, October 17, 1853; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 876, October 18; published simultaneously in abridged form in German in *Die Reform*, No. 60, October 19, 1853

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Frederick Engels

THE RUSSIANS IN TURKEY²⁵⁰

The certainty of war, and the probability that each steamer that now arrives from Europe will report the maneuvers of armies and the results of battles, render it more than ever necessary accurately to understand the respective positions and forces of the combatants, and the various facts which will govern the movements of the campaign. This necessity we propose to meet by a succinct analysis of the elements of offense and defense on both sides, and of the leading strategic considerations which are likely to have weight on the minds of the opposing commanders.

The Russian troops occupying the Danubian Principalities consisted, at the beginning, of two infantry corps and the usual amount of reserve cavalry and artillery. An infantry corps in Russia, counts three divisions, or six brigades of infantry, several regiments of light cavalry, and a brigade of artillery, which, altogether, should amount to about 55,000 men, with about a hundred guns. To every two infantry corps there is a "reserve cavalry corps" and some reserve artillery, including heavy siege artillery. Thus, the original army of occupation amounts, upon paper, to something like 125,000 men. A third infantry corps has since begun to cross the Pruth, and we may, therefore, after all due deductions, consider the Russian forces concentrated on the Danube to number from 140,000 to 150,000 fighting men. How many, in a given moment, may be able to rally around the standards, depends upon the sanitary condition of the district, the greater or less efficiency of the Russian commissariat, and other circumstances of a similar nature which it is impossible correctly to estimate at a distance.

From all the information at our command, the Turkish army opposed to the Russians on the Danube, may be estimated at the very outside, at 110,000 to 120,000 men. Before the arrival of the Egyptian contingent, it was generally asserted not to surpass 90,000 men. There is, then, as far as we can judge, an evident inferiority of numbers on the part of the Turks. And as to the intrinsic value and quality of either army, an equal superiority on the part of the Russians must be admitted. It is true that the Turkish artillery, formed by excellent French and Prussian officers, enjoys a high reputation, while the Russian gunners are notoriously poor marksmen; but in spite of all recent improvements, the Turkish infantry cannot be compared to Russian grenadiers, and Turkish horsemen still lack that discipline and steadiness in battle which will allow of a second and a third charge after the first has been repulsed.

The Generals, on both sides, are comparatively new men. The military merits of Prince Gorchakoff, the Russian commander, and the reasons why the Emperor appointed him to that post, we have already had occasion to state to our readers.²⁵¹ An honest man, and a zealous partisan of Russia's "manifest destiny," it yet remains to be seen whether he can conduct a campaign of such magnitude as that now opening. Omer Pasha, the Turkish Generalissimo, is better known, and what we know of him is generally favorable. His expeditions against Kurdistan and Montenegro were, the first successful under difficult circumstances; the second, exceedingly well planned, and certain of almost bloodless success, but for the interference of diplomacy.²⁵² The chief superiority, then, which can be found on the side of the Turks is, perhaps, that of generalship; in most other respects the Russians have the advantage.

Though the Turks have declared war, and are perhaps, more vehement in their disposition to come to blows than the Russians, it seems evident, that as the weaker party, they will find the greater advantage in defensive, and the Russians in offensive action. This of course excludes the chances which may arise from glaring mistakes in the arrangements of either General. If the Turks were strong enough for the offensive, their tactics would be plain. They would then have to deceive the Russians by false maneuvers on the upper Danube, concentrate their forces rapidly between Silistra and Orsova, cross the lower Danube, fall upon the enemy where his position is weakest, namely, at the narrow strip of land forming the frontier between Wallachia and Moldavia; and then separating the Russian troops in both

Principalities from each other, repel with concentrated forces the corps in Moldavia, and crush that which would find itself isolated and cut off in Wallachia. But as all the chances of an offensive movement are against the Turks, they could reasonably undertake a similar operation in consequence only of egregious blunders on the part of the Russian General.

If the Russians seize the opportunity for offensive action, they have two natural obstacles to pass before they penetrate to the heart of the Turkish Empire; first the Danube and then the Balkan. The passage of a large river, even in presence of a hostile army, is a military feat so often performed during the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, that every lieutenant now-a-days can tell how it is to be done. A few feigned movements, a well-appointed pontoon train, some batteries to cover the bridges, good measures for securing the retreat, and a brave vanguard, are about all the conditions required. But the crossing of a great mountain range, and especially one provided with so few passes and practicable roads as the Balkan, is a more serious operation. And when this mountain range runs parallel to the river, at a distance of no more than forty or sixty miles, as the Balkan does to the Danube, the matter becomes more serious still, as a corps defeated on the hills may, by active pursuit, be cut off from its bridges and thrown into the river before succor can arrive; an army, thus defeated in a great battle, would be inevitably lost. It is this proximity and parallel direction of the Danube and the Balkan which forms the natural military strength of Turkey. The Balkan, from the Macedo-Servian frontier to the Black Sea, that is the Balkan proper, "Veliki Balkan," has five passes, two of which are high roads, such as high roads are in Turkey. These two are the passes of Ikhtiman, on the road from Belgrade, through Sofia, Philippopolis and Adrianople to Constantinople, and of Dobrol, on the road from Silistra and Shumla. The other three, of which two are between the above and the third towards the Black Sea, may be considered as impracticable for a large army, with the impediments of war. They may give passage to smaller corps, perhaps even to light field artillery, but they cannot be made the lines of operation and of communication for the main body of the invaders.

In 1828 and 1829, the Russian forces operated upon the line from Silistra by Dobrol to Adrianople, Ainadjik, this route being the shortest and most direct from the Russian frontier to the Turkish Capital, offers itself as the most natural to any Russian army which comes from the north, is supported by a fleet in

undisputed possession of the Black Sea, and whose object is to bring matters to a speedy decision by a victorious march upon Constantinople. In order to pass by this road, a Russian army, after having passed the Danube, has to force a strong position flanked by the two fortresses of Shumla and Varna, to blockade or to take both of these fortresses, and then to pass the Balkan. In 1828, the Turks risked their main strength in this position. They were defeated at Kulevcha²⁵³; Varna and Shumla were taken, the defense of the Balkan was but feeble, and the Russians arrived at Adrianople, very much enfeebled, it is true, but yet having encountered no resistance, as the Turkish army was completely dissolved and not a brigade at hand for the defense of Constantinople. The Turks committed, on that occasion, a great mistake. A range of mountains, as every officer understands, must not be defended by a defensive position in front of it, nor by dividing the defending armies so as to block up all the passes; but by taking up a central position behind it, by observing all the passes, and when the enemy's intentions are clearly developed, by falling with concentrated forces upon the heads of his columns as they emerge from the various ravines of the mountain range. The strong position across the Russian line of operations between Varna and Shumla led the Turks to make that decisive stand there, which, with more concentrated strength and against an enemy necessarily weakened by sickness and detachments, they ought to have made in the plain of Adrianople.

Thus we see that in the defense of the line from Silistra to Adrianople the passage of the Danube ought to be defended without risking a decisive action. The second stand should be made *behind*, not *between*, Shumla and Varna, and no decisive action risked unless the chances of victory are *very great*. Retreat across the Balkan is the next step leaving the passes defended by detachments, capable of as much resistance as may appear advisable without bringing on a decisive engagement. In the meantime the Russians will weaken themselves by blockading the fortresses, and, if they follow their anterior practice, they will again take these fortresses by storm, and lose a great many men by the operation; for it is a curious fact, and characteristic of the Russian army, that up to the present time it has, unaided, *never been able to lay a regular siege*. The want of skilful engineers and artillerists, the impossibility of creating in a barbarous country large magazines of war, material for sieges, or even to carry across immense tracts of country whatever material may exist, have always driven the Russians to the necessity of carrying every

fortified place by assault after a short, violent, but seldom very effective cannonade. Thus Suwaroff took Ismail and Otchakov²⁵⁴; thus, in 1828 and 1829, the Turkish fortresses in Europe and Asia were stormed; and thus they carried Warsaw in 1831.²⁵⁵ In either case the Russian army will arrive at the passes of the Balkan in a weakened condition, while the Turks have had time to concentrate their detachments from all sides. If the invaders are not repelled while attempting to cross the Balkan, by a dash of the whole Turkish army, the decisive battle may be fought under the walls of Adrianople, and then, if the Turks are defeated, they will at least have exhausted all the chances left them.

But a Russian victory at Adrianople can, under present circumstances, decide very little. The British and French fleets are at Constantinople, and in their teeth no Russian General can march upon that capital. The Russians, arrested at Adrianople, unable to rely on the support of their fleet, which itself would be menaced, would soon fall victims by thousands to disease, and have to retrace their steps beyond the Balkan. Thus, even in victory, they would be defeated as regards their great object in the war. There is, however, another line of operations which they may, perhaps, more advantageously take. It is indicated by the route which leads from Widin and Nikopolis, by way of Sofia, to Adrianople. Apart from political considerations, it would never enter the head of any sensible Russian General to follow this route. But so long as Russia can depend on Austria—so long as the approach of a Russian army to the Serbian frontier, combined with Russian intrigues in Serbia, may excite insurrectionary movements in that country, in Montenegro, and among the predominant Greco-Slavic population of Bosnia, Macedonia, and Bulgaria—so long as the crowning operation of a strictly military campaign, the taking of Constantinople, is out of the question, from the presence of a European fleet—so long this plan of campaign will be the only one which the Russians can adopt with much chance of success, and without forcing England and France to determined hostile action by too direct a march upon Constantinople.

It appears, indeed, from the present position of the Russian army, that something of this sort is projected. Its right wing has been extended to Krajova, near the western frontier of Wallachia, and a general shifting of its array toward the upper Danube has taken place. As this maneuver is entirely out of the line of operations by Silistra and Shumla, it can only have for its object to put the Russians in communication with Servia, the center of

Slavic nationality and Greek Catholicism in Turkey. A defensive position on the lower Danube, combined with an advance across the upper Danube toward Sofia, would be perfectly safe if supported by Austria, combined with a movement of the Turkish Slavonians in favor of national independence; and such a movement could not be more forcibly provoked than by a march of the Russian army into the very heart of the Slavonian population of Turkey. Thus, the Czar^a will obtain far more easily and in a far less offensive manner what he has claimed throughout the controversy. This is the organization of all the Turkish Slavonians in distinct principalities, such as Moldavia, Wallachia and Servia now are. With Bulgaria, Montenegro and Macedonia under the nominal sovereignty of the Sultan^b and the real protection of the Czar, Turkey in Europe would be confined to the environs of Constantinople and deprived of its nursery of soldiers, Albania. This would be a far better result for Russia than a decisive victory at Adrianople, followed by a dead stand of her armies. It is a result which appearances indicate that she is about to try for. Whether she is not mistaken in relying on the Slavonians of Turkey is a doubtful question, though there will be no cause of astonishment should they all declare against her.

Written on September 29, 1853

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3900, October 17, 1853, as a leader; reprinted in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, No. 632, October 22, 1853

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b Abdul Mejid.—*Ed.*

KARL MARX

LORD PALMERSTON²⁵⁶

Written in October-beginning of December, 1853

First published 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, signed by Dr. Marx; in incomplete form published as leaders in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, Nos. 3902, 3916, 3930 and 3973, October 19, November 4 and 21, 1853, January 11, 1854, and in the *New-York Weekly Tribune*, Nos. 632, 635, 638, October 22, November 12, December 3, 1853, and also as pamphlets in London, in 1853-54

Reproduced from *The People's Paper*, checked with the text in the *New-York Daily Tribune* and of the pamphlets

LORD PALMERSTON.

Written for the "New York Tribune," by Dr. Marx, and communicated by him to us.

FIRST ARTICLE.

RUGGIERO is again and again fascinated by the false charms of Alcide, which he knows to disguise an old witch—

Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything and the knight-errant cannot withstand falling in love with her anew whom he knows to have transmuted all her former adorers into asses and other beasts. The English public is neither Ruggiero, and Palmerston is another Alcide. Although a septagenarian, and since 1847 occupying the public stage, almost without interruption, he contrives to remain a novelty, and to evoke all the hopes that used to centre on an untried and promising youth. With one foot in the grave, he is supposed not yet to have begun his true career. If he were to die to-morrow, all England would be surprised at learning that he has been a Secretary of State half this century.

If not a good statesman of all work, he is at least a good actor of all work. He succeeds in the comic as in the heroic—in pathos as in familiarity—in the tragedy as in the farce: although the latter may be more congenial to his feelings. He is no first class orator, but he is an accomplished debater. Possessed of a wonderful memory, of great experience, of a consummate tact, of a never-failing *presence d'esprit*, of a gentlemanlike versatility, of the most minute knowledge of parliamentary tricks, intrigues, parties, and men, he handles difficult cases in an admirable manner and with a pleasant volubility, sticking to the prejudices and susceptibilities of his public, secured from any surprise by his cynic impudence, from any self-confession by his selfish dexterity, from running into a passion by his profound frivolity, his perfect indifference, and his aristocratic contempt. Being an exceedingly happy joker, he ingratiates himself with everybody. Never losing his temper, he imposes on an impassioned antagonist. When unable to master a subject, he knows how to play with it. If wanting of general views, he is always ready to issue elegant generalities.

Endowed with a restless and indefatigable spirit, he abhors inactivity, and pines for agitation, if not for action. A country like England allows him, of course, to busy himself in every corner of the earth. What he aims at is not the substance, but the mere appearance of success.

If he can do nothing, he will devise anything. Where he dares not interfere, he intermeddles. Not able to vie with a strong enemy, he improves a weak one.

Being no man of deep designs, pondering on no combinations of long standing, pursuing no great object, he embarks in difficulties with a view to disentangle himself in a showy manner. He wants complications to feed his activity, and when he finds them not ready, he will create them. He exults in show-conflicts, show-battles, show enemies, diplomatical notes to be exchanged, ships to be ordered to sail, the whole movement ending for him in violent parliamentary debates, which are sure to prepare him an ephemeral success, the constant and the only object of all his exertions. He manages internal conflicts like an artist, driving matters to a certain point, retreating when they threaten to become serious, but having got, at all events, the dramatic excitement he wants. In his eyes, the movement of history itself is nothing but a pastime, expressly invented for the private satisfaction of the noble Viscount Palmerston of Palmerston.

Yielding to foreign influence in fact, he opposes it inwardly. Having inherited from Canning England's mission to propagate Constitutionalism on the Continent, he never in

the act of piracy, while admitting that Denmark had evidenced no hostility whatever towards Great Britain, he contended that they were right in bombarding its capital and steving its fleet, because they had to prevent Danish neutrality from being, perhaps, converted into open hostility by the compulsion of France. This was the new law of nations, proclaimed by my lord Palmerston.

When again specifying, we find that English minister *par excellence*, engaged in the defence of foreign troops, called over from the continent to England, with the express mission of maintaining forcibly the oligarchic rule, to establish which William had, in 1689, come over from Holland, with his Dutch troops. Palmerston answered to the well-founded "apprehensions for the liberties of the country," originating from the presence of the King's German Legion, in a very flippant manner. Why should we not have 16,000 of those foreigners at home; while you know, that we employ "a far larger proportion of foreigners abroad." (House of Commons, March 10, 1822.)

When similar apprehensions for the constitution arose from the large standing army, maintained since 1815, he found "a sufficient protection off the constitution in the very constitution of our army," a large proportion of its officers being "men of property and connexions." (House of Commons, March 8, 1816.)

When the large standing army was attacked from a financial point of view, he made the curious discovery that "much of our financial embarrassments had been caused by our former low peace establishments." (House of Commons, March 8, 1816.)

When the "barbers of the country," and the "misery of the people" were contrasted with the lavish military expenditure, he reminded parliament that those burdens and that misery "were the price which we (viz., the English oligarchy) agreed to pay for our freedom and independence." House of Commons, May 16, 1828.)

In his eyes, military despotism was not to be apprehended from the exertions of "those self-called, but misled Reformers, who demand that sort of reform in the country which, according to every first principle of government, must end, if it were acceded to, in a military despotism." (House of Commons, June 14, 1820.)

While large standing armies were thus his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the country, flogging was his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the army. He defended it in the debates on the Mutiny Bill, on the 5th of March, 1824, he declared it to be "absolutely indispensable" on March 11, 1825, he recommended it again on March 10, 1828; he sto d by it in the debates of April, 1833, and he proved an amateur of flogging on every subsequent occasion.

There existed no abuse in the army, he did not find plausible reasons for, if it happened to foster the interests of aristocratic parasites. Thus, for instance, in the debates on the Sale of Commission. (House of Commons, March 12, 1828.)

Lord Palmerston likes to parade his constant exertions for the establishment of religious liberty. Now, he voted against Lord Russell's motion for the Repeal of Test and Corporation Acts. Why? Because he was "a warm and zealous friend to religious liberty," and could, therefore, not allow the Dissenters to be relieved from "imaginary grievances, while real afflictions pressed upon the Catholics." (House of Commons, Feb. 26, 1829.)

In proof of his zeal for religious liberty he informs us of his "regret to see the increasing numbers of the Dissenters. It is my wish that the Established Church should be the predomi-

FIRST ARTICLE^a

[*The People's Paper*, No. 77, October 22, 1853]

Ruggiero is again and again fascinated by the false charms of Alcina, which he knows to disguise an old witch—

Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything,^b

and the knight-errant cannot withstand falling in love with her anew whom he knows to have transmuted all her former adorers into asses and other beasts. The English public is another Ruggiero, and Palmerston is another Alcina. Although a septuagenarian, and since 1807 occupying the public stage, almost without interruption, he contrives to remain a novelty, and to evoke all the hopes that used to centre on an untried and promising youth. With one foot in the grave, he is supposed not yet to have begun his true career. If he were to die to-morrow, all England would be surprised at learning that he has been a Secretary of State half this century.

If not a good statesman of all work, he is at least a good actor of all

^a The article published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* on October 19, 1853 began as follows: "The Eastern complications have worked a great change in England, if not as to parties, at least as to the men at the head of parties. Lord Palmerston has again become a popular favorite. He is in everybody's mouth, he is the only man to save England, he is confidently announced as the indispensable Premier of any modified Cabinet, extolled alike by the Tories, the Whigs, the self-styled patriots, the press, and public opinion in general.

"So extraordinary a phenomenon is the Palmerston mania that one is tempted to suppose it to be of a merely fictitious character, got up not for home consumption, but as an article of export, destined for foreign use. This, however, would be a mistake."—*Ed.*

^b Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Act II, Scene 7. Ruggiero and Alcina are characters from Ariosto's poem *L'Orlando furioso*.—*Ed.*

work. He succeeds in the comic as in the heroic—in pathos as in familiarity—in the tragedy as in the farce: although the latter may be more congenial to his feelings. He is no first class orator, but he is an accomplished debater. Possessed of a wonderful memory, of great experience, of a consummate tact, of a never-failing *présence d'esprit*,^a of a gentlemanlike versatility,^b of the most minute knowledge of parliamentary tricks, intrigues, parties, and men, he handles difficult cases in an admirable manner and with a pleasant volubility, sticking to the prejudices and susceptibilities of his public, secured from any surprise by his cynic impudence, from any self-confession by his selfish dexterity, from running into a passion by his profound frivolity, his perfect indifference, and his aristocratic contempt. Being an exceedingly happy joker, he ingratiates himself with everybody. Never losing his temper, he imposes on an impassioned antagonist. When unable to master a subject, he knows how to play with it. If wanting of general views, he is always ready to tissue elegant generalities.

Endowed with a restless and indefatigable spirit, he abhors inactivity, and pines for agitation, if not for action. A country like England allows him, of course, to busy himself in every corner of the earth. What he aims at is not the substance, but the mere appearance of success.

If he can do nothing, he will devise anything. Where he dares not interfere, he intermeddles. Not able to vie with a strong enemy, he improvises a weak one.

Being no man of deep designs, pondering on no combinations of long standing, persuing no great object, he embarks in difficulties with a view to disentangle himself in a showy manner. He wants complications to feed his activity, and when he finds them not ready, he will create them. He exults in show-conflicts, show-battles, show-enemies, diplomatical notes to be exchanged, ships to be ordered to sail, the whole movement ending for him in violent parliamentary debates, which are sure to prepare him an ephemeral success, the constant and the only object of all his exertions. He manages internal^c conflicts like an artist, driving matters to a certain point, retreating when they threaten to become serious, but having got, at all events, the dramatic excitement he wants. In his eyes, the movement of history itself is nothing but a pastime, expressly

^a Presence of mind.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has “variety of talent” instead of “versatility”.—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* has “international”.—*Ed.*

invented for the private satisfaction of the noble Viscount Palmerston of Palmerston.^a

Yielding to foreign influence in facts, he opposes it in words. Having inherited from Canning England's mission to propagate Constitutionalism on the Continent, he is never in need of a theme to pique the national prejudices, and to counteract revolution abroad, and, at the same time, to hold awake the suspicious jealousy of foreign powers. Having succeeded in this easy manner to become the *bête noire* of the continental courts, he could not fail in being set up as the truly English minister at home. Although a Tory by origin, he has contrived to introduce into the management of foreign affairs all the shams and contradictions that form the essence of Whiggism. He knows how to conciliate a democratic phraseology with oligarchic views,^b how to cover the peacemongering policy of the middle classes with the haughty language of England's aristocratic past—how to appear as the aggressor where he connives, and as the defender where he betrays—how to manage an apparent enemy, and how to exasperate a pretendant ally—how to find himself, at the opportune moment of the dispute, on the side of the stronger against the weak, and how to utter brave words in the act of running away.

Accused by the one party of being in the pay of Russia, he is suspected by the other of Carbonarism.²⁵⁷ If, in 1848, he had to defend himself against the motion of impeachment for having acted as the minister of Nicholas, he had, in 1850, the satisfaction of being persecuted by a conspiracy of foreign ambassadors, which was successful in the House of Lords, but baffled in the House of Commons.²⁵⁸ If he betrayed foreign peoples, he did it with great politeness—politeness being the small coin of the devil, which he gives in change for the life-blood of his dupes. If the oppressors were always sure of his active support, the oppressed did never want a great ostentation of his rhetorical generosity. Poles, Italians, Hungarians, Germans, found him in office, whenever they were crushed, but their despots always suspected him of secret conspiracy

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* the phrase "the private satisfaction of" is omitted and this sentence is followed by the text: "He is a great sample of that species designated by Thomas Carlyle as the sham captains of the world."—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune*: "He knows how to conciliate a large phraseology with narrow views."—*Ed.*

with the victims they had allowed him to make. Till now, in all instances, it was a probable chance of success to have him for one's adversary, and a sure chance of ruin to have him for one's friend. But, if this art of diplomacy does not shine in the actual results of his foreign negotiations, it shines the more brilliantly in the construction he induced the English people to lay upon them, by accepting phrases for facts, phantasies for realities, and high-sounding pretexts for shabby motives.

Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, deriving his title from a peerage of Ireland, was nominated Lord of the Admiralty in 1807, on the formation of the Duke of Portland's Administration. In 1809, he became Secretary of War, and he continued to hold this office till May, 1828. In 1830 he went over, very skilfully too, to the Whigs, who made him their permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Excepting the intervals of Tory administration, from November 1834 to April 1835, and from 1841 to 1846, he is responsible for the whole foreign policy England has pursued from the revolution of 1830 to December 1851.

Is it not a very curious thing to find, at first view, that Quixote of "free institutions," and that Pindarus of the "glories of the constitutional system," a permanent and an eminent member of the Tory administrations of Mr. Perceval, the Earl of Liverpool, Mr. Canning, Lord Goderich, and the Duke of Wellington, during the long epoch of the Anti-Jacobin war carried on, the monster-debt contracted, the Corn Laws promulgated,²⁵⁹ foreign mercenaries stationed on the English soil,²⁶⁰ the people—to borrow an expression from his colleague, Lord Sidmouth,^a—"bled," from time to time, the press gagged, meetings suppressed, the mass of the nation disarmed, individual liberty suspended together with regular jurisdiction, the whole country placed as it were in a state of siege—in one word, during the most infamous and most reactionary epoch of English history?

His *debut* in parliamentary life is a characteristic one. On February 3, 1808, he rose to defend—what?—secrecy in the working of diplomacy, and the most disgraceful act ever committed by one nation against another nation, viz., the bombardment of Copenhagen, and the capture of the Danish fleet, at the time when England professed to be in profound peace with Denmark.²⁶¹ As to the former point, he stated that,

^a The phrase "to borrow an expression from his colleague, Lord Sidmouth" is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune.—Ed.*

"In this particular case, his Majesty's Ministers are pledged" (by whom?) "to secrecy;" but he went farther^a: "I also object generally to making public the working of diplomacy, because it is the tendency of disclosures in that department to shut up future sources of information."

Vidocq would have defended the identical cause in the identical terms. As to the act of piracy, while admitting that Denmark had evidenced no hostility whatever towards Great Britain, he contended that they were right in bombarding its capital and stealing its fleet, because they had to prevent Danish neutrality from being, perhaps, converted into open hostility by the compulsion of France. This was the new law of nations, proclaimed by my lord Palmerston.

When again speechifying, we find that English minister *par excellence*, engaged in the defence of foreign troops, called over from the Continent to England, with the express mission of maintaining forcibly the oligarchic rule, to establish which William had, in 1688, come over from Holland with his Dutch troops. Palmerston answered to the well-founded "apprehensions for the liberties of the country," originating from the presence of the King's German Legion, in a very flippant manner. Why should we not have 16,000 of those foreigners at home; while you know, that we employ "a far larger proportion of foreigners abroad." (House of Commons, March 10, 1812.)

When similar apprehensions for the constitution^b arose from the large standing army, maintained since 1815, he found "a sufficient protection of the constitution in the very constitution of our army," a large proportion of its officers being "men of property and connexions." (House of Commons, March 8, 1816.)

When the large standing army was attacked from a financial point of view, he made the curious discovery that "much of our financial embarrassments had been caused by our former low peace establishment." (House of Commons, April 25, 1816.)

When the "burdens of the country," and the "misery of the people" were contrasted with the lavish military expenditure, he reminded Parliament that those burdens and that misery "were the price which we" (*viz.*, the English oligarchy) "agreed to pay

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* the end of the quotation and the following sentence are given as follows: "...his Majesty's Ministers 'are pledged to security,' but he improved on this statement"—*Ed.*

^b The phrase "for the constitution" is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^c In the *New-York Daily Tribune* in this article on Palmerston and in the following articles, there are, as a rule, no references to the House sittings.—*Ed.*

for our freedom and independence.” (House of Commons, May 16, 1820.)

In his eyes, military despotism was not to be apprehended from the exertions of

“those self-called, but misled Reformers, who demand that sort of reform in the country which, according to every first principle of government, must end, if it were acceded to, in a military despotism.” (House of Commons, June 14, 1820.)

While large standing armies were thus his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the country, flogging^a was his panacea for maintaining the constitution of the army. He defended it in the debates on the Mutiny Bill,²⁶² on the 5th of March, 1824, he declared it to be “absolutely indispensable” on March 11, 1825, he recommended it again on March 10, 1828; he stood by it in the debates of April, 1833, and he proved an amateur of flogging on every subsequent occasion.

There existed no abuse in the army, he did not find plausible reasons for, if it happened to foster the interests of aristocratic parasites. Thus, for instance, in the debates on the Sale of Commission. (House of Commons, March 12, 1828.)

Lord Palmerston likes to parade his constant exertions for the establishment of religious liberty. Now, he voted against Lord Russell’s motion for the Repeal of Test and Corporation Acts.²⁶³ Why? Because he was “a warm and zealous friend to religious liberty,” and could, therefore, not allow the Dissenters²⁶⁴ to be relieved from “imaginary grievances, while real afflictions pressed upon the Catholics.” (House of Commons, Feb. 26, 1828.)

In proof of his zeal for religious liberty he informs us of his “regret to see the increasing numbers of the Dissenters. It is my wish that the Established Church should be the predominant Church in this country,” and it is his wish “that the Established Church should be fed at the expense of the misbelievers.” His jocose lordship accuses the rich Dissenters of affording churches for the poor ones,^b while

“with the Church of England it is the poor alone who feel the want of Church accommodation.... It would be preposterous to say, that the poor ought to subscribe for churches out of their small earnings.” (House of Commons, April 9, 1824.)

It would be, of course, more preposterous yet to say, that the rich members of the Established Church ought to subscribe for the church out of their large earnings.

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune*: “corporal punishment and flogging”.—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune*: “of satisfying the ecclesiastical wants of the poorer ones”.—*Ed.*

Let us now look at his exertions for Catholic Emancipation,²⁶⁵ one of his great "claims" on the gratitude of the Irish people. I shall not dwell upon the circumstances, that, having declared himself for Catholic Emancipation, when a member of the Canning Ministry, he entered, nevertheless, the Wellington Ministry, avowedly hostile to that emancipation. Perhaps Lord Palmerston considered religious liberty as one of the Rights of Man, not to be intermeddled with by Legislature. He may answer for himself,

"Although I wish the Catholic claims to be considered, I never will admit those claims to stand upon the ground of right.... If I thought the Catholics were asking for their right, I, for one, would not go into the committee." (House of Commons, March 1, 1813.)

And why is he opposed to their asking their right?

"Because the Legislature of a country has the right to impose such political disabilities upon any class of the community, as it may deem necessary for the safety and the welfare of the whole.... This belongs to the fundamental principles on which civilised government is founded." (House of Commons, March 1, 1813.)

There you have the most cynic confession ever made, that the mass of the people have no rights at all, but that they may be allowed that amount of immunities, the Legislature—or, in other words, the ruling class—may deem fit to grant them. Accordingly, Lord Palmerston declared in plain words, "Catholic Emancipation to be a measure of grace and favour." (House of Commons, Feb. 10, 1829.)

It was then entirely upon the ground of expediency that he condescended to discontinue the Catholic disabilities. And what was lurking behind this expediency?

Being himself one of the great Irish proprietors, he wanted to entertain the delusion, that other remedies for Irish evils than Catholic Emancipation are impossible, that it would cure absenteeism,²⁶⁶ and prove a substitute for Poor Laws.—(House of Commons, March 18, 1829.)

The great philanthropist, who afterwards cleared his Irish estates of their Irish natives, could not allow Irish misery to darken, even for a moment, with its inauspicious clouds, the bright sky of the landlords and moneylords.^a

"It is true," he said, "that the peasantry of Ireland do not enjoy all the comforts which are enjoyed by all the peasantry of England" (only think of all the

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune*: "the bright sky over the Parliament of landlords and moneylords."—Ed.

comforts enjoyed by a family at the rate of 7s. a week). Still, he continues, "still however, the Irish peasant has his comforts.... He is well supplied with fuel, and is seldom" (only four days out of six), "at a loss for food."

What a comfort!^a But this is not all the comfort he has—"he has a greater cheerfulness of mind than his English fellow sufferer!"—(House of Commons, May 7, 1829.)

As to the extortions of Irish landlords, he deals with them in as pleasant a way as with the comforts of the Irish peasantry.

It is said that the Irish landlord insists on the highest possible rent that can be extorted. Why Sir, I believe that is not a singular circumstance; certainly in England the landlord does the same thing.—(House of Commons, May 7, 1829.)

Are we then to be surprised that the man, so deeply interested in the mysteries of the "glories of the English constitution," and the "comforts of her free institutions," should aspire at spreading them all over the Continent?

SECOND ARTICLE

[*The People's Paper*, No. 78, October 29, 1853]

When the Reform Movement²⁶⁷ had grown irresistible, Lord Palmerston deserted the Tories, and slipped into the Whiggery camp. Although he had apprehended the danger of military despotism springing up, not from the presence of the King's German legion on the English soil, nor from keeping large standing armies, but only from the "self-called Reformers," he patronised, nevertheless,^b already in 1828, the extension of the franchise to such large industrial places as Birmingham, Leeds, and Manchester. But why?

"Not because I am a friend to Reform in principle, but because I am its decided enemy."

He had persuaded himself that some timely concessions made to the overgrown manufacturing interest^c might be the surest means

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence is omitted.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* of October 19, 1853 has the beginning of this passage as follows: "It is known that, when the Reform-movement had grown irresistible, Lord Palmerston deserted the camp of the Tories, and skilfully effected his junction with the Whigs. We have seen that he once apprehended danger of military despotism from the demands of the self-called Reformers. Nevertheless...."—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* gives "factory-kings" instead of "manufacturing interest".—*Ed.*

of escaping "the introduction of general reform." (House of Commons, June 27th, 1828.) Once allied with the Whigs, he did not even pretend that the Reform Bill aimed at breaking through the narrow trammels of the Venetian Constitution; but, on the contrary, at the increase of its strength and solidity, by disjoining the middle classes from the people's opposition.

"The feelings of the middle classes will be changed, and their dissatisfaction will be converted into that attachment to the constitution, which will give to it a vast increase of strength and solidity."

He consoled the peers with the prospect of the Reform Bill not really endangering the "influence of the House of Lords," and their "interfering in elections." He told the aristocracy that the constitution was not to lose its feudal character; "the landed interest being the great foundation upon which rests the fabric of society, and the institutions of the country." He allayed their fears by throwing out the ironical hint that "we have been charged with not being in earnest or sincere in our desire to give to the people a real representation," that "it was said, we only proposed to give a different kind of influence to the aristocracy and the landed interest." He went even as far as to own that, besides the inevitable concession to be made to the middle classes, "disfranchisement," viz., the disfranchisement of the old Tory rotten boroughs for the benefit of new Whig boroughs, "was the chief and leading principle of the Reform Bill."^a (House of Commons, March 24th, 1831, and May 14, 1832.)

It is now time to return to the performances of the noble lord in the foreign branch of policy^b:

In 1823, when, consequent on the resolutions of the Congress of Verona,²⁶⁸ a French army was marched into Spain, in order to overturn the constitution of that country, and to deliver it up to the merciless revenge of the Bourbon idiot^c and his suite of bigot monks, Lord Palmerston disclaimed any "Quixotic crusades for abstract principles," any intervention in "favour of the people," whose heroic resistance had saved England from the sway of Napoleon. The words he addressed on that occasion to his Whig

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune*, instead of "viz., the disfranchisement of the old Tory rotten boroughs for the benefit of new Whig boroughs", has: "that is to say, a new kind of distribution of rotten boroughs between the Tory Aristocrats and the Whig Aristocrats was the chief and leading principle of the Reform Bill".—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence ends as follows: "during the Tory period of his life".—*Ed.*

^c Ferdinand VII.—*Ed.*

adversaries are a lively and true picture of his own foreign policy, after he had turned himself into the permanent Minister of Foreign Affairs for those who then were his opponents. He said,

“Some would have had us use threats in negotiation, without being prepared to go to war, if negotiation failed.[...] To have talked of war, and to have meant neutrality; to have threatened an army, and to have retreated behind a state paper; to have brandished the sword of defiance in the hour of deliberation, and to have ended in a penful of protests on the day of battle, would have been the conduct of a cowardly bully, and would have made us the object of contempt, and the laughing-stock of Europe.”—(House of Commons, April 30, 1823.)

At last, we arrive at the Greco-Turkish debates, affording to Lord Palmerston the first opportunity for displaying his unrivalled talents, as the unflinching and persevering advocate of Russian interests, in the Cabinet and in the House of Commons. One by one, he re-echoed all the watch-words given out by Russia of Turkish cruelty, Greek civilisation, religious liberty, Christianity, and so forth. At first, we meet him repudiating, in his ministerial capacity,^a any intention of passing “a censure” upon the meritorious conduct “of Admiral Codrington,” which had caused the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino,²⁶⁹ although he admits that “this battle took place against a power with which we are not at war,” and that it was “an untoward event.”—(House of Commons, January 31, 1828.)

Then, having retired from office, he opens the long series of his attacks upon Aberdeen, by reproaching him with having been too slow in executing the orders of Russia.^b

“Has there been much more energy and promptitude in fulfilling our engagements to Greece? [...] July, 1829, is coming fast upon us, and the treaty of July, 1827,²⁷⁰ is still unexecuted.... The Morea, indeed, has been cleared of the Turks.... But why were the arms of France checked at the Isthmus of Corinth?... The narrow policy of England stepped in, and arrested her progress.... But why do not the allies deal with the country north of the Isthmus, as they have done with that of the south, and occupy at once all that which must be assigned to Greece? I should have thought that the allies had had enough of negotiating with Turkey about Greece.”—(House of Commons, June 1, 1829.)

Prince Metternich was, as is generally known, at that time opposing the encroachments of Russia, and accordingly her diplomatic agents—I remind you of the despatches of Pozzo di Borgo and Prince Lieven—had been advised to represent Austria as the great enemy of Grecian emancipation and of European civilisation, the

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “as the Minister of War”.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “the Czar’s orders”.—*Ed.*

furtherance of which was the exclusive object of Russian diplomacy.^a The noble lord follows, of course, in the beaten track.

“By the narrowness of her views, the unfortunate prejudices of her policy, Austria almost reduced herself to the level of a second-rate power;” and consequent on the temporising policy of Aberdeen, England is represented as “the key-stone of that arch of which Miguel, Spain, Austria, and Mahmud are the component parts.... People see in the delay in executing the treaty of July not so much fear of Turkish resistance as inevitable^b repugnance to Grecian freedom.”—(House of Commons, June 1, 1829.)

Again he assails Aberdeen because of his anti-Russian diplomacy^c:

“I, for one, shall not be satisfied with a number of despatches from the government of England, which will no doubt read well and smooth enough, urging, in general terms, the propriety of conciliating Russia, but accompanied, perhaps, by strong expressions of the regard which England bore to Turkey, which, when read by an interested party, might easily appear to mean more than was really intended.... I should like to see that, whilst England adopted a firm resolution—almost the only course she could adopt—upon no consideration and in no event to take part with Turkey in that war—that that decision was fairly and frankly communicated to Turkey.... There are three most merciless things—time, fire, and the Sultan.”—(House of Commons, Feb. 16, 1830.)

Arrived at this point, I must recall to memory some few historical facts, in order to leave no doubt about the meaning of the noble Lord's philo-Hellenic feelings.^d

Russia, having seized upon Gokcha, a strip of land bordering on the Lake of Sevan, which was an undisputed possession of Persia, demanded as the price of its evacuation the abandonment of Persia's claims to another portion of her own territory, the lands of Kapan. Persia not yielding, she was overrun, vanquished, and forced to subscribe to the treaty of Turkmanchai,²⁷¹ in February, 1828. According to this treaty Persia had to pay an indemnity of

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence ends as follows: “to denounce Austria, as the stupid ally of the Sultan”.—*Ed.*

^b “Invincible” according to G. H. Francis' *Opinions and Policy of the Right Honourable Viscount Palmerston*, London, 1852.—*Ed.*

^c Instead of “Again he assails Aberdeen because of his anti-Russian diplomacy”, the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “For half a century one phrase has stood as a barrier between Russia and Constantinople—the phrase of the integrity of the Turkish Empire being necessary to the balance of power. ‘I object,’ exclaims Palmerston on Feb. 5, 1830, ‘to the policy of making the integrity of the Turkish dominion in Europe an object essentially necessary to the interests of Christian and civilized Europe.’ Again he returns to attack Aberdeen.”—*Ed.*

^d The end of the sentence beginning with “in order to leave no doubt” is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

two millions sterling to Russia, to cede the provinces of Erivan and Nakhichevan, including the fortresses of Erivan and Abbasabad, the exclusive purpose of this arrangement being, as Nicholas stated, to define the common frontier by the Araxes, the only means, he said, of preventing any future dispute of the two empires, although he refused simultaneously to give back Talish and Moghau, which are situated on the Persian bank of the Araxes. Finally, Persia pledged herself to maintaining no navy on the Caspian Sea. Such were the origin and the results of the Russo-Persian war.

As to the religion and the liberty of Greece, Russia cared at that epoch as much about them as the god of the Russians cares now about the key of the "Holy Sepulchre" and the famous "Cupola."²⁷² It was the traditionary policy of Russia, to excite the Greeks to revolt, and, then, to abandon them to the revenge of the Sultan. So deep was her sympathy for the regeneration of Hellas, that she treated them as rebels at the congress of Verona, acknowledging the right of the Sultan to exclude all foreign intervention between himself and his Christian subjects. Yea, the Czar^a offered "to aid the Porte in suppressing the rebellion;" a proposition which was, of course, rejected. Having failed in that attempt, he turned round upon the Great Powers with the opposite proposition, "To march an army into Turkey, for the purpose of dictating peace under the walls of the Seraglio." In order to hold his hands bound by a sort of common action, the other Great Powers concluded a treaty with him at London, July 6, 1827, by which they mutually engaged in enforcing, if need be, by arms, the adjustment of the differences between the Sultan and the Greeks. A few months before she had signed that treaty, Russia concluded another treaty with Turkey, the treaty of Akerman,²⁷³ by which she bound herself to renounce all interference with Grecian affairs. This treaty was brought about, after Russia had induced the crown prince of Persia to invade the Ottoman dominions, and after she had inflicted the greatest injuries on the Porte, in order to drive her to a rupture. After all this had passed, the resolutions of the London treaty of July 6, 1827, were presented to the Porte by the English Ambassador,^b or in the name of Russia and the other Powers. By virtue of the complications resulting from these frauds and lies, Russia found at last the pretext for beginning the war of 1828 and 1829. That war

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

^b Stratford de Redcliffe.—*Ed.*

terminated with the treaty of Adrianople,²⁷⁴ whose contents are resumed in the following quotations from McNeill's celebrated pamphlet on the *Progress of Russia in the East*:

"By the treaty of Adrianople the Czar acquired Anapa and Poti with a considerable extent of coast on the Black Sea, a portion of the Pashalik of Akhalzikh, with the fortresses of Akhalkalaki and Akhalzikh, the islands formed by the mouths of the Danube, the stipulated destruction of the Turkish fortress of Giurgevo, and the abandonment by Turkey of the right bank of the Danube to the distance of several miles from the river.... Partly by force, and partly by the influence of the priesthood, many thousand families of the Armenians were removed from the Turkish provinces in Asia to the Czar's territories.... He established for his own subjects in Turkey an exception from all responsibility to the national authorities, and burdened the Porte with an immense debt, under the name of expenses for the war and for commercial losses—and, finally, retained Moldavia, Wallachia, and Silistra, in pledge for the payment.... Having by this treaty imposed upon Turkey the acceptance of the protocol of March 22, which secured the suzerainty of Greece, and a yearly tribute from that country, Russia used all her influence to procure the independence of Greece, which was erected into an independent state, of which Count Capo d'Istria, who had been a Russian Minister, was named President." (Pp. 105-07.)

Such are the facts. Now look at the picture drawn of them by Lord Palmerston's hand^a:

"It is perfectly true that the war between Russia and Turkey arose out of aggressions made by Turkey on the commerce and rights of Russia, and violations of treaties."—(House of Commons, Feb. 16, 1830.)

When the Whig-incarnation of the office of Foreign Affairs, he improved on this statement:

"The honourable and gallant member" (Col. Evans) "has represented the conduct of Russia as one of unvarying aggression upon other States from 1815 to the present time. He adverted more particularly to the wars of Russia with Persia and Turkey. Russia was the aggressor in neither of them, and although the result of the Persian war was an aggrandisement of her power, it was not the result of her own seeking.... Again, in the Turkish war, Russia was not the aggressor. It would be fatiguing to the house to detail all the provocations Turkey offered to Russia; but I believe there cannot be a doubt that she expelled Russian subjects from her territory, detained Russian ships, and violated all the provisions of the treaty of Akerman, and then, upon complaint being made, denied redress—so that, if there ever was a just ground for going to war, Russia had it for going to war with Turkey. She did not, however, on any occasion, acquire any increase of territory, at least in Europe. I know there was a continued occupation of certain points" [Moldavia and Wallachia are only points, and the mouths of the Danube are mere zeros] "and some additional acquisitions on the Euxine in Asia; but she

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* erroneously adds: "in a speech in the House of Commons on Aug. 7, 1832".—*Ed.*

had an agreement with the other European powers that success in that war should not lead to any aggrandisement in Europe.”—(House of Commons, Aug. 7, 1832.)

Your readers will now understand Sir Robert Peel’s telling the noble lord, in a public session of the house,^a that “he did not know whose representative he was.”²⁷⁵

THIRD ARTICLE^b

[*The People’s Paper*, No. 79, November 5, 1853]

The noble viscount is generally known as the chivalrous protector of the Poles, and never fails to give vent to his painful feelings with regard to Poland before the deputations that wait upon him once every year by “dear, dully, deadly” Dudley Stuart,^c

“a worthy who makes speeches, passes resolutions, votes addresses, goes up with deputations, has at all times the necessary quantity of confidence in the necessary individual, and can, also, if necessary, give three cheers for the Queen.”

The Poles had been in arms for about a month when the noble lord came into office, in November, 1830. As early as August 8th, 1831, Mr. Hunt presents to the House of Commons a petition from the Westminster Union, in favour of the Poles, and “for the dismissal of Lord Palmerston from his Majesty’s councils.” Mr. Hume stated on the same day he concluded from the silence of the noble lord that the government “intended to do nothing for the Poles, but allow them to remain at the mercy of Russia.” Lord Palmerston replied that, “whatever obligations existing treaties

^a On February 16, 1830.—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune* of November 4, 1853, and also in the pamphlet *Palmerston and Russia*, published on the basis of the newspaper text in London in 1853, the article begins as follows: “At a recent meeting in London, to protest against the action of the British Ministry, in the present controversy between Russia and Turkey, a gentleman who presumed to find special fault with Lord *Palmerston*, was saluted and silenced by a storm of indignant hisses. The meeting evidently thought that if Russia had a friend in the Ministry it was not the noble Viscount, and would no doubt have rent the air with cheers, had some one been able to announce that his Lordship had become Prime Minister. This astonishing confidence in a man so false and hollow, is another proof of the ease with which people may be imposed on by brilliant abilities, and a new evidence of the necessity of taking off the mask from this wily enemy to the progress of human freedom. Accordingly, with the history of the last twenty-five years, and the debates of Parliament for guides, we proceed with the task of exposing the real part which this accomplished actor has performed in the drama of modern Europe.”—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* adds: “who has been described by one, not too friendly or too just to his Lordship, as ‘a worthy...’”—*Ed.*

imposed, would at all times receive the attention of the government." Now, what sort of obligation was there imposed in his opinion upon England by existing treaties?

"The claims of Russia," he tells us himself, "to the possession of Poland bear the date of the treaty of Vienna."—(House of Commons, July 9, 1833.)

And that treaty makes this possession dependent upon the observance of the Polish constitution by the Czar, but

"the mere fact of this country being a party to the treaty of Vienna, was not synonymous with our guaranteeing that there would be no infraction of that treaty by Russia."—(House of Commons, March 25, 1834.)

If you guarantee a treaty, you do by no means guarantee the observance of the treaty. Thus answered the Milanese to the Emperor Barbarossa: "You have had our oath, but remember we did not swear to keep it."²⁷⁶

For one thing, however, the treaty of Vienna is good. It gives to the British government, as one of the contracting parties,

"a right to entertain and express an opinion on any act which [...] tends to a violation of that treaty.... The contracting parties to the treaties of Vienna had a right to require that the constitution of Poland should not be touched, and this was an opinion which I have not concealed from the Russian government. I communicated it *by anticipation* to that government previous to the taking of Warsaw, and before the result of hostilities was known. I communicated it again when Warsaw fell. [...] The Russian government, however, took a different view of the question."—(House of Commons, July 9, 1833.)

He is quietly anticipating the downfall of Poland, and watches this opportunity for expressing and entertaining an opinion on certain articles of the treaty of Vienna, persuaded as he is that the magnanimous Czar waits only for having crushed the Polish people by armed force, in order to honour a constitution trampled upon when they were yet possessed of unbounded means of resistance. Simultaneously the noble lord charges the Poles with having "taken the uncalled for, and, in his opinion, *unjustifiable* steps of the [...] dethronement of the Emperor."—(House of Commons, July 9, 1833).

"He could also say that the Poles were the aggressors, for they commenced the contest."—(House of Commons, August 7, 1832.)

When the apprehensions for the extinction of Poland became troublesome, he declared that

"to exterminate Poland, either *morally or politically*, is so perfectly impracticable that I think there need be no apprehension of its being attempted."—(House of Commons, June 28, 1832.)

When reminded afterwards of the wayward expectations thus held out, he assures that he had been misunderstood, that he had said so not in the political but in the Pickwickian sense of the word, meaning that the Emperor of Russia was unable

“to exterminate *nominally or physically* so many millions of men as the Polish kingdom in its divided state contained.”—(House of Commons, April 20, 1836.)

When the house makes a pretence of interfering during the struggle of the Poles,^a he appeals to his ministerial responsibility. When the thing is done, he coolly tells them that

“no vote of this house would have the slightest effect in reversing the decision of Russia.”—(House of Commons, July 9, 1833.)

When the atrocities committed by the Russians, after the fall of Warsaw, are denounced, he recommends to the house great tenderness towards the Emperor of Russia, declaring that

“no person could regret more than he did—the expressions which had been uttered” (House of Commons, June 28, 1832), that “the present Emperor of Russia was a man of high and generous feelings”—that “where cases of undue severity on the part of the Russian government to the Poles have occurred, we may set this down as a proof that the power of the Emperor of Russia is practically omitted, and we may take it for granted that the Emperor has, in those instances, yielded to the influence of others, rather than follow the dictates of his spontaneous feelings.”—(House of Commons, July 9, 1833.)

When the doom of Poland was sealed on the one hand, and on the other the dissolution of the Turkish Empire became imminent, from the rebellion of Mehemet Ali,^b he assured the house that “affairs in general were proceeding in a satisfactory train.”—(House of Commons, January 26, 1832.)

A resolution for granting subsidies to the Polish refugees having been moved, it is

“exceedingly painful to him to oppose the grant of any money to those individuals which the natural and spontaneous feelings of every generous man would lead him to acquiesce in; [...] but, [...] it is [...] not consistent with his duty [...] to propose any grant of money to those unfortunatè persons.”—(House of Commons, March 25, 1834.)

The same tender-hearted man had defrayed, as we shall see by and by, the cost of Poland’s fall, to a great extent, out of the pockets of the British people.

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence begins as follows: “When the house threatened to interfere during the struggle in favor of the Poles....”—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence begins as follows: “When on the one side the utter ruin of Poland was secured, and on the other the dissolution of the Turkish Empire became imminent from the progress of Ibrahim Pasha....”—*Ed.*

The noble lord has taken good care to withhold all state papers on the Polish catastrophe from the parliament. But statements made in the House of Commons, which he did never as much as attempt to controvert, leave no doubt as to the game he played at that fatal epoch.

After the Polish revolution had broken out, the Consul of Austria did not quit Warsaw, and the Austrian government went so far as to send a Polish agent, M. Walewski, to Paris, with the missions of negotiating with the governments of France and England about the re-establishment of a Polish kingdom. The Court of the Tuileries declared "it was ready to join England in case of her consenting to the project." Lord Palmerston rejected the offer. In 1831 M. de Talleyrand, the Ambassador of France, at the Court of St. James, proposed a plan of combined action on the part of France and England, but met with a distinct refusal, and with a note from the noble lord, stating that

"an amicable intermediation on the Polish question would be declined by Russia. The powers had just declined a similar offer on the part of France; the intervention of the two Courts of France and England could only be by force in case of a refusal on the part of Russia, and the amicable and satisfactory relations between the Cabinet of St. James and the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, would not allow his British Majesty^a to undertake such an interference. The time was *not yet* come to undertake such a play with success against the will of a sovereign, whose *rights were indisputable.*"

This was not all.^b On February 23, 1848, Mr. Anstey made the following declaration in the House of Commons:

"Sweden was arming her fleet for the purpose of making diversion in favour of Poland, and of regaining to herself the provinces in the Baltic, which have been so unjustly wrested from her in the last war. The noble lord instructed our ambassador at the Court of Stockholm, in a contrary sense, and Sweden discontinued her armaments. The Persian Court [...] had, with similar purpose, despatched an army three days on its march towards the Russian frontier, under the [...] command of the Persian Crown prince. [...] The Secretary of Legation at the Court of Teheran, Sir John McNeill followed the prince, at a distance of three days' march from his headquarters, overtook him, and there, under instructions from the noble lord, and in the name of England, threatened Persia with war if the prince advanced another step towards the Russian frontier. Similar inducements were used by the noble lord to prevent Turkey from renewing war on her side."

^a William IV.—*Ed.*

^b The text beginning with the words "This was not all", and ending with the quotation from Knight's speech in the House of Commons on July 13, 1840, is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

To Colonel Evans asking for the production of papers with regard to Prussia's violation of her pretended neutrality in the Russo-Polish war, the noble lord objected,

"that the ministers of this country could not have witnessed that contest without the deepest regret, and [...] it would be most satisfactory for them to see it terminated."—(House of Commons, August 16, 1831.)

Certainly he wished to see it terminated as soon as possible, and Prussia shared in his feelings.

On a subsequent occasion, Mr. H. Gally Knight thus resumed the whole proceedings of the noble lord with regard to the Polish insurrection—

"There is something *curiously inconsistent* in the proceedings of the noble lord when Russia is concerned.... On the subject of Poland, the noble lord has disappointed us again and again. Remember when the noble lord was pressed to exert himself in favour of Poland, then he admitted the justice of the cause—the justice of our complaints; but he said, 'Only restrain yourselves at present, there is an ambassador fast setting out of known liberal sentiments, you may be sure we will do all that is right; you will only embarrass his negotiation, if you incense the power with whom he has to deal. So, take my advice, be quiet at present, and be assured that a great deal will be effected.' We trusted to those assurances; the liberal ambassador went; whether he ever approached the subject or not, was never known, but all we got were the fine words of the noble lord, and no results."—(House of Commons, July 13, 1840.)

The so-called kingdom of Poland having disappeared from the map of Europe, there remained still, in the free town of Cracow, a fantastic remnant of Polish nationality. The Czar Alexander had, during the general anarchy resulting from the fall of the French empire, not conquered the Duchy of Warsaw, but simply seized it, and wished, of course, to keep it, together with Cracow, incorporated with the Duchy by Bonaparte. Austria, once possessed of Cracow, wished to have it back. The Czar being unable to obtain it himself and unwilling to concede it to Austria, proposed to constitute it as a free town. Accordingly the treaty of Vienna stipulated in article VI,^a

"that the town of Cracow with the territory is to be for ever a free, independent, and strictly neutral city, under the protection of Austria, Russia, and Prussia," and in its article IX "that the Courts of Russia, Austria, and Prussia engage to respect, and to cause to be always respected, the neutrality of the free town of Cracow and its territory. *No armed force shall be introduced upon any pretence whatever.*"

Immediately after the close of the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, the Russian troops suddenly entered Cracow, the

^a Here and below the *New-York Daily Tribune* has no references to numbers of articles in the 1815 Treaty of Vienna.—*Ed.*

occupation of which lasted two months.^a This, however, was considered as a transitory necessity of war, and in the turmoil of that time was soon forgotten.

In 1836, Cracow was again occupied by the troops of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, on the pretext of forcing the authorities of Cracow to deliver up the individuals concerned in the Polish revolution five years before. The constitution of Cracow was abrogated, the three consular residencers assumed the highest authority—the police was entrusted to Austrian spies—the senate was overthrown—the tribunals were destroyed—the university of Cracow put down in consequence of the prohibitions to the neighbouring provinces—and the commerce of the free city with the surrounding countries destroyed.^b

On March 18th, 1836, when interpellated on the occupation of Cracow, the noble viscount declared that occupation to be of a merely transitory character. Of so palliative and apologetic a kind was the construction he put on the doings of his three northern allies, that he felt himself obliged suddenly to stop and to interrupt the even course of his speech by the solemn declaration.

“I stand not up here to defend the measure, which, on the contrary, I *must* censure and condemn. I have merely stated those circumstances which, though they do not excuse the forcible occupation of Cracow, might yet afford a justification, &c....”

He admits that the treaty of Vienna bound the three Powers to abstain from any step without the previous consent of England, but,

“they may be justly said to have paid an *involuntary* homage to the justice and plain dealing of this country, by supposing that we would never give our assent to such a proceeding.”

Mr. Patrick Stewart^c having, however, found out that there existed better means for the preservation of Cracow than the

^a Instead of this sentence the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “In 1831, Cracow was temporarily occupied by Russian troops.”—*Ed.*

^b Instead of this passage the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “In 1836, Cracow was again occupied by the troops of Russia, Austria and Prussia, on the pretext of their being obliged to accomplish, in that way, the expulsion of some Polish refugees from the town and its territory. On this occasion the noble Lord abstained from all remonstrance on the ground, as he stated, in 1836 and in 1840, ‘that it was difficult to give effect to our remonstrances.’—As soon, however, as Cracow was definitively confiscated by Austria, a simple remonstrance appeared to him to be ‘the only effectual means.’”—*Ed.*

^c Here and below the *New-York Daily Tribune* erroneously has: “Sir Stratford Canning”.—*Ed.*

“abstention from remonstrance,” moved on April 20, 1836, that the government should be ordered to send a representation to the free town of Cracow as consul, there being three consuls there from the three Northern Powers. The joint arrival of an English and French consul at Cracow would prove an event.^a The noble viscount seeing that the majority of the house was for the motion induced Mr. Stewart to withdraw it by solemnly pledging himself that the government “intended to send a consular agent to Cracow.” On March 22, 1837, being reminded by Lord Dudley Stuart of his promise, the noble lord answered that “he had altered his intention, and had not sent a consular agent to Cracow, and it was not at present his intention to do so.” Lord D. Stuart having given notice that he should move for papers elucidatory of this singular declaration, the noble viscount succeeded in defeating the motion by the simple process of being absent and of causing the house to be counted out.^b

In 1840, the “temporary” occupation continued, and the people of Cracow had addressed a memorandum to the governments of France and England, which says, amongst other things:

“The misfortunes which overwhelm the free city of Cracow and its inhabitants, are such that the undersigned see no further hope for themselves and their fellow citizens than in the powerful and enlightened protection of the governments of France and England. The situation in which they find themselves placed, gives them a right to invoke the intervention of every power that subscribed to the treaty of Vienna.”^c

Being interrogated on July 13th, 1840, about this petition from Cracow, the noble viscount declared

“that between Austria and the British government the question of the evacuation of Cracow remained only a question of time.”

As to the violation of the treaty of Vienna

“there were no means of enforcing the opinions of England, supposing that this country was disposed to do so by arms, [...] because Cracow was evidently a place where no English action could possibly take place.”

^a After these words the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “and must, in any case, have prevented the noble lord from afterward declaring himself unaware of the intrigues pursued at Cracow by the Austrians, Russians and Prussians”.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has after this: “He never stated why or wherefore he had not fulfilled his pledge, and withstood all attempts to squeeze out of him any papers on the subject.” The following text beginning with: “In 1840, the ‘temporary’ occupation continued” and ending with the quotation from Palmerston’s statement on August 17, 1846, is omitted in the *Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from Canning’s speech in the House of Commons on July 13, 1840.—*Ed.*

Be it remarked that two days after this declaration the noble lord concluded a treaty with Russia, Austria, and Prussia for closing the Black Sea²⁷⁷ to the English navy, probably in order that no English action could take place in those quarters. It was at the very same time that the noble lord renewed a Holy Alliance with those Powers against France. As to the commercial loss sustained by England, consequent upon the occupation of Cracow, the noble lord demonstrated that "the amount of general exports to *Germany* had not fallen off," which, as Sir Robert Peel justly remarked, had nothing to do with Cracow. As to his intentions on the subject and to the consular agent to be sent to Cracow,

"he thought that his experience of the manner in which his unfortunate assertion" (made by the noble lord in 1836, in order to escape from the censure of a hostile house) "of an intention to appoint a British Consul at Cracow, had been taken up by honourable gentlemen opposite, justified him in positively refusing to give any answer to such a question, which might expose him to similar [...] unjustifiable attacks."

On August 17, 1846, he stated that

"whether the treaty of Vienna is, or is not executed and fulfilled by the Great Powers of Europe, depends not upon the presence of a consular agent at Cracow."

On January 28, 1847, when again asked^a for the production of papers relative to the *non-appointment* of a British Consul at Cracow, he declared that

"the subject had *no necessary* connexion with the discussion on the incorporation of Cracow, and he saw no advantage in reviving an angry discussion on a subject which had *only a passing interest*."

He proved true to his opinion in the production of state papers, pronounced on March 17, 1837:

"If the papers bear upon questions now under consideration, their production would be dangerous; if they refer to questions that are gone by, they can obviously be of no use."

The British government was very exactly informed of the importance of Cracow, not only from a political but also from a commercial point of view, their own Consul at Warsaw, Colonel Duplat having reported to them that^b

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this sentence begins as follows: "Ten years afterward, when Cracow was doomed, and when the noble Lord was again asked ..."—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: "The Consul at Warsaw, Col. Duplat, having reported in detail thereupon...." The following quotation from this report is omitted.—*Ed.*

“Cracow, since its elevation into an independent state, has always been the depot of very considerable quantities of English merchandise sent thither by the Black Sea, Moldavia, and Galicia, and even *via* Trieste; and which afterwards find their way to the surrounding countries. In the course of years it came into railway communication with the great lines of Bohemia, Prussia, and Austria.... It is also the central point of the important line of railway communication between the Adriatic and the Baltic. It will come in direct communication of the same description with Warsaw.... Looking, therefore, to the almost certainty of every great point of the Levant, and even of India and China, finding its way up the Adriatic, it cannot be denied that it must be of the greatest commercial importance, even to England, to have such a station as Cracow, in the centre of the great net of railways connecting the Western and Eastern Continent.”^a

Lord Palmerston himself was obliged to confess to the house that the Cracow insurrection of 1846²⁷⁸ had been intentionally provoked by the Three Powers.

“I believe the original entrance of the Austrian troops into the territory of Cracow was in consequence of an application from the government. But, then, those Austrian troops retired. *Why* they retired has never yet been explained. With them retired the government and the authorities of Cracow; the *immediate*, at least, the early, consequence of that retirement, was the establishment of a provisional government at Cracow. (House of Commons, Aug. 17, 1846.)

On the 22nd of February, 1846, the army of Austria, and afterwards of Russia and Prussia, took possession of Cracow. On the 26th of the same month the Prefect of Tarnów issued his proclamation calling upon the peasants to murder their proprietors, and promising them “a sufficient recompense, in money,”^b which proclamation was followed by the Galician atrocities, and the massacre of about 2,000 proprietors. On March the 12th appeared the Austrian proclamation to the “faithful Galicians having aroused themselves for the maintenance of order and law, and destroyed the enemies of order.” In the official *Gazette*^c of April 28th, Prince Frederick of Schwarzenberg stated that “the acts that had taken place had been *authorised* by the Austrian government,” which, of course, acted on a common plan with Russia and with Prussia, the footman of the Czar.^d Now, after all

^a Marx gives this passage from Duplat’s report to Aberdeen of March 10, 1846 as quoted in the speech of Stuart Wortley in the House of Commons on March 16, 1847.—*Ed.*

^b This and the following documents are cited according to Milnes’ speech in the House of Commons on August 17, 1846.—*Ed.*

^c *Oesterreichisch Kaiserliche Wiener Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^d The phrase “the footman of the Czar” is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

these abominations had passed, Lord Palmerston thought fit to declare in the house,

“I have too high an opinion of the sense of justice and of right that must animate the governments of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, to believe that they can feel any disposition or intention to deal with Cracow otherwise than Cracow is entitled by treaty-engagements to be dealt with.” (House of Commons, Aug. 17th, 1846.)

For the noble lord the only business in hand was to get rid of parliament, the session drawing to a close. He assured the Commons that “on the part of the British government everything shall be done to ensure a due respect being paid to the provisions of the treaty of Vienna.” Mr. Hume, giving vent to his doubts about Lord Palmerston’s “*intention* to cause the Austro-Russian troops to retire from Cracow,” the noble lord begged of the house not to give credence to the statements made by Mr. Hume, as he was in possession of better information, and was convinced that the occupation of Cracow was only a “*temporary*” one. The parliament of 1846 having been got rid of, in the same manner as that of 1853, out came the Austrian proclamation of November 11th, 1846, incorporating Cracow into the Austrian dominions. When parliament re-assembled on January 19th, 1847, it was informed by the Queen’s^a Speech that Cracow was gone, but that there remained in its place a protest on the part of the brave Palmerston. To deprive this protest of even the appearance of a meaning, the noble lord contrived at that very epoch to engage, on the occasion of the Spanish marriages,²⁷⁹ England in a quarrel with France, very near setting the two countries by the ears, as he was twitted in the teeth by Mr. Smith O’Brien. The French government having applied to him for his co-operation in a joint protest against the incorporation of Cracow, Lord Normanby, under instructions from the noble viscount, answered that the outrage of which Austria had been guilty in annexing Cracow was not greater than that of France in effecting a marriage between the Duke of Montpensier and the Spanish Infanta—the one act being a violation of the treaty of Vienna, and the other of the treaty of Utrecht.²⁸⁰ Now, the treaty of Utrecht, renewed in 1782, was definitively abrogated by the Anti-Jacobin war; and that, therefore, ever since 1792 ceased to exist. There was no man in the house better informed of this circumstance than the noble lord, as he had stated himself on the occasion of the blockades of Mexico and Buenos Ayres,²⁸¹ that

^a Queen Victoria.—*Ed.*

“the provisions of the treaty of Utrecht have long lapsed in the variations of war, with the exception of the single clause relating to the boundaries of Brazil and French Guiana, because that clause had been expressly incorporated in the treaty of Vienna.”^a

We have not yet done with the exertions of the noble lord for resisting the encroachments of Russia on Poland.^b

There existed a curious convention between England, Holland, and Russia—the so-called *Russian-Dutch loan*. During the Anti-Jacobin war the Czar Alexander had contracted a loan with Messrs. Hope and Co., at Amsterdam; and after the fall of Bonaparte, the King of the Netherlands “desired to make a suitable return to the Allied Powers for having delivered his territories,” and for having annexed to his own Belgium, upon which he had no claim whatever, and engaged himself—the other Powers waiving their common pretensions in favour of Russia, then in great need of money—to execute a convention with Russia for paying her by successive instalments the twenty-five millions of florins she owed to Messrs. Hope and Co. England, in order to cover the robbery she committed on Holland, of her colonies at the Cape of Good Hope, Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice, became a party to that convention, and bound herself to pay a certain proportion of the subsidies granted to Russia. This stipulation became part of the treaty of Vienna, but upon the *express condition* “that the payment should cease if the union between Holland and Belgium were broken prior to the liquidation of the debt.” When Belgium separated itself by revolution^d from Holland, she of course refused to pay her portion^c to Russia. On the other hand, there remained, Mr. Herries stated, “not the smallest iota of a claim on the part of Russia for the continuance of debt by England.” (House of Commons, Jan. 26, 1832.)

Lord Palmerston, however, found it quite natural that,

“at one time Russia is paid for supporting the union of Belgium with Holland, and that at another time she is paid for the separation of these countries.” (House of Commons, July 16th, 1832.)

^a Quoted from Palmerston’s speech on March 19, 1839.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has “upon Europe” instead of “on Poland”.—*Ed.*

^c William I.—*Ed.*

^d This refers to the revolution of 1830-31.—*Ed.*

^e After the words “to pay her portion” the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “on the ground that the loan had been contracted to continue her in the undivided possession of the Belgian provinces, and that she no longer had the sovereignty of that country”.—*Ed.*

He appealed in a very tragical manner to the faithful observance of treaties—and above all, of the treaty of Vienna; and he contrived to carry a new convention with Russia, dated 16th November, 1831, in the preamble of which it is expressly stated that it is contracted “in consideration of the general arrangements of the Congress of Vienna which remain in full force.”

When the convention relating to the Russo-Dutch loan, had been inserted in the treaty of Vienna, the Duke of Wellington exclaimed,

“This is a master-stroke of diplomacy on the part of Lord Castlereagh; for Russia has been tied down to the observance of the Vienna treaty by a pecuniary obligation.”

When Russia, therefore, withdrew her observance of the Vienna treaty by the Cracow confiscation, Mr. Hume moved to stop any further payment^a to Russia from the British Treasury. The noble viscount, however, thought that although Russia had a right to violate the treaty of Vienna with regard to Poland, England remained tied to the treaty with regard to Russia.

But this is not the most extraordinary incident of the noble lord's proceedings. After the Belgian revolution had broken out, and before parliament had sanctioned the new loan to Russia, the noble lord defrayed the costs of the Russian war against Poland, under the false pretext of paying off the old debt contracted by England in 1815, although we may state, on the authority of the greatest English lawyer, Sir E. Sugden, now Lord St. Leonards, that

“there was not a single debatable point in that question, [...] and [...] the government had no power whatever to pay a shilling of the money.” (House of Commons, January 26, 1832.)

And on the authority of Sir Robert Peel that “the noble lord was *not warrantable by law* in advancing the money.” (House of Commons, July 12, 1832.)

Now we understand why the noble lord is reiterating on every occasion that “nothing can be more painful to men of proper feeling than discussions upon the subject of Poland.”^b

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “any further annual payment”.—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune* this passage ends as follows: “They can also appreciate the degree of earnestness he is now likely to exhibit in resisting the encroachments of the power he has so uniformly served.”—*Ed.*

FOURTH ARTICLE^a

[*The People's Paper*, No. 80, November 12, 1853]

The great and eternal themes of the noble viscount's self-glorification are the services he has rendered to the cause of constitutional liberty all over the continent. The world owes him, indeed, the invention of the "constitutional" kingdoms of Portugal, Spain, and Greece,—three political phantoms, only to be compared with the *homunculus* of *Faust's* Wagner.^b Portugal, under the yoke of that huge hill of flesh, Donna Maria da Gloria, backed by a Coburg,^c

"must be looked upon as one of the *substantive* powers of Europe." (House of Commons, March 10, 1837.)

At the very time the noble viscount uttered these words, six British ships-of-the-line anchored at Lisbon, in order to defend the "substantive" daughter of Don Pedro from the Portuguese people, and to help her to destroy the constitution she had sworn to defend. Spain, at the disposition of another Maria,^d who, although a notorious sinner, has never found a Magdalene,

"holds out to us a fair, [...] a flourishing, and even a formidable power among the European kingdoms." (Speech of Lord Palmerston, H. of C., March 10, 1837.)^e

^a In the *New-York Daily Tribune* of November 21, 1853, the article begins as follows: "There are those who expect that in the war between Turkey and Russia, which has now begun, the British Government will at last abandon its system of half-way measures and fruitless negotiations to act with energy and effect in repelling the Muscovite invader back from his prey and from the universal dominion he dreams of. Such an expectation may not be without some ground of abstract probability and policy to justify it, but how little real reason there is for it will appear to whoever ponders the facts below set forth with regard to the past conduct of that English Minister who is thought to be most hostile to the advance of Russian despotism in Europe. Indeed, most people in England who are dissatisfied with the policy of the Government in the contest between Turkey and Russia, fondly believe that matters would be in a very different state if Lord Palmerston had the control of them. Such persons, in recalling the noble Viscount's history, must leave blank the whole eventful period from 1832 to 1847—a blank which we will fill up for their instruction."—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has: "the constitutional model-kingdoms"; the end of this sentence, beginning with the words "three political phantoms", is omitted.—*Ed.*

^c Ferdinand August.—*Ed.*

^d Maria Cristina.—*Ed.*

^e The *New-York Daily Tribune* has instead of this sentence: "Spain, crushed beneath the yoke of another Maria—the she-wolf of Naples, 'holds out to us,' according to his sanguine view of the case, 'a fair and legitimate hope that she may yet become what she has proved in former times—a flourishing and even a formidable power among the European Kingdoms'."—*Ed.*

Formidable, indeed, to the holders of Spanish bonds. The noble lord has even his reasons ready for having delivered the native country of the Pericles and the Sophocles to the nominal sway of an idiot Bavarian boy.

“King Otto belongs to a country where there exists a free Constitution.” (H. of C., August 8, 1832.)

A free constitution in Bavaria, the German Bastia!^a This passes the *licentia poetica*^b of rhetorical flourish, the “legitimate hopes” held out by Spain, and the “substantive” power of Portugal. As to Belgium, all Lord Palmerston did for it was burdening it with a part of the Dutch debt, reducing it by the Province of Luxemburg, and adding to it a Coburg dynasty. As to the *entente cordiale* with France, waning from the moment he pretended to give it the finish by the Quadruple Alliance²⁸² of 1834, we have already seen how far the noble lord understood to manage it in the instance of Poland, and we shall hear, by and by, what became of it in his hands.^c

One of those facts, hardly adverted to by contemporaries, but broadly marking the boundaries of historical epochs, was the military occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, in 1833.

The eternal dream of Russia was at last realised. The barbarian from the icy banks of the Neva held in his grasp luxurious Byzantium, and the sunlit shores of the Bosphorus. The self-styled heir to the Greek Emperors occupied, however temporarily, the Rome of the East.^d

“The occupation of Constantinople by Russian troops [...] sealed the fate of Turkey as an independent power. [...] The fact of Russia having occupied Constantinople even for the purpose” (?) “of saving it, was as decisive a blow to Turkish independence as if the flag of Russia now waved on the Seraglio.” (Speech of Sir Robert Peel, H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

In consequence of the unfortunate war of 1828-29,^e the Porte had lost her prestige in the eyes of her own subjects. As usual with Oriental empires, when the paramount power is weakened, successful revolts of Pashas broke out. As early as October, 1831,

^a A town in Corsica; the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: “the German Boeotia!”; both these towns symbolise provincial backwardness.—*Ed.*

^b Poetical liberty.—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* has instead of the last sentence: “But let us come to the Turks and Russians.”—*Ed.*

^d This sentence is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^e The *New-York Daily Tribune* has further: “and the treaty of Adrianople”.—*Ed.*

commenced the conflict between the Sultan^a [and] Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, who had supported the Porte during the Greek insurrection. In the spring of 1832, Ibrahim Pasha, his son, marched his army into Syria, conquered that province, by the Battle of Homs, crossed the Taurus, annihilated the last Turkish army at the battle of Konia, and moved on the way to Stambul. The Sultan was forced to apply to St. Petersburg, on February 2, 1833. On February 17, the French Admiral Roussin arrived at Constantinople, remonstrated with the Porte two days afterwards, and engaged for the retreat of the Pasha on certain terms, including the refusal of Russian assistance; but, unassisted as he was, he was, of course, unable to cope with Russia. "You have asked for me, and you shall have me."^b On February 20, a Russian squadron sailed from Sebastopol, and disembarked a large force of Russian troops on the shores of the Bosphorus, and laid siege to the capital. So eager was Russia for the protection of Turkey, that a Russian officer was simultaneously dispatched to the Pashas of Erzerum and Trebizond, to inform them that, in the event of Ibrahim's army marching towards Erzerum, both that place and Trebizond should be immediately protected by a Russian army. At the end of May, 1833, Count Orloff arrived from St. Petersburg, and intimated to the Sultan that he had brought with him a little bit of paper, which the Sultan was to subscribe to, without the concurrence of any minister, and without the diplomatic agent, at the Porte. In this manner the famous treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was brought about and concluded for eight years to come. By virtue of it the Porte entered into an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Russia, resigned the right of entering into any new treaties with other powers, except with the concurrence of Russia, and confirmed the former Russo-Turkish treaties, especially that of Adrianople.^c By a secret article, appended to the treaty, the Porte obliged herself,

"in favour of the Imperial Court of Russia, to close the Straits of the Dardanelles—viz., not to allow any foreign man-of-war to enter it under any pretext whatever."^d

Whom was the Czar indebted to for occupying Constantinople by his troops, and for transferring, by virtue of the treaty of

^a Mahmud II.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from Mozart's opera *Don Giovanni*.—*Ed.*

^c The phrase "especially that of Adrianople" is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^d Martens, *Recueil de traités*. T. II, p. 659.—*Ed.*

Unkiar-Skelessi, the supreme seat of the Ottoman empire from Constantinople to St. Petersburg? To nobody else but to the Right Honourable Henry John Viscount Palmerston, Baron Temple, a Peer of Ireland, a Member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight of the Great Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, a Member of Parliament, and His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi was concluded on July 8th, 1833. On July 11th, 1833, Mr. H. L. Bulwer, moved for the production of papers with respect to the Turko-Syrian affairs. The noble lord opposed the motion,

"because the *transactions* to which the papers called for referred, were *incomplete*, and the character of the whole transaction would depend upon its termination. [...] As the results were not yet known, [...] the motion was premature."—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

Accused by Mr. Bulwer of not having interfered for the defence of the Sultan against Mehemet Ali, and not having thus prevented the advance of the Russian army, he began that curious system of defence and of confession, developed on later occasions, the *membra disjecta*^a of which I shall now gather together.

"He was not *prepared* to deny, that the latter part of last year an application was made on the part of the Sultan to this country for assistance."—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

The Porte made formal application for assistance in the course of August—(H. of C., August 24, 1833.)

No, not in August.

"The request of the Porte for naval assistance has been made in the month of October, 1832."—(H. of C., August 28, 1833.)

No, it was not in October.^b

"Its assistance was asked by the Porte in November 1832."—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

The noble lord is as uncertain of the day when the Porte implored his aid, as Falstaff was of the number of rogues in buckram suits, who came at his back, in Kendal green.^c He is not

^a Scattered parts, disjointed quotations.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has after this: "as we learn from a speech made a year later".—*Ed.*

^c Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

prepared, however, to deny that the armed assistance offered by Russia was rejected by the Porte, and that he was applied to. He refused to comply with her demands. The Porte did again apply to the noble lord. First she sent M. Maurogeni to London; then she sent Namick Pasha, who entreated the assistance of a naval squadron on the condition of the Sultan undertaking to defray all the expenses of that squadron, and promising in future requital for that succour, the grant of new *commercial* privileges, and advantages to British subjects in Turkey. So sure was Russia of the noble lord's refusal, that she joined the Turkish Envoy in praying his lordship for the affording of the demanded succour. He tells us himself,

"it was but justice that he should state, that so far from Russia having expressed any jealousy as to this government granting this assistance, the Russian Ambassador^a officially communicated to him, [...] while the request was still under the consideration, that he had learned that such an application had been made, and that, from the interest taken by Russia in the maintenance and preservation of the Turkish empire, it would afford satisfaction if ministers could find themselves able to comply with that request."—(H. of C., August 28, 1833.)

The noble lord remained, however, inexorable to the demands of the Porte, although backed by disinterested Russia herself. Then, of course, the Porte knew what she was about. She understood that she was doomed to make the wolf shepherd. Still she hesitated, and did not accept the Russian assistance till three months later.^b

"Great Britain," says the noble lord, "never complained of Russia granting that assistance, but, on the contrary, was glad that Turkey had been able to obtain effectual relief from any quarter."—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

At whatever epoch the Porte may have implored the aid of Lord Palmerston, he cannot but own,

"No doubt if England had *thought fit* to interfere, the progress of the invading army would have been stopped, and the Russian troops would not have been called in."—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

Why then did he not "*think fit*" to interfere and to keep the Russians out?

^a K. Lieven.—*Ed.*

^b Instead of the three last sentences the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: "Then, of course, the Porte knew what it was about, and comprehended that it was doomed to accept the Russian assistance."—*Ed.*

First he pleads *want of time*. According to his own statement the conflict between the Porte and Mehemet Ali arose as early as October 1831, while the decisive battle of Konia was not fought till December 21st 1832. Could he find no time during all this period? A great battle was won by Ibrahim Pasha in July 1832,²⁸³ and again he could find no time from July to December. But he was all that time waiting for a *formal* application, which, according to his last version, was not made till the 3rd of November.

“Was he then,” asks Sir Robert Peel, “so ignorant of what was passing in the Levant, that he must wait for a formal application?”—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

And from November, when the formal application was made, to the latter part of February, there elapsed again four long months, and Russia did not arrive until February 20, 1833. Why did not he?

But he has better reasons in reserve.

The Pasha of Egypt was but a rebellious subject, and the Sultan was the Suzerain.

“As it was a war against the sovereign by a subject, and that sovereign was in alliance with the King of England, it would have been inconsistent with good faith to have had *any communication* with the Pasha.” (H. of C., August 28, 1833.)

Etiquette prevented the noble lord from stopping Ibrahim's armies. *Etiquette* forbade him giving instructions to his Consul at Alexandria to use his influence with Mehemet Ali.^a Like the Spanish Grandee, the noble lord would rather let the Queen burn to ashes than infringe on *etiquette* and interfere with her petticoats. Perchance it so appears that the noble lord had already in 1832 accredited consuls and diplomatic agents to the “subject” of the Sultan without the consent of the Sultan, that he entered into treaties with Mehemet altering existing regulations and arrangements touching matters of trade and revenue and establishing other ones in their room; that he did so without the consent of the Porte beforehand, or caring for its approbation afterwards.^b—(H. of C., February 23, 1848.)

Accordingly, we are told by Earl Grey, the then chief of the noble viscount, that

^a These two sentences are omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^b In the *New-York Daily Tribune* the end of this sentence is given as follows: “that he had entered into treaties with Mehemet Ali altering existing regulations and arrangement touching matters of trade and revenue; that he did not ask the consent of the Porte beforehand, not even care for its approbation afterward: and that he had thus treated ‘the rebellious subject’ as an independent power”.—*Ed.*

"They had at the moment extensive commercial relations with Mehemet Ali which it would not have been their interest to disturb."—(House of Lords, February 4, 1834.)

What commercial relations with the "rebellious subject."^a

But the noble viscount's fleets were occupied in the Duero, and the Tagus, and blockading the Schelde, and doing the service of the midwife at the birth of the constitutional empires of Portugal, Spain, and Belgium, and he was, therefore, not in a situation to spare one single ship.—(H. of C., July 11, 1833, and March 17, 1834.)

But what the Sultan insisted on was precisely naval assistance. For argument's sake we will grant the noble lord to have been unable to dispose of one single vessel.^b But there are great authorities assuring us that what was wanted was not a single *vessel*, but only a single *word*^c on the part of the noble lord. There is Admiral Codrington, the destroyer of the Turkish fleet at Navarino.

"Mehemet Ali," he states, "had of old felt the strength of our representations on the subject of the evacuation of the Morea. He had then received orders from the Porte to resist all applications to induce him to evacuate it at the risk of his head, and he did resist accordingly, but at last prudently yielded and evacuated the Morea."—(H. of C., April 20, 1836.)

There is the Duke of Wellington.

"If, in the session of 1832 or 1833, they had plainly told Mehemet Ali, that he should not carry on his contest in Syria and Asia Minor, they would have put an end to the war without the risk of allowing the Emperor of Russia to send a fleet and an army to Constantinople."—(House of Lords, February 4, 1834.)

But there are better authorities. There is the noble lord himself.

"Although," he says, "his Majesty's government did not comply with the demand of the Sultan for naval assistance, yet the moral assistance of England was afforded; and the communications made by the British government to the Pasha of Egypt, and to Ibrahim Pasha, commanding in Asia Minor, did materially contribute to bring about that arrangement" (of Kutaiah) "between the Sultan and the Pasha, by which that war was *terminated*."—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

^a This sentence is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has after this: "for such trifles as preventing Russia from occupying Constantinople, or Mehemet Ali from endangering the *status quo* of the world".—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* has further: "in order to check the ambition of Mehemet Ali and the armies of Ibrahim Pasha. Lord Mahon tells us this, and when he made his statement he had just been employed at the Foreign Office under Sir Robert Peel".—*Ed.*

There is Lord Derby, then Mr. Stanley and a member of the Palmerston Cabinet, who

“boldly asserts that what stopped the progress of Mehemet Ali, was the distinct declaration of France and England that they would not permit the occupation of Constantinople by his troops.”—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

Thus then, according to Lord Derby and to Lord Palmerston himself,^a it was not the Russian squadron and army at Constantinople, but it was a *distinct declaration* on the part of the British consular agent at Alexandria, that stopped Ibrahim’s victorious march upon Constantinople, and brought about the arrangement of Kutaiah, by virtue of which Mehemet Ali obtained, besides Egypt, the Pashalik of Syria, of Adana and other places, added as appendage. But the noble lord thought fit not to allow his consul at Alexandria to make this distinct declaration till after the Turkish army was annihilated—Constantinople overrun by the Cossacks, the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi signed by the Sultan, and pocketed by the Czar.

If want of time and want of fleets, forbade the noble lord to assist the Sultan, and a superfluity of *etiquette* to check the Pasha, did he at least employ his ambassador at Constantinople to guard against excessive influence on the part of Russia, and to keep her influence confined to narrow bounds? Quite the contrary. In order not to clog the movements of Russia, the noble lord took good care to have no ambassador at all at Constantinople during the most fatal period of the crisis.

“If ever there was a country in which the weight and station of an ambassador were useful—or a period in which that weight and station might be advantageously exerted—that country was Turkey, during the six months before the 8th of July.”—(Speech of Lord Mahon, H. of C., April 20, 1836.)

Lord Palmerston tells us, that the British Ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, left Constantinople in September, 1832—that Lord Ponsonby, then at Naples, was appointed in his place in November, and that “difficulties experienced in making the necessary arrangements for his conveyance,”—although a man-of-war was in waiting for him—“and the unfavourable state of the weather, did prevent his getting to Constantinople until the end of May, 1833.”—(H. of C., March 17, 1834.)

The Russian was not yet in, and Lord Ponsonby was accordingly

^a The *New-York Daily Tribune* has after this: “—and this is the most curious feature of these curious transactions”.—*Ed*

ordered to require seven months for sailing from Naples to Constantinople.^a

But why should the noble lord prevent the Russians from occupying Constantinople?

"He for his part had great doubts that *any* intention to partition the Ottoman Empire *at all* entered into the policy of the Russian government."—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

Certainly not. Russia wants not to partition the empire but to keep the whole of it. Besides the security Lord Palmerston possessed in this *doubt* he had another security "in the *doubt*, whether it enters into the policy of Russia *at present* to accomplish the object," and a third "security" in the third "*doubt*"

"whether the *Russian nation*" (just think of a Russian *nation*!)^b "would be prepared for that transference of power, of residence, and authority to the southern provinces which would be the necessary consequence of the conquest by Russia of Constantinople."—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

Besides these negative arguments the noble lord had an affirmative one:

"if they had quietly beheld the temporary occupation of the Turkish capital by the forces of Russia, it was because they had full confidence in the honour and good faith of Russia.... The Russian government in granting its aid to the Sultan had pledged its honour, and in that pledge *he* reposed the most implicit confidence."^c—(H. of C., July 11, 1833.)

So inaccessible, indestructible, integral, imperishable, inexpungable, incalculable, incommensurable, and irremediable; so boundless, dauntless, and matchless was the noble lord's confidence, that still on March 17, 1834, when the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi had become a *fait accompli*, he went on declaring that, "in their *confidence* ministers were not deceived." Not his is the fault if nature has developed his protuberance of confidence to altogether anomalous dimensions.

^a Instead of the sentence beginning with the words: "The Russian was not yet in", the *New-York Daily Tribune* has: "Sir Stratford Canning is recalled in September and Lord Ponsonby appointed in November. But Ibrahim Pasha had not yet crossed the Taurus, not yet fought the battle of Konia and the Russians had not yet seized upon Czarigrad. Accordingly Lord Ponsonby is ordered to employ seven months in sailing from Naples to Constantinople."—*Ed.*

^b The phrase in brackets is omitted in the *New-York Daily Tribune*.—*Ed.*

^c The *New-York Daily Tribune* has after the quotation: "With the same confidence he had relied upon Russia not abolishing the Polish Constitution and Nationality. Meanwhile the Czar had abolished both by the Organic Statute of 1832²⁸⁴—but the most implicit confidence of the noble lord remained unshaken."—*Ed.*